A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Mark Leonard at 7:03 P.M. on Tuesday, June 8, 2004, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Kelley, Ramirez, Tumbaga, Chairperson Leonard

Absent: None

Staff: Director of Planning and Building Randy Jerome; Associate Planner Noel Ibalio; Associate Planner Christopher Barton; Senior Civil Engineer Alfredo Hurtado; Senior Civil Engineer Ron Nevels; and City Engineer Joe Sbranti.

POSTING OF AGENDA:

The agenda was posted at City Hall on Friday, June 4, 2004.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Ramirez led the Pledge of Allegiance.

DELETIONS/withdrawals/CONTINUANCES:

There were no deletions, withdrawals or continuances.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no comments from the audience.
City Engineer Joe Sbranti explained that staff would be presenting an overview of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), a plan that had been prepared by all City Departments through a group effort and which had previously been presented to the Recreation Commission, the City Council and the Community Advisory Committee (CAC).

Mr. Sbranti reported that the CIP included over 60 projects and the document itself was over 180 pages longer than the previous year. He added that the CIP included everything the City had ever considered. Staff had made an effort to include operational expenses for each project so that when the City Council considered the projects in the document, it would also be able to consider the long term maintenance and operational costs associated with each project.

Senior Civil Engineer Ron Nevels presented an overview of the Five-Year CIP which identified how the City would expend funds for future projects. The Five-Year CIP serves as an indicator for funding shortfalls. It is updated annually to be current with the City’s needs.

Mr. Nevels advised that there were 185 projects in the Five-Year CIP including funded and un-funded projects. A list of criteria used to include each of the projects in the CIP were identified. The development of the CIP had been possible through a team of City Department heads who reviewed all of the projects. A review of the City’s Water Master Plan, Sewer Master Plan and Storm Drain Master Plan identified the projects waiting for construction.

Mr. Nevels explained that the CIP had been presented to the Recreation Commission in March 2004 and had been the subject of a City Council Workshop on May 17, 2004. It had also recently been reviewed by the CAC. The City Council would be asked to adopt the Final Five-Year CIP at its meeting on July 6, 2004.

Mr. Nevels identified the scheduling of the projects in the Five-Year CIP and the criteria used for the scheduling of projects, most importantly the availability of funding and project staff. Several funding sources were also identified. He noted that the General Fund would not fund any of the projects in the Five-Year CIP. Several of the funding sources were restricted and could not be used for just any project, such as sewer funds which are required to be used for sewer projects only.

A pie chart was displayed to the Commission to illustrate the source of funding for projects which total almost $41 million. Mr. Nevels identified the Redevelopment Agency as the source of 62 percent of the funding.

A summary of the categories of projects for were also identified with building projects at $8.25 million. Included in those projects was the new Pittsburg Library which was currently...
being designed, the parks projects at $8.7 million and the new Marina where the City had opened bids this week. The operations and maintenance costs estimated for each of the projects was presented.

Mr. Nevels highlighted the projects either partially or fully funded by the Redevelopment Agency. The construction and design schedule for all projects was noted. He explained that the schedule could change depending on any potential delays associated with the projects. Several projects included in the Five-Year CIP were identified as planned to start but were not actually at construction, the majority of which were park projects that would be designed but would not be constructed until operations and maintenance funds were available. Projects that were currently active and were close to completion were identified but had not been included in the Five-Year CIP.

Mr. Sbranti explained that staff would update the Commission on current projects. The current presentation was not only to present the CIP but also to allow the Commission to provide input or inquire about any ongoing projects that had been listed in the CIP. He commented that some of the projects, such as the Senior Center, were nearing completion.

Mr. Nevels added that the future updates would include a project by project slide for each of the projects identified.

Commissioner Garcia spoke to the inclusion of the Buchanan Road Bypass on the project list that the City was not responsible for financing or building the road. He noted that the Bypass had been assigned a funding source from the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Finance Authority (ECCRFFA), although that was not accurate. He understood that the project would be financed through Joint Powers Authority 1, (JPA1) which had nothing to do with the ECCRFFA which had been formed to build I-160 and the State Route 4 Bypass.

Commissioner Garcia added that although staff had identified no funding available for the Buchanan Road Bypass project, there was $4 million in JPA1 funds available at any time the City requested the funds. Rather than be the lead agency, he expressed a preference that the City take over the project.

Commissioner Garcia understood that the City had been allowed access to the Thomas Ranch property for the past year and the City Council had approved a staff report which had located the road and which had already been halfway designed and was currently being built in the City of Antioch.

Mr. Sbranti explained that the Buchanan Road Improvement project was not connected to the Buchanan Road Bypass Project. There were two projects listed in the CIP for the Buchanan Road Bypass project including a study, design and actual construction. That portion of the design and studies had shown the $4 million in funding from the ECCRFFA, although the East County Transportation Improvement Authority (ECTIA) was the other JPA which had been formed to build the Bypass. He commented that staff was currently working to merge those two entities.
Mr. Sbranti added that the funding was not all coming from the City, although the City was the lead agency in terms of the studies and the City was trying to push the studies along for the alignment and the environmental issues. There were also several sources of funding included in the document where the City had acted as the lead point of contact for other agencies. He explained that the project would need to be shown in the document although the majority of the funding must come from outside sources.

Commissioner Garcia disagreed with Mr. Sbranti where the funding had originated in that prior to the establishment of the ECCRFFA, the JPA had already been established and the $4 or $5 million in funding had become available. He understood that the City had already been allocated half a million dollars for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Mr. Sbranti acknowledged that monies had been used for the feasibility and alignment studies. There had also been some environmental constraints analyses on the project although it was short of the EIR. The current funding was identified through the ECCRFFA, with no ongoing work being done at this time. Staff had recently met with two Councilmembers and representatives from the ECCRFFA and the TRANSPLAN Committee to discuss moving forward with additional studies. He expected that work would be undertaken before the end of the year and immediately upon the merger of the group.

Commissioner Garcia also pointed out that a street not on the list for repair was Mariposa Drive, which was in very poor condition. He noted that other streets in better condition had been included in the CIP. He requested that Mariposa Drive be included in the CIP.

Mr. Sbranti recognized that there were several streets that fell under that category, particularly in the downtown area. In working with the Public Works Department he advised that staff had worked to mitigate the problems as quickly as possible, although the problem was that the utilities underneath the streets must be repaired before the repavement of the streets. The streets selected for this year had been selected based on need and readiness.

Commissioner Garcia also spoke to the West Leland Road Extension. He suggested that the developer should be responsible for the roadway rather than funding the project through traffic mitigation fees.

Commissioner Garcia did not want to see the City put into the position of not being able to recover the money. He noted that the City was not to build the roads when a developer was developing the surrounding property.

Mr. Sbranti explained that the City would be taking advantage of the opportunity to build all four lanes at one time when the contractor was mobilized to do all of the work at one time. It was expected that the project would be out for construction this year. He added that the City would be building a share of the road which would be funded through local traffic
mitigation fees. The City would be responsible for two lanes of the four-lane roadway.

Commissioner Garcia noted that Leland Road had been built by developers. He questioned why the developer had not been required to build all four lanes, with credit to the City for the traffic mitigation fees.

Mr. Sbranti reiterated that the funding for the City's two lanes would be paid by the developer in the form of the local traffic mitigation fees, which was the same for both developers in this instance. In effect, the developer was building the entire roadway, with the City to use the developer's fees to build that share.

Commissioner Garcia again disagreed in that the fees that were being used were not from Lyons [the developer] which had built nothing in the City. He suggested that the developer should receive credit for two lanes while the cost of the other two lanes, when developed, should include the full costs including the public utilities.

Mr. Sbranti advised that was what was being done.

Commissioner Tumbaga expressed concern that the streets between Eighth Street and the Santa Fe Railroad Tracks from Railroad Avenue to Beacon Street had not been included in the project list. She emphasized that the residents of those areas had lived with streets in poor condition for many years.

Mr. Nevels identified a Redevelopment Agency project for the Downtown Infrastructure Replacement Improvements.

Mr. Sbranti commented that the infrastructure improvements needed in the downtown totaled over $50 million. The City was not capable of expending all of those funds at any one time. The City would continue to work on the downtown streets and was in the process of completing Tenth Street and had completed improvements to Eighth Street.

Mr. Sbranti added that the Herb White Way project had been scheduled for 2005 with additional worked needed on the storm drain and the Montezuma Street Pump Station, which would have to be upgraded. Additional mories had been allocated in the downtown for sewer and water improvements. As the projects continued, more and more streets would be in a position to be repaved over the underground utilities.

Mr. Sbranti added that the Public Works Department worked to keep roads patched, although until a more thorough job was possible, the road would not be as nice as everyone would like. Commissioner Ramirez spoke to the Herb White Way Improvement Project, which had been scheduled for 2005. He noted that a project shown in 2008 would tear up the intersection and install the watershed running from Eighth Street from Herb White Way to Montezuma Street and to Railroad Avenue. He added that there were a number of projects tying into the same area. Another project in 2006-2007 had shown improvements to West Eighth Street for a sewer line from Beacon Street to Herb White Way to tie into the corner.
of Eighth Street and Herb White Way. In his opinion, all of the underground work should be completed prior to the repaving.

Mr. Sbranti explained that the City would not hold off on utilities and do the pavement first, in that it was done the other way around. If the project list had shown the repaving work being done prior to the underground work, that was incorrect in that the utility work would be done first and then the repaving. When the City had to go back and do undergrounding with newly paved streets, the practice had been to do a pipe bursting method that would minimize impacts to the streets. He cited a project on Columbia Street in 1998 which had used that method.

Commissioner Ramirez questioned when the utilities would be installed, to which Mr. Sbranti advised that would be done when the funding was available.

Commissioner Ramirez expressed concern that when the funding was available it would be when the street had been resurfaced on Herb White Way where the City would tear up the street again. He noted that the area of West Eighth Street between Herb White Way and Beacon Street ran behind homes on the south side of the street. The existing sewer line in that area was only 6 to 8 inches below the surface in some areas. That had been a real problem where raw sewage had come up. While the City had conducted some minor improvements, there remained some cleanup of the lines once a week to prevent back ups. He suggested that was a higher priority than some of the other projects and should be done prior to anything else in the area.

Mr. Sbranti reiterated that was not the way the City did the work in that the underground work would be done first. If the funding was not available, the work would not be done and the paving would not be done until the financing was available for the underground work. He explained that the Public Works Department had hand selected the sewer projects which were of the highest priority. He assured the Commission that the project was on the list and was scheduled to proceed within the next year and a half.

Given the length of the discussion, Chairperson Leonard recommended that the Commission consider the remaining agenda items prior to the completion of the CIP discussion.

By consensus, the Commission considered the remaining agenda items at this time.

CONSENT:
A. Planning Commission Minutes of May 25, 2004
B. Ferguson Storage Yard Expansion AP-04-86 (UP)

MOTION:
Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt the Consent Calendar, as shown. The motion
was seconded by Commissioner Kelley and carried by the following vote:

| Ayes:       | Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Kelley, Ramirez, Tumbaga, Leonard |
| Noes:       | None                                                             |
| Abstain:    | None                                                             |
| Absent:     | None                                                             |

COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS:

Item 2: Hospital Systems Addition. AP-04-110 (DR)

Application by T. C. Chen requesting design review approval of architectural plans for the construction of a 2,880 square foot building addition to an existing building currently used for custom manufacturing located at 750 Garcia Avenue, IP (Industrial Park) zone; APN 088-250-042.

Associate Planner Christopher Barton presented the staff report. He recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9486, approving Design Review Application AP-04-110 (DR), with the conditions as shown.

PROPONET:

DAVID MILLER, Hospital Systems, 750 Garcia Avenue, Pittsburg, requested a variance to the requirement for an enclosed trash enclosure. The only waste generated by the business would be office paper that was not recycled. There would be no liquid or food waste. The existing City dumpster was located behind the building. The rear of the building was completely fenced and locked during the evening. The requirement for an enclosed trash enclosure would add to the cost of the addition and take up space at the rear of the property. He preferred the use of a dumpster that could be moved out as needed.

Chairperson Leonard spoke to the rear of the building where the shed was located and suggested that a fence could be placed across that area where the trash enclosure could be located.

Mr. Miller noted that would only be a three foot area. The dumpster was currently located by the door on the east side. Twice a week it was placed out for pickup by the garbage company. If the dumpster was enclosed, the garbage truck would have difficulty reaching the dumpster.

Mr. Barton explained that the requirement for the trash enclosure was based on the City’s joint Municipal National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. It was not adopted by ordinance and was something the Commission could waive if the Commission chose not to impose the condition on the applicant.
Mr. Jerome inquired if the dumpster could be placed inside the new addition since it had roll-up doors.

Mr. Miller explained that the manufacturing company used material that came in 18-foot lengths. That material was currently off-loaded and brought through the original 10-foot doors with a forklift and placed on racks. The addition was to have a 20-foot door to allow the materials to be brought straight in. If the dumpster was located inside the addition, it would obstruct the forklift.

Mr. Barton suggested rather than a solid masonry trash enclosure, the applicant could build a covered structure to be incorporated into the side of the building where the existing trash bin was located and which would prevent precipitation into the trash enclosure. He suggested that as a compromise to achieve the NPDES goals.

Mr. Miller commented that they could comply with that proposed method. He also affirmed, when asked, that he had read and was in agreement with the other staff recommended conditions of approval.

OPPONENTS: None

MOTION: AP-04-110 (DR)

Motion by Commissioner Ramirez to adopt Resolution No. 9486, approving Design Review Application No. AP-04-110 (DR), including architectural drawings for the construction of a 2,880 square foot building addition and on-site improvements to an existing building located at 750 Garcia Avenue, with the conditions as shown and with the placement of an overhang over the existing garbage bin, as discussed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dolojan and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Kelley, Ramirez, Tumbaga, Leonard
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Item 3: Creekside Village Sign Exception. AP-03-63 (DR)

Application by Chris Valeriote requesting design review approval of plans for the construction of a freestanding sign and sign exception for sign area and location of signage offsite for Creekside Village Senior Apartments located at 30 Castlewood Drive, PD, (Planned Development) District; APN 089-060-008.

Associate Planner Christopher Barton reported that the applicant was not present in the audience. He acknowledged that the applicant had been notified of the meeting and had not contacted staff to advise of an inability to attend the meeting.
MOTION: AP-03-63 (DR)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to continue AP-03-63, (DR) to the Planning Commission meeting of June 22, 2004. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kelley and carried by the following vote:

    Ayes: Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Kelley, Ramirez, Tumbaga, Leonard
    Noes: None
    Abstain: None
    Absent: None

The Commission resumed the discussions of the Five-Year CIP at this time.

Mr. Sbranti explained that Project SS-4, the replacement of an 8-inch sewer line on Beacon Street, was on the top of the Public Works Department list in terms of need. The project would be moving forward as soon as possible and could occur this year, although it would likely start in the spring of 2005. Project SS-2 for West Eighth Street and Herb White Way had been shown on the CIP list as also being constructed soon. That project should move back since there was new pavement on that street which the City would not disturb.

Commissioner Ramirez recommended that Projects SS-2 and SS-4 be done at the same time. He noted that the homes for Habitat for Humanity all tied into the existing sewer line and the City had placed an extra load on the existing lines since those homes had been constructed.

Mr. Sbranti reiterated that all of the work in the area of Beacon Street behind the homes was on the top of the priority list. If not scheduled for work this year, it should be and would be added. He emphasized that the document could be cleared up to ensure that was clearly reflected on the project list.

Mr. Sbranti also spoke to the status of the streets in the area south of Tenth Street. He noted that the City had a variety of needs and the CIP had well over $100 million of needed improvements. Staff had been directed to spread the improvements throughout the City. He spoke to the exhibit on the last page of the CIP which had illustrated how the projects had been scattered around the City, with a substantial number of projects in the downtown area and throughout the City.

Mr. Sbranti reported that approximately $1.1 million had recently been added for the downtown infrastructure which had been averted from funds previously allocated to West Leland Road. Since the City was working with the developer on that project and since the City would be saving funds from that project, funds had been freed up for reallocation into
the downtown area. He clarified that he could not guarantee that all of the roads would be completed.

Commissioner Tumbaga questioned when any work had been done in the neighborhood south of Tenth Street.

Mr. Sbranti acknowledged, when asked, that with the exception of work done around the Park Place development, no work had been done in that area of the City for the past eight years. He added that staff had recently held a Neighborhood Preservation Team meeting to address the area. While there had been comments from the neighbors, no one from the neighborhood south of Tenth Street had attended that meeting. He reported that the Redevelopment Agency had set up a fund with an initial allocation of half a million dollars and with a million dollars annually for the next four years to specifically address such concerns and to target some of the lower income neighborhoods.

Commissioner Tumbaga questioned whether or not the City had taken into account the demographics of the neighborhoods where the meetings had been held. She also inquired whether or not an interpreter had been present since a language barrier could have been a problem and could account for the lack of attendance.

Mr. Sbranti affirmed that a translator had been available at the meetings and that flyers had been distributed in the neighborhood, although they were not bilingual. He emphasized that staff would continue to target all areas of the City.

Chairperson Leonard added that the neighborhood had a 60 percent non-owner occupant ratio and it was likely those residents would not be interested in attending the meetings. He suggested that the owners of record be notified of the neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Sbranti stated that the flyers had gone directly to the homes and not to the property owners. Ideally both the occupants and the property owners should be notified. He would make that suggestion to ensure that was the case for future meetings.

Commissioner Ramirez understood that a community workshop had been scheduled for June 14 for the Marina Walk 2 project. He commented when that project was a reality it would tie into the neighborhood under discussion at Eighth Street and Herb White Way. He emphasized the importance of synchronizing all improvements.

Commissioner Kelley inquired whether or not the area of Suzanne Drive was part of the Buchanan Road Improvement Project since the area had a problem with flooding during inclement weather.

Mr. Sbranti advised that Suzanne Drive had been scheduled for improvements in the near future, hopefully over the next construction season, to be followed next spring with paving. He was unaware of any storm drain problems. He would investigate that issue to determine how it could be addressed.
The Commission proceeded with the public hearing for Item No. 1 at this time, which tied into the presentation.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Item 1: CIP Consistency with General Plan

Determination by Planning Commission whether the projects listed in the proposed Five Year Capital Improvement Program are consistent with the City’s General Plan.

Associate Planner Noel Ibaliio presented the staff report. He recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9493, finding that the proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) conforms with the City’s General Plan.

Chairperson Leonard spoke to the unfunded item for a topography map of the City. With all of the discussions over the past several months on the City’s hillsides, roads and accessibility, he emphasized the importance of a topographic map for any development in the western portion of the City. He questioned the lack of priority given to that needed item.

Mr. Sbranti advised that all comments would be forwarded to the City Council, which had the option of reallocating funds.

Commissioner Garcia suggested that the CIP was consistent with the policies of the General Plan, although he disagreed where the City Council was spending money. He cited the new library as an example, noting that the City did not have the money to staff a new library. In addition, with the development of the new Senior Center, many library services had been relocated to the new Senior Center resulting in fewer people patronizing the library. While the existing library might have to be remodeled, and while many had argued that the existing property was too valuable, he questioned the demolition of the existing library to build something new. He suggested that the existing building could be expanded or remodeled costing the City less than the cost of a new building.

Commissioner Garcia also pointed out that Los Medanos Junior College (LMC) was in the process of building a new library. He recommended that the City Council reconsider expending funds for a new library and that the Council redistribute the money into projects that were needed by the community.

Chairperson Leonard noted that one percent of the fund allocated for the new library would pay for the cost of the topography map.

Commissioner Tumbaga questioned whether or not the CIP was consistent with the General Plan and its policies because of the neighborhoods that had not been addressed, particularly those that had not been addressed for many years. In her opinion there was an opportunity to do something in areas that had not been listed on the CIP.

Mr. Jerome clarified that the discussion was for a Five-Year CIP while the General Plan
was a long-range document with a 20-year horizon. He stated that some of the issues that had been discussed could be included in a future CIP.

Mr. Sbranti also explained that general descriptions had been included in the CIP covering sewer, water and paving. Beyond a year's time no specific project areas had been identified in that general improvements only had been described. He reiterated that the comments offered by the Commission would be considered for future projects and that the comments would be forwarded to the City Council. He also reiterated, when asked, that the CIP was reviewed every year. The projects listed in the CIP had been specifically targeted for the next 12 to 18 months.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Sbranti explained that the Redevelopment Agency had held workshops to discuss the projects to include on the Agency's list. At the July 6, 2004 meeting, the City Council and the Redevelopment Agency would jointly consider the approval of the CIP as well as the use of Agency funds.

Commissioner Ramirez questioned where the City would secure funds for the replacement of sewer lines since the City was now responsible for the replacement of sewer lines from the sidewalk to the lateral.

Mr. Sbranti advised that the Public Works Department would handle that situation on a case by case basis, clean out at the property line or route it between the property and main line of a residence. Once cleaned it would be the homeowner's responsibility. Such clean ups were done each month and were absorbed within the existing budget.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPOSER: City of Pittsburg

INTERESTED SPEAKERS:

BRUCE OHLSON, Pittsburg, a member of the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, spoke to Attachment 2 of the staff report, and ST-10, Herb White Way (Montezuma Street) Eighth Street to Tenth Street. He suggested that Policy 7-P-43 would also have significant bearing on the street, since it required the provision of adequate roadway width for bike lanes consistent with Figure 7-4 in the General Plan.

Mr. Sbranti advised that he had assured Mr. Ohlson that there would be room for bike lanes in the referenced area. He added that as the Habitat for Humanity homes had been created and constructed the City had been acquiring a sliver of right-of-way. When Herb White Way was constructed there will be a widened roadway with 50 feet or at least 48 feet in width, curb to curb to accommodate bike lanes and parking on both sides.

Mr. Ibalio advised that Attachment 2 could be amended to include Mr. Ohlson’s recommended revision to add Policy 7-P-43 to ST-10.
Mr. Ohlson also spoke to ST-21, Railroad Avenue, Leland Road, Geometric Improvements. He suggested that Policy 7-P-51 should also be included as a supporting policy in that the Railroad Avenue Linear Park was to accommodate bicycles to ensure that future greenways throughout the City contained multi-use paths.

Mr. Ibalio agreed that Attachment 2 could be further amended to include Policy 7-P-51 as a supporting policy to ST-21.

With respect to ST-22, Bailey Road/Route 4 Ramp Turn Lane Modifications, Mr. Ohlson suggested that Policy 7-P-43 be added as a supporting policy to provide adequate roadway width for bike lanes consistent with Figure 7-4. He added that Table 7-5 had been created and the General Plan consultant had been directed that the map reflect the table, although that had not been done.

Mr. Sbranti explained that Mr. Ohlson was speaking to a project that was currently unfunded. He could not speak to the map to determine the impacts. He commented that it might reach a point where the safety improvements could not be done if accommodating the bike lane improvements being referenced.

Mr. Sbranti reiterated that the City Council would have a choice to either hold off and do nothing, or do it partially. He could not guarantee that would be part of the project, although he would make every effort to accommodate bicycles.

Further with respect to ST-32, Street Median Construction, Mr. Ohlson suggested that Policy 7-P-43 would apply to that project as well.

Mr. Ibalio affirmed that ST-32 could be amended to add supporting Policy 7-P-43, as recommended.

PETE CARPINO, Pittsburg, understood that a signal at Harbor Street and Yosemite Drive would be funded in the CIP.

Mr. Nevels advised that the project had not been listed for the current fiscal year. The project would be installed later, approximately a year from now.

Mr. Sbranti added that when staff had reallocated Redevelopment Agency funds that had been set aside for West Leland Road, staff had pushed some towards the downtown area and towards traffic signal projects, including the intersection of Yosemite Drive and Harbor Street. The project had been scheduled for design in 2005 and construction in 2006.

Mr. Carpino also expressed concern that repavement repairs had not been identified for the Calistoga and Mariposa Drive areas.

Mr. Sbranti reiterated that work would have to be done to accommodate utilities.
underneath the paving before that work could be done. He expressed hope that the roadway could be done over the course of the next 12 months.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION: (CIP Consistency)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9493, affirming conformance of the Capital Improvement Program Five-Year Plan with the City of Pittsburg adopted General Plan, as modified. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Kelley, Ramirez, Leonard
Noes: Commissioner Tumbaga
Abstain: None
Absent: None

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

1. Notice of Intent (to review/approve projects at staff level).

The Commission acknowledged the receipt of the Notice of Intent, as shown.

Mr. Jerome reported that the public review draft Housing Element was complete and was in the being distributed to the Commission and public for the 30-day review period. A public hearing was tentatively scheduled with the Planning Commission on July 13. An Open House on the Housing Element had also been scheduled for Thursday, June 18, 2004 at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Jerome also reported that the City Council had held interviews for the various City Committees/Commissions, with a number of applications having been received for the Planning Commission. Appointments would be made by the City Council on June 21, 2004.

Mr. Jerome also reported that the new City Manager, Marc Grisham, had started work with the City.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Commissioner Garcia reported that he would be unable to attend the June 10, 2004 TRANSPLAN Committee meeting. He noted that the agenda for that meeting would include congratulations to Tri Delta Transit for improvements to Tri Delta's building,
discussion of the Committee’s Administrative Procedures in terms of representation from each City regarding councilmembers and planning commissioners, and an update on the Measure C Reauthorization.

**COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:**

Commissioner Ramirez reported that he would not be in attendance for the July 27, 2004 Planning Commission meeting and a Commission packet would not have to be delivered to his residence. He also requested that the Commission packets be delivered on the Wednesday prior to each meeting to allow ample time for Commissioners to review agenda materials.

Chairperson Leonard spoke to the area of Third Street where new homes had been built. He noted that the road up to and just past the Liberty Hotel was a throughway with parking. The road was now cut down to two lanes as a result of the new homes with parking in front of the new homes that was blocking a portion of the lane.

Chairperson Leonard expressed concern with traffic safety in that area as a result of the changes to the roadway configuration. He suggested that the roadway be widened as a safety factor or that the City consider a no parking zone in that area.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 P.M. to a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on June 22, 2004 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

MELISSA AYRES, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission