
3.3 LAND USE

Introduction

This land use analysis addresses how the Proposed Project relates to and affects existing and future land uses as defined in the general plans of local jurisdictions in the project corridor. The study area for this land use assessment covers the length of the approximately 10-mile corridor that extends from the unincorporated community of Bay Point to the Hillcrest Avenue Station Area in the City of Antioch. The project corridor follows the State Route 4 (SR 4) median from the existing Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, through the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch. To understand how land uses and development patterns may be altered and influenced along the project corridor, the study area encompasses one-quarter mile on each side of the proposed route and one-half mile around the two proposed stations. The one-quarter and one-half mile study area is generally accepted as the area expected to experience the greatest land use change in response to a transit facility. For the purposes of this analysis, the one-half mile areas surrounding the proposed stations are referred to as station areas.

The key issues examined in this land use section are:

- whether transit service, and particularly transit stations, are compatible with existing development along the proposed route;
- whether construction of transit facilities would displace or lead to the conversion of agricultural land; and
- how well the Proposed Project supports local land use and development policies and strategies.

It should be noted that even though this section describes the Proposed Project's consistency with local policies, California Government Code Section 53090 exempts rapid transit districts like BART from complying with local land use plans, policies, and zoning ordinances. However, BART's Strategic Plan emphasizes the importance of transit investments supporting local land use, planning, and development activities. Accordingly, this land use analysis includes a discussion of local land use policies in order to disclose to the public the ability of the Proposed Project to support or impede local land use decisions.

In addition, in December 1999 and December 2002, the BART Board of Directors adopted the *BART System Expansion Policy* and the *System Expansion Policy Criteria and Process* which contain evaluation criteria for proposed expansions of BART transit service. These criteria include evaluation of local land use plans and policies, existing land uses and station area access in order to determine whether anticipated ridership levels appear to be sufficiently high

to favor investment in a proposed expansion project. The System Expansion Policy is intended to both guide BART's review of proposed projects and to help local jurisdictions identify ways to effectively achieve the ridership necessary to support a BART expansion project. The System Expansion Policy was adopted with the intention of guiding evaluation of all future BART expansion projects. In order to demonstrate sufficient anticipated ridership for the Proposed Project, BART's System Expansion Policy provides that a Ridership Development Plan (RDP) be prepared and implemented by the local jurisdiction in which stations are proposed.

The Proposed Project is the first BART expansion project subject to the System Expansion Policy. In August 2005, BART entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley and Pittsburg; Contra Costa County; the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); and Tri Delta Transit to provide the process for developing and funding the RDPs. In 2008, BART entered into a First Amendment to the MOU that recognizes the revised scope of the Phase 1 Proposed Project and requires that the cities of Antioch and Pittsburg prepare RDPs for the proposed stations in their respective jurisdictions. The cities must also provide the requisite environmental clearance under CEQA for these plans, as the cities are the public agencies responsible for approving and implementing the plans. The development and access improvements proposed by the RDPs are not part of the Proposed Project but are obviously related.

The RDPs are meant to demonstrate sufficient anticipated ridership to support the proposed new BART stations, and to support development of that ridership by adopting transit supportive land uses and/or making access improvements in the area of the proposed transit stations. These plans, which can be in the form of general plan amendments, specific plans, or zoning revisions, must be approved by the local jurisdictions before BART can approve the Proposed Project. Hence, the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch have undertaken planning efforts as described more fully below.

The compatibility of a new use, like a transit station, with existing and proposed future development is dependent on how the new use alters the character of the neighborhood, district, city, etc. Integral elements of community character include traffic patterns, air quality and noise levels, visual quality, and adequacy of public services, which are addressed in following sections of this EIR. This analysis focuses specifically on land use conflicts and consistency with existing plans and policies, as well as the anticipated changes in land use that would result from the cities of Antioch and Pittsburg adopting the required RDPs.

Comments in response to the Notices of Preparation from 2005 and 2008 (see Appendix A) identified concerns about effects on prime farmland. These comments are addressed in this section.

Existing Conditions

Regional Overview

Regional Development Pattern. Contra Costa County is generally divided into three distinct areas: West County, Central County, and East County. Residential, commercial, and industrial land uses are predominant in the West and Central County areas, while agriculture and open space are notable in the East County area. The project corridor is in East County, which includes the Pittsburg-Antioch area, the cities of Brentwood and Oakley, and the unincorporated communities of Bethel Island, Knightsen, Byron, and Discovery Bay. The East County has the largest land area of the County's subareas and includes much of the hilly terrain of the Mt. Diablo range. Historically agricultural in nature and use, this area of the County has experienced a dramatic increase in housing and population, particularly in the 1990s. Between 1990 and 2000 the population of Contra Costa County grew from about 803,700 to 948,800, an increase of approximately 18 percent, with the majority of the increase concentrated in the east Contra Costa County area. Even with the growth of recent years, agricultural uses, farmland, and particularly grazing land, continue to account for most of the acreage in the East County.¹

Of the developed land in the East County, residential land use is the most predominant. The majority of the residential areas are concentrated in the cities along the project corridor and unincorporated Discovery Bay. The largest commercial areas are in Pittsburg and Antioch, along with the major industrial uses, which include heavy chemical and steel plants and light manufacturing businesses. Smaller commercial and industrial uses are scattered through the remaining communities.

Urban Limit Lines. In response to the rapid growth and a growing environmental awareness in the County, voters adopted Measure C (1990), also known as the "65/35 Contra Costa County Land Preservation Plan," which requires not less than 65 percent of the land in the County be preserved for parks, open space, agriculture, wetlands, and other non-urban uses. Measure C (1990) also created an Urban Limit Line (ULL), which prohibits the County from approving urban land uses beyond the ULL. The most recent inventory by County staff found that 69.6 percent of the land in the County is currently non-urban use and planned for non-urban use, and 30.4 percent of the land in the County is currently urban use or planned for urban use.²

Following Measure C (1990), County voters adopted Measure J (2004). Measure J extended a half-cent transportation sales tax for an additional 25 years beyond its original 2008 sunset date and required cities and the County to have a voter-approved ULL by November 2006 to be

¹ Contra Costa County, *Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020*, January 2005.

² Contra Costa County, Advance Planning, *Methods and Results Used for the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard Inventory*, June 2000, <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/>, accessed January 29, 2008.

eligible for Measure J funds. In November 2006, County voters approved Measure L, which extended the term of the ULL to 2026; required voter approval to expand the ULL by more than 30 acres; adopted a new ULL map; and added new review procedures. The most recent ULL map, which was adopted in November 2006, shows that the project corridor is located entirely within the ULL.³ In fact, the ULL extends beyond the area surrounding the project corridor and includes the cities of Oakley and Brentwood.

Future Development Pattern. With increasing pressure to accommodate anticipated future growth while preserving at least 65 percent of the County's lands for agricultural, open space, and recreational areas, Contra Costa County has focused planning efforts on the development of more efficient planning practices and trends. These practices include transit-oriented development (TOD), which places housing and commercial and employment centers in close proximity to transit service; an overall denser, mixed-use development pattern so that residents can walk to services and transit, rather than using cars; and infill development of underutilized and vacant properties. The RDPs being developed by the cities of Antioch and Pittsburg pursuant to the MOU entered into to implement BART's System Expansion Policy also focus on TOD in and around the proposed new station areas to guide and intensify development in those areas and support transit services. The development of TODs around future transit stations can aid in preserving open space, reducing traffic congestion, and minimizing environmental impacts.

Existing Land Uses in the Project Corridor

The project corridor traverses the East County, generally along SR 4. The greatest residential densities in the project corridor are concentrated in the Pittsburg and Antioch areas. Table 3.3-1 and Figure 3.3-1 show the distribution of land uses within one-quarter mile of the project corridor. As seen in Table 3.3-1, even though there is more acreage in the City of Antioch than in the City of Pittsburg, land in the City of Pittsburg within the project corridor is more developed. Large proportions of the City of Pittsburg are developed with single family residential, commercial, and transportation uses. By contrast, in the City of Antioch, the most predominant land uses within the project corridor are undeveloped lands, single family residential, and transportation uses. The land uses in the City of Oakley are overwhelmingly single family. The affected land uses in unincorporated Contra Costa County are limited to those in the area around the existing Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, which are primarily single family residential. There is also a park, some open space, some multifamily residential uses, a small area of commercial uses, and an elementary school. Existing land uses within one-half mile of each proposed station area are described in detail below. Overall, the predominant land uses within the project corridor are single family residential, followed by transportation uses and undeveloped land.

³ Contra Costa County, Urban Limit Line map, updated November 6, 2006, <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/cd/current/advance/ULL/ULLMap11x17.pdf>

**Table 3.3-1
Existing Land Uses in Project Corridor Study Area (in acres)**

	Pittsburg	Antioch	Oakley	Unincorporated County	Proposed Project Corridor	Percent of Total ^a
Agricultural	0	27	4	0	31	< 1%
Undeveloped	153	612	12	14	791	18%
Single family Residential	499	611	114	74	1,298	29%
Multifamily Residential	49	114	0	21	184	4%
Commercial	246	165	0	10	421	10%
Industrial	200	10	0	0	210	5%
Public/Institutional	36	19	0	0	55	1%
Public/Institutional/School	113	42	0	8	163	4%
Park	28	28	0	12	68	2%
Open Space	0	0	0	15	15	< 1%
Utility	60	64	1	3	128	3%
Transportation	390	568	39	69	1,066	24%
TOTAL	1,774	2,260	170	226	4,430	100%

Source: PBS&J, 2008.

Notes:

All values rounded to the nearest acre.

a. Percentages do not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

Bailey Road to Somersville Road, Pittsburg. The project corridor, between Bailey Road and Somersville Road, is in the SR 4 and traverses the unincorporated community of Bay Point and the City of Pittsburg. This portion of the project corridor is shown in Figure 3.3-1. Between Bailey Road and Railroad Avenue, to the north and south of SR 4, are primarily single family subdivisions. Four elementary schools and one preschool/daycare are located within this portion of the project corridor as well. There are also scattered undeveloped parcels and a utility corridor. Between Railroad Avenue and Loveridge Road, north of SR 4, single family homes and industrial uses are equally distributed within the study area. Pittsburg Senior High School is located less than one-half mile northeast of the proposed Railroad Avenue Station. A preschool/daycare and independent study school are both located within one-half mile of the Railroad Avenue interchange. Another preschool/daycare is located approximately one-quarter mile north of SR 4, about halfway between Railroad Avenue and Loveridge Road. South of SR 4, the project corridor is dominated by commercial and industrial uses, with some small areas of single family and multifamily residential uses. From Loveridge Road east to Somersville Road, this portion of the project corridor is defined primarily by regional retail uses with smaller areas of residential and public uses, including Los Medanos College just east

of Loveridge Road and a hospital just west of Somersville Road. There are some large undeveloped parcels along this stretch of the project corridor as well.

Railroad Avenue Station Area. As shown in Figure 3.3-1, the Railroad Avenue Station would be in the median of SR 4 at Railroad Avenue in the City of Pittsburg. Existing land use designations for the station area range from public/institutional uses in the existing Civic Center, to low and medium density residential uses, to community-serving commercial uses. North of SR 4, existing land uses include the Pittsburg Civic Center, Pittsburg High School, single family residences, and some small office and commercial uses fronting Railroad Avenue. South of SR 4, the primary land uses are commercial and light industrial, and some single family residential. Commercial uses and some light industrial uses front Railroad Avenue, with more light industrial uses and residential uses further back from the main thoroughfare. Two churches that are surrounded by single family residences are located approximately one-half mile southwest of the proposed station. There are also a few vacant parcels and multifamily residences on the south side of SR 4 between Goff Avenue and Railroad Avenue. A number of underutilized parcels have been identified in the station area. Table 3.3-2 shows the existing land use distribution within one-half mile of the proposed Railroad Avenue Station. As shown, single family residential, commercial, and transportation uses make up a total of 67 percent of the land uses within one-half mile of the proposed station.

Table 3.3-2
Existing Land Uses within one-half Mile of the
Proposed Railroad Avenue Station (in acres)

Land Use	Acres	Percentage
Agricultural	0	0%
Undeveloped	5.3	1%
Single family Residential	132.5	26%
Multifamily Residential	13.0	3%
Commercial	74.1	15%
Industrial	45.8	9%
Public/Institutional	33.7	7%
Public/Institutional/School	41.0	8%
Park	27.0	5%
Transportation/Rights-of-way	130.1	26%
TOTAL	502.5	100%

Source: PBS&J, 2008.

Somersville Road to Hillcrest Avenue, Antioch. East of Somersville Road, approaching L Street, the primary uses in the project corridor are single and multifamily residential units, and regional retail businesses (see Figure 3.3-1). The approximately two-mile segment of the project corridor between L Street and Hillcrest Avenue in the City of Antioch is primarily surrounded by single family residential, although some commercial uses, and public/institutional uses, including two elementary schools, a high school, and four preschool/daycares, are present as well. East of Hillcrest Avenue, the project corridor would continue to the Hillcrest Avenue Station and then to the project corridor's terminus at the easternmost location for the proposed remote maintenance facility (see Figure 3.3-1). Land uses east of Hillcrest Avenue in the vicinity of all three station options, discussed below, are more rural and less intense than the remainder of the project corridor.

Hillcrest Avenue Station Area. The location of the proposed Hillcrest Avenue Median Station (and station options) is located east of the Hillcrest Avenue interchange. East of Hillcrest Avenue, the existing land uses within the project corridor primarily consist of undeveloped lands and single family residential uses, although the uses closest to Hillcrest Avenue contain commercial, public, and industrial activities. In particular, the area closest to Hillcrest Avenue contains an existing large Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) facility. Further east, developed uses become less concentrated and the land adjacent to and north of SR 4 is generally undeveloped. The segment of the project corridor south of SR 4 and west of State Route 160 (SR 160) contains a neighborhood of single family homes and a large park. The segment of the project corridor north of SR 4 contains primarily undeveloped land, although another neighborhood of single family homes and some open space areas is located just west of SR 160. The new SR 4 Bypass is also located within the project corridor, moving southeast from the SR 4/SR 160 interchange, along a route nearly parallel to the Union Pacific Railroad Mococo Line (Mococo Line). In this area, land uses north of the Mococo Line and within the City of Oakley are primarily single family residential, with small open space and undeveloped parcels. South of the Mococo Line, the project corridor is all undeveloped, with the exception of a Contra Costa Water District canal near the eastern terminus of the project corridor. In this eastern portion of the project corridor, the SR 4 Bypass, Mococo Line, and Contra Costa Water District canal have created an isolated island of undeveloped land within the City of Antioch.

As stated above, this portion of the project corridor contains the Median Station and three optional locations, all of which are analyzed below. Table 3.3-3 shows the distribution of various land uses within one-half mile of the four station sites.

Table 3.3-3
Existing Land Uses within one-half Mile of the Proposed Hillcrest Avenue Station Options (in acres)

Land Use	Median Station		Northside West Option		Northside East Option		Median Station East Option	
	Acres	Percentage ^a	Acres	Percentage ^a	Acres	Percentage ^a	Acres	Percentage ^a
Agricultural	0	0%	7.3	1%	27.4	5%	0	0%
Undeveloped	169.3	34%	231	46%	262.8	52%	210.6	42%
Single family Residential	118.1	23%	127.1	25%	87.3	17%	119.6	24%
Multifamily Residential	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Commercial	25.2	5%	3.7	1%	0	0%	13.1	3%
Industrial	0	0%	0	0%	9.9	2%	0	0%
Public/Institutional	3.2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0.4	0%
Public/Institutional/School	3.2	1%	3.2	1%	0	0%	3.2	1%
Park	17.3	3%	18.9	4%	3.2	1%	17.5	3%
Transportation/Rights-of-way	112.3	22%	93	19%	111.9	22%	103.7	21%
Utility	54.1	11%	18.3	4%	0	0%	34.4	7%
TOTAL	502.6	100%	502.6	100%	502.6	100%	502.6	100%

Source: PBS&J, 2008.

Notes:

a. Percentages do not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

General Plan Land Uses

The following section describes General Plan land use designations within the project corridor. Descriptions of the variations between the County General Plan's land use designations and those for each of the cities are also provided. Figure 3.3-2 depicts land use designations from the Contra Costa County General Plan for the project corridor.

Contra Costa County (Bay Point). The unincorporated Bay Point area is in Contra Costa County. As shown in Figure 3.3-2, the County General Plan land use designations include a large variety of uses, dominated by residential uses both north and south of SR 4 within the project corridor. The residential uses in this portion of the project corridor are largely high

density single family, and medium density multifamily. A special designation for Bay Point Residential Mixed Use is also found within the project corridor. Areas of commercial, public, and park uses are also found within this portion of the project corridor. Land use designations in the area surrounding the existing Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station are primarily public, commercial, high density single family residential, and include the Bay Point Residential Mixed Use designation, all of which are more intense uses than exist in other portions of the project corridor.

City of Pittsburg. As shown in Figure 3.3-2, the primary land use designations in the project corridor west of Railroad Avenue are residential, including high density single family, low density multifamily, and medium density multifamily residential, with some public uses scattered both north and south of SR 4; a large open space area north of SR 4; a large park just to the south; and a few commercial areas. The City's General Plan designates this area as primarily low density residential, with some areas of medium and high density residential. The public uses and commercial uses depicted in Figure 3.3-2 are also shown as such in the City General Diagram.⁴

In the area surrounding Railroad Avenue and the proposed Railroad Avenue station, land use designations transition to higher concentrations of commercial uses, including a large area southeast of the Railroad Avenue interchange that is designated for Business Commercial. The residential uses within the one-half mile surrounding the proposed Railroad Avenue station become more intense than in other areas of the project corridor. Public uses are also prominent in this area, including the Pittsburg Civic Center and an adjacent large park. Southwest of the Railroad Avenue interchange, set back behind some commercial and public uses, are areas designated for high density single family and low density multifamily residential. Aside from this area, most of the residential uses within this portion of the project corridor are north of SR 4. Figure 3.3-2 shows that some high density single family residential is located northwest of the Railroad Avenue interchange, adjacent to the Civic Center, while more high density single family residential is located east of Railroad Avenue, along with a small area of high density multifamily residential. In general, the land use designations surrounding the proposed Railroad Avenue station tend to be more intense and more varied than in other areas of the City. In addition, land use designations for this area are also generally more intense than the existing land uses.

In the area east of Railroad Avenue, the Pittsburg General Plan depicts public, industrial, and regional commercial east of this residential area and north of SR 4, with the business park uses designated as Business Commercial. South of SR 4, the Business Commercial designation continues in lieu of the County's Business Park designation, while the other City designations are community commercial, public/institutional, and high density residential. Land use

⁴ City of Pittsburg, City of Pittsburg General Plan, General Plan Diagram, December 2004, Figure 2-2.

designations in the County and City general plans are generally the same, although some slight differences may exist.

City of Antioch. Under the City of Antioch General Plan, the area west of Somersville Road includes medium low density residential, but also contains special designations for the Western Gateway and Somersville Road Corridor focus areas.⁵ In the County General Plan, these special focus areas are shown as the commercial land use designation in Figure 3.3-2. East of Somersville Road, the Antioch General Plan designates this area primarily for medium low density residential, with some medium density and low density residential intermixed. Under the Antioch General Plan, the area surrounding A Street is designated as A Street Interchange Focus Area. Further east of this area is another block of medium density single family land uses, with some commercial and public land use designations north of SR 4.

In the City General Plan land use diagram, this same area east of A Street until Hillcrest Avenue is designated for medium low density residential, with commercial areas surrounding the Hillcrest Avenue interchange. As shown in Figure 3.3-2, east of Hillcrest Avenue, land use designations south of SR 4 are primarily medium density single family residential and public, with open space and parks mixed in, along with some smaller areas designated as commercial. North of SR 4, land use designations are largely for business park use and public right-of-way along SR 4, with areas of residential use beyond.

Land use designations for the areas within one-half mile of the proposed Median Station include transit-oriented, public, business park, open space and both single family and multifamily residential. The single family residential uses are concentrated south of SR 4. Land use designations within one-half mile of the Northside West Station option tend to include more mixed-use, single and multifamily residential, and business park. Single family residential and a park are located south of SR 4. For the Northside East Station option, land use designations are less intense than those located within one-half mile of the Median Station and the Northside West Station option, but this area primarily contains land designated for use as a business park and is currently underutilized. Land use designations within one-half mile of the proposed Median Station East option include single family and multifamily residential, transit-oriented development, business park, commercial, open space, and public uses. The City's general plan includes more specific designations for this area, which assume the development of a transit station.

Under the City General Plan, the area east of Hillcrest Avenue and south of SR 4 is designated for low density residential and open space, while the area north of SR 4 is classified as the SR 4 Industrial Frontage Focus Area, which includes land use designations for transit-oriented development, business park, public/institutional, and medium density residential uses.⁶ This area spans the land located north of SR 4 from Hillcrest Avenue east to the SR 160

⁵ City of Antioch, Antioch General Plan, Proposed General Plan Land Use map, March 4, 2004.

⁶ City of Antioch, Antioch General Plan, November 2003, Figure 4.5, State Route 4 Industrial Frontage Focus Area.

interchange. Each station location contains areas within the SR 4 Industrial Frontage Focus Area.

City of Oakley. As shown in Figure 3.3-2, the majority of land within Oakley's portion of the project corridor is designated in the Contra Costa County General Plan for residential use, although a very small strip of land along the City boundary and the Mococo Line is designated as public and semi-public, and a small area at the very eastern extent of the project corridor within the City (south of the Contra Costa Water District canal) is designated as commercial. In July 1999, the City of Oakley incorporated and replaced these County land use controls, zoning and General Plan designations with City zoning and General Plan designations. The current 2002 City of Oakley General Plan Land Use Diagram also depicts this area within the eastern extent of the project corridor to be primarily residential, split between low and very low single family residential designations.⁷ The intersections of Neroly Road, Live Oak Avenue, and Laurel Road are designated for commercial use, which can accommodate a variety of commercial uses, ranging from large-scale retail, to regional-serving retail, to neighborhood-commercial. The City's General Plan also designates this area at the intersection of Neroly Road and Laurel Road as commercial.

Only a very small portion of land located within the City of Oakley is within one-half mile of the Northside East Station option location, although this area is physically separated from the station option by the SR 4/SR 160 interchange. The land use designations located within this portion of the project corridor are less intense than those located throughout the remainder of the corridor, particularly in the one-half mile station areas, which overall contain the most intense land use designations.

Station Area Ridership Development Plans

The cities of Pittsburg and Antioch are currently preparing RDPs for the proposed Railroad Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue Stations, respectively, in accordance with the BART System Expansion Policy. An RDP, as defined by BART, is a station area plan that is created by a local jurisdiction to achieve transit ridership thresholds. Transit ridership thresholds are based on the minimum ridership required to meet BART's System Expansion Policy. The RDP is used to balance TOD and access goals that the community desires. If existing land use plans and access plans (in conjunction with land use) are not sufficient to enable the station to achieve its share of the corridorwide ridership threshold, the land use and access components of the RDP must describe proposed ridership enhancement actions that would enable the proposed station to do so. The RDP can be in the form of rezoning, a specific plan, a general plan amendment, or any combination of these actions.

A Station Plan component developed by BART will also be incorporated into each RDP. The Station Plan will address the station property and identify conceptual-level station design,

⁷ City of Oakley, General Plan 2020, December 2002, Figure 2-2, Land Use Diagram.

related facilities, and parking proposed to be construction and funded by the Proposed Project. The Station Plan will present conceptual-level designs for station platforms, vertical circulation (stairs and escalators), and fare equipment. It will also address station property and circulation and automobile and bicycle parking. The RDPs for each of the proposed stations are described below.

Railroad Avenue Ridership Development Plan. As of publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Pittsburg has released the Draft Railroad Avenue Specific Plan, which will serve as the RDP for the proposed station at Railroad Avenue. The Specific Plan provides development standards and guidance for an area encompassing an approximately one-half mile radius from the proposed Railroad Avenue Station, and would include land use changes within 11 identified sub-areas. Some land uses within the one-half mile radius of the proposed station would remain the same, but the Specific Plan would add new land use designations, including TOD Residential, High Intensity Mixed-Use, and Medium Intensity Mixed-Use. The Specific Plan also calls for the development of the vacant and underutilized parcels within the plan area. More intense uses would be concentrated around the proposed station itself. Most existing single family residential areas would remain as is, while some multifamily residential areas may be redistributed so that they center on the proposed station. Some areas designated as Multifamily Residential would remain as they are, but their land use designations would change to High Density Residential, allowing for additional or new development. The Specific Plan would result in more housing placed in an efficient development pattern, as well as better access to employment centers, both by providing areas for the development of employment centers and by placing housing near transit, which would aid residents in commuting to other areas. Ultimately, the Specific Plan provides opportunities for the development of nearly 1,845 new residential units and approximately 1,004,000 square feet of new commercial space within a compact mixed-use development district surrounding the proposed Railroad Avenue Station.

The Draft Railroad Avenue Specific Plan includes a variety of improvements to promote and facilitate the safe and efficient circulation of all modes of non-vehicular transportation. These improvements are consistent with the goals of the City of Pittsburg General Plan and enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between the Specific Plan Area and the greater City. The circulation system is designed to promote safe and efficient pedestrian and bicycle access through the application of sidewalks and pathways. Direct, wide sidewalks and paths provide line-of-sight linkage between residential, commercial, civic, and public uses throughout the Specific Plan Area.

An important programmatic aspect of the Plan includes coordinating with the Tri-Delta bus service and existing Tri-Delta bus routes 380, 387, 388, 390, and 391 to support the desired circulation pattern and connect the Transit Village to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station and other sub-regional locations. It is envisioned that, during peak hours, service is to be provided using 10-minute headways, with longer headways during non-peak hours. Existing Tri-Delta bus routes 70 and 387 could follow the same circulation pattern and connect the Transit Village to Old Town Pittsburg and other local destinations. As ridership increases and housing units

continue to develop in Old Town Pittsburg, additional transit connections may be required. To further supplement service, a new direct shuttle is envisioned to connect the Transit Village with Old Town during peak commute times. A two-way bus driveway is also proposed between Garcia Avenue and Bliss Avenue to facilitate passenger pick-up and drop-off without requiring buses to idle on any of the public streets in the Transit Village sub-area. The proposed 60-foot right-of-way will accommodate extra-wide sidewalks for passenger circulation and queuing, with space remaining for wayfinding signage and schedule information.

The plan is consistent with City, BART, and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) goals and policies. Adoption of the Railroad Avenue Specific Plan by the City of Pittsburg is expected by late 2008 or early 2009.

Hillcrest Avenue Ridership Development Plan. The City of Antioch has commenced preparation of the Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan that will include policies and guidelines promoting TOD and will evaluate the area surrounding the proposed Median Station and the three Hillcrest Avenue Station options. The proposed Specific Plan is consistent with the City's General Plan, which identifies the Hillcrest Avenue Station area as a key transit hub, and as proposed would provide opportunities to develop between 650 and up to 2,500 residential units, depending on the station option selected, and up to 2,150,000 square feet of office and retail uses.

As of publication of this Draft EIR, the City of Antioch's preliminary documents concerning development of the Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan, reveals that the overall intent of the proposed development surrounding the proposed Hillcrest Avenue Station would locate the most intense, highest-density development and employment centers immediately surrounding the proposed station options. This is consistent with the City's General Plan, as well as BART and MTC policies and goals. The City of Antioch expects to adopt the Specific Plan by early 2009.

Project Components in the City of Oakley. The City of Oakley is not preparing a RDP since the Proposed Project does not include a station within Oakley's jurisdiction. However, a portion of the project corridor could be located within the City of Oakley to accommodate the remote maintenance facility option that could be developed under the Northside West or Northside East Station options. Only a very small area of the one-half mile station area radius surrounding the Northside East Station option would fall within the City of Oakley's jurisdiction, but this area is physically separated from the remainder of the station area by SR 160 and the Mococo Line, so that it is unlikely that this area would be greatly influenced by development of this station location option.

Sensitive Land Uses

Sensitive land uses are those that would be most affected by changes in land use, such as schools, hospitals, retirement communities, etc. As stated above under the descriptions of the various segments of the Proposed Project, the project corridor contains six elementary schools,

two high schools, six preschools/child care centers, two independent study schools, one community college, one hospital, and approximately 68 acres of parks.

Agricultural Resources

In 2004, Contra Costa County's gross agricultural income was approximately \$94.8 million, 37th in the statewide rankings.⁸ The leading agricultural commodities produced in the County, in descending order of value, are cattle and calves, bedding plants, sweet corn, grapes, tomatoes, and rangeland pasture.⁹

Important Farmlands. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, maintains the Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program (FMMP), which produces maps and statistics to analyze impacts on California's agricultural resources. The FMMP rates agricultural land on soil quality and irrigation status; the best quality land is called Prime Farmland. "Important Farmland" includes Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance. Table 3.3-4 presents the FMMP categories and definitions.

During the most recent survey of Contra Costa County for the California Farmland Conversion Report (2006), 262,352 acres were in agricultural use. The County contains 93,690 acres of Important Farmland, which is composed of Prime Farmland (29,938 acres), Farmland of Statewide Importance (8,092 acres), Unique Farmland (3,589 acres), and Farmland of Local Importance (52,071 acres). The County also contains 168,662 acres of grazing land.¹⁰

As shown in Figure 3.3-3, the project corridor is dominated by urban land uses, although some areas of agricultural land occur, primarily near the eastern terminus of the project corridor, within the cities of Antioch and Oakley. In total, there are 21 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, 211 acres of Farmland of Local Importance, 20 acres of Grazing land, and 583 acres designated as Other. Much of this land is east of SR 160 in the area where the SR 4 Bypass is under construction, and the environmental documents for the SR 4 Bypass have declared that the loss of Important Farmland is a significant and unavoidable impact.¹¹ Urban land uses account for 3,596 acres of the project corridor.¹²

⁸ California Farm Bureau Federation, *Contra Costa County Farm Bureau*, <http://www.cfbf.com/counties/index.cfm?id=7>, accessed February 9, 2006.

⁹ Contra Costa County, Department of Agriculture, 2006 Annual Crop Report, <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/agriculture/images/CropRpt2006.jpg>, accessed January 30, 2006.

¹⁰ California Department of Conservation, *Contra Costa County 2004 - 2006 Land Use Conversion, Table A-5*, http://redirect.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/pubs/2004-2006/conversion_tables/concon06.xls, accessed February 7, 2008.

¹¹ State Route 4 Bypass Authority, State Route 4 Bypass Project Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (Impact III.B.2, Mitigation III.B.2), December 1994.

¹² California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, 2004.

**Table 3.3-4
FMMP Farmland Classifications**

Land Classification	Definition
Prime Farmland	Land with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term agricultural production. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.
Farmland of Statewide Importance	Land similar to Prime Farmland but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture. Land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.
Unique Farmland	Land with lesser quality soils used for the production of the State's leading agricultural crops. This land is usually irrigated, but may include non-irrigated orchards or vineyards as found in some climatic zones in California. Land must have been cropped at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.
Farmland of Local Importance	Land of importance to the local agricultural economy as determined by each county's board of supervisors and a local advisory committee.
Grazing Land	Land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock. The minimum mapping unit is 40 acres.
Urban and Built-up Land	Land occupied by structures with a building-density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. Common examples include residential, industrial, commercial, institutional facilities, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures.
Other Land	Land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than 40 acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land.
Water	Perennial water bodies with an extent of at least 40 acres.

Source: California Department of Conservation, *California Farmland Conversion Report 2000-2002*, page 5.

Williamson Act Contracts. The California Land Conservation Act (1965), also known as the Williamson Act, was enacted to preserve agricultural and open spaces by discouraging premature and unnecessary conversion to urban uses. Within the study area, there are no parcels that are enrolled in Williamson Act contracts.¹³

Applicable Policies and Regulations

BART System Expansion Policy. Adopted in 1999, the BART System Expansion Policy identifies goals, strategies, and project advancement criteria to guide expansion of the system. The policy is used in evaluating both extension projects and infill stations. The project advancement criteria consider ridership in the context of project cost effectiveness, surrounding land use and access, connections with other transit systems, effects on the existing BART system, and the degree of partnering and community support.

The system expansion criteria are designed to contend with the pressures of growth in the Bay Area and to address the dispersal of jobs and housing while reinvesting in BART and other transit systems to maximize service. BART, as a steward of public funding for transportation investments that enhance the Bay Area's environment and quality of life, applies the adopted criteria to meet the following goals:

- Enhance regional mobility, especially access to jobs.
- Generate new ridership on a cost-effective basis.
- Demonstrate a commitment to transit-supportive growth and development.
- Enhance multi-modal access to the BART system.
- Develop projects in partnership with communities that will be served.
- Implement and operate technology-appropriate service.
- Ensure that all projects address the needs of the District's residents.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution #3434. The MTC is responsible for planning, financing, and coordinating transportation in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. Of relevance to the Proposed Project is MTC Resolution #3434 – Transit-Oriented Development Policy for Regional Transit Extension Projects. The MTC adopted Resolution #3434 in 2005 to aid the various jurisdictions throughout the Bay Area region in addressing multiple goals: improving the cost effectiveness of regional investments in new transit expansions; easing the Bay Area's chronic housing shortage; creating vibrant new communities; and helping preserve regional open space by ensuring cooperation in creating development patterns that support transit services. The TOD policy applies only to physical

¹³ Contra Costa County, Mapping Information Center, <http://ccmap.us/gis/search.aspx>, accessed February 7, 2008.

transit extensions funded by Resolution 3434, which identified specific priority projects for transit expansion.

Meeting the corridor-level housing thresholds requires that, within one-half mile of all stations, a combination of existing land uses and planned land uses meets or exceeds the overall corridor threshold for housing. The corridor-level thresholds, which are listed below, vary depending on the type of service proposed:

- BART: 3,850 housing units
- Light Rail: 3,300 housing units
- Bus Rapid Transit: 2,750 housing units
- Commuter Rail: 2,200 housing units

The MTC determines which transit system and which threshold is appropriate for projects based on the different characteristics of the areas in which these systems are to be located. The traditional BART system is considered to be a rapid transit system, which is defined by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) as an electric railway with a high capacity for traffic characterized by high speed, rapid acceleration of passenger rail cars on fixed rails, operating within a separate right-of-way, and high platform loading. Light rail systems are defined as lightweight passenger rail cars that operate singly or in short, two-car trains on fixed railways typically driven electrically using power from overhead lines. These systems are generally not separated from other types of traffic. Commuter rail systems generally serve as connections between suburbs and central business districts. Service operates on a regular basis, and riders are predominantly commuters riding at least three times per week.¹⁴

The Proposed Project is classified as Commuter Rail by the MTC because it would be located in outlying suburban areas and connect those commuter communities to the larger, more urban employment centers located in the Bay Area. Since the Proposed Project is not located in a dense urban area and the majority of its riders would be commuting on a regular basis, the use of the BART or Light Rail thresholds are not appropriate. Based on the Commuter Rail threshold, the project corridor would need an average of 2,200 housing units per station, including existing housing units near the current end station at Pittsburg/Bay Point, to meet the MTC corridor level thresholds. As shown in Table 3.4-2 in Section 3.4, Population and Housing, there were approximately 1,477 housing units within one-half mile of the proposed Railroad Avenue Station in 2007. Housing unit counts for the proposed Hillcrest Avenue Station vary depending on the location: the Median Station had 999 housing units within one-half mile; the Median Station East option had 887 housing units; the Northside West Station Option had 816 housing units; and the Northside East Station Option had 399 housing units within one-half mile of the proposed station. Refer to Section 3.4, Population and Housing for

¹⁴ American Public Transportation Association, *Rail Definitions*, <http://www.apta.com/research/stats/rail/definitions.cfm>, accessed May 22, 2008.

more information. Both new and existing housing units are considered by MTC in evaluating a project. Although the project corridor does not currently meet this housing threshold, General Plan projections, ABAG forecasts, and Contra Costa Transit Authority (CCTA) Travel Forecast Assumptions indicate that the project corridor would meet this requirement by 2030, as required by the MTC. Station Area Plans (the above-discussed RDPs) that demonstrate plans for meeting the threshold are required in order to qualify for funding through Resolution 3434.¹⁵

Contra Costa County General Plan. The Contra Costa County General Plan contains broad policies and specific implementation measures to guide decisions on future growth.¹⁶ The following goals and policies related to land use and agricultural resources from the Contra Costa General Plan relevant to the Proposed Project's effectiveness in meeting BART's policy goal of coordination with local land use planning.

Land Use Goal 3-C: To encourage aesthetically and functionally compatible development which reinforces the physical character and desired images of the County.

Land Use Goal 3-E: To recognize and support existing land use densities in most communities, while encouraging higher densities in appropriate areas, such as near major transportation hubs and job centers.

Land Use Goal 3-M: Protect and promote the economic viability of agricultural land.

Land Use Policy 3-12: Preservation and buffering of agricultural land should be encouraged as it is critical to maintaining a healthy and competitive agricultural economy and assuring a balance of land uses. Preservation and conservation of open space, wetlands, parks, hillsides, and ridgelines should be encouraged as it is crucial to preserve the continued availability of unique habitats for wildlife and plants, to protect unique scenery and provide a wide range of recreational opportunities for County residents.

Land Use Policy 3-21: The predominantly single family character of substantially developed portions of the County shall be retained. Multiple-family housing shall be dispersed throughout the County and not concentrated in single locations. Multiple-family housing shall generally be located in proximity to facilities such as arterial roads, transit corridors, and shopping areas.

¹⁵ Metropolitan Transportation Commission, MTC Resolution 3434 Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy for Regional Transit Expansion Projects, adopted July 2005.

¹⁶ Contra Costa County, Community Development Department, *Contra Costa County General Plan 2005 – 2020*, January 18, 2005.

Land Use Policy for Bay Point Area (aq): Transit supportive amenities shall be constructed in conjunction with the Neighborhood Commercial District (Specific Plan Policy UD-11).

Roadway and Transit Goal 5-H: To ensure the mutual compatibility of major transportation facilities with adjacent land uses.

Roadway and Transit Goal 5-K: To provide basic mobility to all sectors of the public including the elderly, disabled, and transit dependent.

Roadway and Transit Policy 5-3: Transportation facilities serving new urban development shall be linked to and compatible with existing and planned roads of adjoining areas, and such facilities shall use presently available public and semi-public rights of way where feasible.

Agricultural Resources Goal 8-G: To encourage and enhance agriculture, and to maintain and promote a healthy and competitive agricultural economy.

East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan. The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) is intended to provide a comprehensive framework to protect natural resources in eastern Contra Costa County, while improving and streamlining the environmental permitting process for impacts on endangered and threatened species. The Plan describes how to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the impacts on Covered Species¹⁷ and their habitats while allowing for the urban development in selected regions of the County and the cities of Pittsburg, Clayton, Oakley, and Brentwood.¹⁸ Refer to Section 3.9, Biological Resources, for a more detailed description of this regional plan and the Proposed Project's compatibility with the plan.

City of Pittsburg General Plan. The City of Pittsburg General Plan addresses issues related to physical development, growth, and conservation of resources in Pittsburg's planning area.¹⁹ The following goals and policies related to land use from the City of Pittsburg General Plan are relevant to the evaluation of the Proposed Project's effectiveness in meeting BART's policy goal of coordinating system expansions with local land use planning.

¹⁷ A Covered Species is a species covered by a HCP/NCCP that is listed on either a federal or state list as endangered, threatened, or as a species of concern.

¹⁸ East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan Association, *Final East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan*, October 2006.

¹⁹ City of Pittsburg, *General Plan; Pittsburg 2020: A Vision for the 21st Century*, adopted October 2004, amended through December 2004.

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

Land Use Policy 2-P-7: During development review, consider project compatibility with existing surrounding land uses. Ensure that sensitive uses—such as residences, schools, and parks—are not subject to hazardous or unhealthy conditions.

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

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

Land Use – Railroad Avenue Policy 2-P-56: Work with BART to develop a specific plan for the Railroad Avenue BART Station area, featuring mixed-use Business Commercial activities with extensive pedestrian amenities. Provide pedestrian linkages from this mixed-use village to the Civic Center, City Park, high school, and other institutional uses on the north side of SR 4.

Land Use – East Leland Policy 2-P-63: Participate in the development of a specific plan for the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station. Ensure that all uses within one-half mile radius of the proposed Station feature mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented design.

Urban Design Policy 4-P-44: Work with BART to develop a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use district in the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station Area.

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

City of Antioch General Plan. The Antioch General Plan encompasses a comprehensive strategy for managing the community's future. It is the City's most important statement regarding its ultimate physical, economic, and cultural development over the next 25 years.²⁰ The following policies related to land use from the City of Antioch General Plan are relevant to

²⁰ City of Antioch, *Antioch General Plan*, November 24, 2003.

the evaluation of the Proposed Project's effectiveness in meeting BART's policy goal of coordinating system expansions with local land use planning.

Land Use Policy 4.3.2a: As part of General Plan implementation - including development review, capital improvement planning, and preparation of Specific Plans - foster close land use/transportation relationships to promote use of alternative transportation system modes and minimize travel by single occupant automobiles.

Land Use Policy 4.3.2c: Encourage high density residential development (both freestanding and in mixed use projects) within one-quarter mile of existing and planned heavy and/or light rail transit stops as illustrated in the Circulation Element.

Land Use Policy 4.4.6.4b: The design and function of the SR 4/SR 160 Frontage Focus Area will be based on transit-oriented development principles. A mix of office, business park, light industrial uses, none of which rely on intensive use of heavy trucks, will be located within walking distance of high density housing, retail commercial, and the rail transit station and parking areas serving the station.

Circulation Policy 7.5.2a: Facilitate development of rail transit centers within the SR 4 Industrial Frontage Focus Area and the East Lone Tree Focus Area by working with BART, Amtrak, Tri-Delta Transit, and other transit providers toward the development and implementation of a transit oasis system within areas surrounding area transit centers, including establishment of a system of priority transit lanes or dedicated travel lanes in addition to those needed for vehicular travel to facilitate movement by transit oasis vehicles in areas surrounding the transit center.

Resource Management Policy 10.8.2h: Promote coordination of new public facilities with transit services and nonmotorized transportation facilities, including bicycles, and design structures to enhance transit, bicycle, and pedestrian use.

Environmental Hazards Policy 11.6.2b: Maintain a pattern of land uses that separates noise-sensitive land uses from major noise sources to the extent possible, and guide noise-tolerant land uses into the noisier portions of the Planning Area.

City of Oakley General Plan. The City of Oakley General Plan provides a blueprint for growth through 2020 and establishes and promotes a community that reflects the value and character of local residents.²¹ The following goal and policies related to land use and agricultural resources from the City of Oakley General Plan are relevant to the evaluation of the Proposed Project's effectiveness in meeting BART's policy goal of coordinating system expansions with local land use planning.

²¹ City of Oakley, 2020 General Plan.

Land Use Policy 2.1.8: Discourage development that results in land use incompatibility. Specifically, require buffers between uses where appropriate and discourage locating sensitive uses (residential) adjacent to existing potentially objectionable uses or locating potentially objectionable uses adjacent to sensitive uses.

Land Use Policy 2.2.3: Protect existing residential areas from intrusion of incompatible land uses and disruptive traffic to the extent reasonably possible.

Land Use Policy 2.2.4: Promote, in areas where different land uses abut one another, land use compatibility by utilizing buffering techniques such as landscaping, setbacks, screening and, where necessary, construction of sound walls.

Agricultural Resources Goal 6.1: Allow agriculture to continue as a viable use of land that reflects the community's origins and minimizes conflicts between agricultural and urban uses.

Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

This analysis focuses on potential project effects on adjacent land uses, including long-term (operational) effects, as well as consistency with relevant planning documents and goals. Effects related to construction, traffic, noise and dust are not specifically addressed in this land use analysis because those impacts are short-term, whereas impacts associated with changes in land use occur over long periods of time and are not directly associated with construction activities. Future TOD impacts are not part of this analysis. The cities of Pittsburg and Antioch will undertake their own environmental review process for the Railroad Avenue and Hillcrest Station area Specific Plans, respectively, that will provide opportunities for public review and comments once impacts are assessed.

An adverse land use impact can be manifested in many ways. New development can increase traffic and result in localized congestion; noise, vibration, and air pollution that can degrade the quality of the surrounding land uses; development of physical structures can alter the aesthetics of the existing setting or result in displacement of private property or recreational areas. Other sections of this document address these various concerns, and the reviewer is directed to Section 3.2, Transportation; Section 3.4, Population and Housing (including land acquisition and displacement); Section 3.5, Visual Quality; Section 3.10, Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11, Air Quality; and Section 3.13, Community Services.

Pursuant to California Government Code Section 53090, BART is exempt from local land use plans, policies, and zoning ordinances. Therefore, were the Proposed Project inconsistent with such local regulations, such inconsistency would not be determined to be a significant impact and mitigation would not be required. BART nevertheless wishes to emphasize to the public and to local jurisdictions the extent to which the project is consistent with local plans, policies and zoning ordinances.

Standards of Significance

This analysis relies on standards of significance developed by BART on the basis of accepted professional practice for land use planning. Based on these criteria, impacts related to land use are considered significant if the Proposed Project is likely to result in either of the following:

- Incompatibility with adjacent and surrounding land uses caused by degradation or disturbances that diminish the quality of a particular land use;
- Physical division of an established community; or
- Premature conversion of Important Farmland or land that is under a Williamson Act land contract.

For each land use impact below, a level of significance is determined and reported in the italicized summary impact statement that precedes the analysis of each impact. Conclusions of significance are defined as follows: significant (S), potentially significant (PS), less than significant (LTS), no impact (NI), and beneficial (B). If the mitigation measures would not diminish potentially significant or significant impacts to a less-than-significant level, the impacts are classified as “significant and unavoidable effects (SU).” For this section, LU refers to Land Use.

Although not a Standard of Significance, the following analysis also includes an impact analysis to determine whether the Proposed Project is consistent with appropriate local land use policies and goals. The analysis does not, however, make a significance finding, based on the provisions of the State Government Code, Section 53090. The policy consistency analysis is shown under Impact LU-4 for the Proposed Project, and Impact LU-7 for the Hillcrest Avenue Northside West, Northside East, and Median Station East options.

Project-Specific Environmental Analysis

Operational Impacts

Impact LU-1 The Proposed Project would not be incompatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses. (LTS)

The Proposed Project would develop rail transit within the median of SR 4 from the existing Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station to east of the Hillcrest Avenue interchange (Hillcrest Avenue Station). A maintenance facility would also be constructed east of the proposed Hillcrest Avenue Station. In addition to the Median Station that would be developed under the Proposed Project, this analysis evaluates three other location options for the proposed Hillcrest Avenue Station.

Guideway in the SR 4 Median. The portion of the route that would operate in the SR 4 median is surrounded by urban uses such as residential, commercial, and industrial uses that are already bisected by SR 4. Since this is an established transportation route, the addition of rail transit services in this area in the median of SR 4, separated from the surrounding uses by four lanes of highway traffic on each side of the guideway would not be considered incompatible with surrounding land uses. Because the area is currently developed and is already traversed by an established transportation route (SR 4), the extension of BART services to this portion of the project corridor would not result in incompatible land uses.

Transfer Platform. The Proposed Project would include a transfer platform approximately 2,750 feet east of the existing Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, which would connect the Proposed Project with the existing BART system. Existing land uses surrounding the proposed transfer platform are primarily single family residential, although an undeveloped area is located just to the northwest, and an open space area is located to the southwest. However, the transfer platform in the SR 4 median would only be accessible by transit; DMU and BART passengers would not be able to access this station by walking, riding a bus, or driving to the station. As a result, the transfer platform would be isolated and separated from surrounding land uses and would have no effect on compatibility with nearby existing land uses. Refer to Figure 3.3-1 for the location of the transfer platform.

Train Control Huts and Staff Building. The Proposed Project would include eight single-story enclosed structures, each with a floor area of approximately 216 square feet, and each of which would contain electronic equipment. Each train control hut would be located directly off a public road, where it would sit on a vacant traffic median strip or on a currently vacant lot, and each hut would be sited at least 15 feet away (generally 30 feet or more) from the nearest residential or commercial uses. It is standard practice to place necessary small utility structures, which enclose such items as electrical transformers and telephone service equipment, within residential and commercial neighborhoods. Because these utility structures are set apart from abutting uses, and are set on lands that are currently vacant, there is no potential conflict between these utility structures and abutting residential or commercial uses.

The approximately 3,000-square-foot staff building would either be set on the transfer platform east of the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, where it would have no direct interaction with abutting uses and would therefore not conflict with those uses, or it would be set on a strip of land between SR 4 and Canal Road. There are single family homes on the northwest side of Canal Road.

The parking for the staff building would comprise 25 spaces attached to an existing surface parking lot on the strip of land between SR 4 and Canal Road. The staff building and the addition of these 25 spaces would not generate a significant land use impact since they are separated from the nearby residences by Canal Road, the staff building would not involve activities out of character with the area and the parking lot would be an extension of an existing parking area. In sum, the construction of the train control huts and staff building would not be incompatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses.

Railroad Avenue Station. The proposed Railroad Avenue Station would be located within the median of the recently widened SR 4. The park-and-ride lot for this station would be at the site of the existing park-and-ride lot off Bliss Avenue and west of Harbor Avenue; in essence, there would be no change in land use with respect to parking when compared with existing land uses, since no additional parking would be provided at this location. Refer to Figure 2-5 for the location of both the proposed Railroad Avenue Station and the existing park-and-ride lot.

Access to the Railroad Avenue Station would be provided via elevators and stairs between the station platform and the Railroad Avenue overcrossing above the project service. These “vertical circulation” elements would occur within the median of SR 4 east of Railroad Avenue, directly adjacent to the roadway (transportation uses). The vertical circulation elements that would provide a connection to the Proposed Project would not be directly adjacent to existing residential or commercial land uses. As a result, the location of the Railroad Avenue Station would not be directly adjacent to existing land uses and, thus, would not negatively affect the character, operations, or activities at the existing land uses.

In summary, the Proposed Project and existing land uses would be compatible with respect to development of the Railroad Avenue Station. The addition of BART services at this location would broaden the availability of transit options and provide improved connectivity between the communities of east Contra Costa County and the rest of the Bay Area. Nearby commercial uses would benefit because retail uses would become more accessible to a broader base of customers and more attractive destinations for shoppers. Proximate office uses would benefit by being more accessible to employees. The increased density in the area surrounding the proposed Railroad Avenue Station would offer non-local transit riders access to retail and employment opportunities within the Railroad Avenue Station area, and would offer potential residents housing within walking distance to the proposed station. These land uses are not incompatible with the proposed station and the proximity of these uses to the station is, in fact, consistent with the MTC’s policy of encouraging transit-

oriented development, residential development in particular, within walking distance of transit stations.

Hillcrest Avenue Station. The predominant land uses in the vicinity of the proposed Hillcrest Avenue Station within the SR 4 median are undeveloped and utility north of SR 4 and single family residential south of SR 4. A single family neighborhood is also located north of SR 4, but it is separated from the proposed station by the PG&E facility. Since most of the area immediately surrounding the Hillcrest Avenue Station is generally undeveloped, there would be no land use conflicts with existing uses.

The proposed Median Station platform is physically separated from other land uses since it would be in the median of SR 4. There is a single family neighborhood to the south, but this area is separated from the station by the SR 4 eastbound travel lanes. The one-half mile station area includes some commercial uses, which are located primarily near the Hillcrest Avenue interchange with SR 4. Other proposed station facilities, including parking areas, bus transfer connections, an employee parking area, and the maintenance annex would be sited on the north side of SR 4, so that the residences on the south side of SR 4 would not be affected by station activities. The area surrounding the proposed station parking is largely undeveloped and defined by an existing park-and-ride lot near Hillcrest Avenue to the west and the large PG&E distribution facility north of the Mococo Line. The area of residential use located within the station area would not be located adjacent to any of the proposed station facilities, including the existing park-and-ride lot, which would serve as the parking area for the Proposed Project, since it is separated by the PG&E facility. None of these uses would be adversely affected by the proposed station facilities. Maintenance activities and the associated tailtracks would occur within the SR 4 median, while a maintenance annex that would serve as a storage area for DMUs would be located within a 2.8-acre area east of the proposed station adjacent to the northern side of SR 4, so they would be separated from residential land uses by SR 4. In summary, the Proposed Project would not result in significant land use compatibility impacts with adjacent uses, so that the impact associated with conflicting land uses would be less than significant.

Impact LU-2 The Proposed Project would not result in the physical division of an existing community. (NI)

The Proposed Project would extend BART transit services primarily within the median of the existing SR 4, which currently divides the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch into northern and southern portions. Since development of the Proposed Project would occur primarily within the median of the existing SR 4, it would not result in further separation of the communities along SR 4.

In the eastern portion of the project corridor, some uses associated with the Proposed Project would occur outside of the median in the area north of SR 4 and south of the Mococo Line. However, these uses would not divide an existing community since this area is currently undeveloped.

The placement of train control huts and the staff building also would not divide an existing community. These structures are small and would be placed on already vacant lots within existing neighborhoods, or on lands set apart from existing neighborhoods, such as median strips.

Development of the Proposed Project would, however, foster TOD in the vicinity of the proposed stations. TOD in general tends to involve higher-density mixed-use communities filled with a variety of uses, activities, and people. As a result, the areas surrounding transit stations tend to become new hubs of activity, which can lead to a greater sense of place and community connectivity. Because the Proposed Project would not physically divide existing communities, there would be no impact with respect to disrupting established land use patterns.

Impact LU-3 The Proposed Project would not result in the premature conversion of agricultural land uses. (NI)

As stated above under Impact LU-1, most of the project corridor is located within the urban areas of eastern Contra Costa County. Under the Proposed Project, no project components would be located on agricultural land or areas designated as Important Farmland, as shown in Figure 3.3-3. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no impact on agricultural land uses.

Impact LU-4 The Proposed Project would be consistent with local policies that seek to encourage transit-oriented development and would support local efforts to provide a convenient alternative to the automobile. (NI)

The Proposed Project would be consistent with the development goals and policies of the cities of Pittsburg, Antioch, and Oakley, as well as Contra Costa County, particularly those aimed at encouraging TOD. Contra Costa County policies specifically call for the preservation of agricultural lands, which remain a large part of the County's economy; transit services within existing transportation corridors; and TOD in the denser, urban areas of the County to help the County achieve those goals. The Proposed Project would extend transit services and encourage TOD, which would decrease the demand for lands outside of dense city centers for development, such as the County's farmlands. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with these County plans and policies.

The General Plans for the cities of Pittsburg, Antioch, and Oakley contain policies that call for denser, mixed-use development close to existing and planned transit systems to encourage transit use, walking, and bicycling. These policies would reduce vehicular trips and promote regional connectivity, which is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Proposed Project. The City of Pittsburg General Plan specifically includes land use policies for the extension of BART and development surrounding proposed BART stations within the City, specifically calling for the development of a specific plan for the Railroad Avenue area (Railroad Avenue Goal 2-G-20, Railroad Avenue Policy 2-P-56). Similar policies found in the City of Antioch General Plan support the development of TOD in proximity to existing and planned transit stations, including in the SR 4 Industrial Frontage Focus Area (Land Use policies 4.3.2a, 4.3.2c, and 4.4.6.4b, and Circulation Policy 7.5.2a). In addition to General Plan goals and policies, the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch are preparing RDPs that guide future development for these areas and promote TOD and the efficient use of land; for example, infill development of undeveloped or underutilized parcels in order to maximize space and provide more jobs, housing, and commercial uses within walking distance of transit services. The RDPs would aid in addressing many of the issues mentioned above.

The Proposed Project would also encourage TOD and more intense development in the vicinity of new transit stations. It would be consistent with the regional policies of the MTC and BART that promote TOD to support transit extensions. These key policies include the MTC Policy expressed in Resolution #3434 which, in turn, shapes and influences BART's System Expansion Policy.

Consistency with MTC Regional Policy. The MTC Resolution #3434 was adopted in 2005 to aid the various jurisdictions throughout the Bay Area region in addressing multiple goals: improving the cost effectiveness of regional investments in new transit expansions; easing the Bay Area's chronic housing shortage; creating vibrant new communities; and helping preserve regional open space by ensuring cooperation in creating development patterns that support transit services. The TOD policy applies to all physical transit extensions funded by Resolution #3434, including the Proposed Project. The three key elements of its regional TOD policy include:

- Corridor-level thresholds to quantify appropriate minimum levels of development around transit stations along new corridors;
- Local station area plans that address future land use changes, station access needs, circulation improvements, pedestrian-friendly design, and other key features in a transit-oriented development; and

- Corridor working groups that bring together Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), city and county planning staff, transit agencies, and other key stakeholders to define expectations, timelines, roles and responsibilities for key stages of the transit project development process.

Meeting the corridor-level housing thresholds requires that, within one-half mile of all stations, a combination of existing land uses and planned land uses meets or exceeds the overall corridor threshold for housing. The corridor-level thresholds, which are listed below, vary depending on the type of service proposed. MTC considers the proposed DMU technology as a type of commuter rail and, thus, requires 2,200 housing units per station, including existing housing units near the current end station at Pittsburg/Bay Point, to meet the MTC corridor-level thresholds. The Proposed Project complies with this corridor-level threshold, as illustrated in Table 3.3-5.

**Table 3.3-5
Comparison of MTC Resolution #3434 Targets
with Proposed Project Station Area Development**

Station	Housing Units in 2030 ^a	
MTC Target	2,200	
Pittsburg/Bay Point ^b	2,195	} Per Station Average = 2,755
Railroad Avenue ^c	4,591	
Hillcrest Avenue ^c	1,479	

Source: Pittsburg General Plan; Antioch General Plan, CCTA, and Fehr & Peers Associates.

Notes:

- Housing units within one-half mile of station sites; however, housing units do not include Ridership Development Plan.
- Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area Specific Plan Final EIR, December 2001, identifies 2,195 housing units at buildout.
- These figures are derived from the CCTA traffic model. Data were based on the adopted General Plan and compiled for applicable Traffic Analysis Zones, which included those within one-half mile of a station.

The cities of Pittsburg and Antioch have engaged in local station area plans to foster transit-oriented development and access improvements. These plans are being prepared as Specific Plans, pursuant to the California Government Code, and contain detailed guidelines and standards for station area land uses, circulation, and design, consistent with the second element of the MTC’s regional TOD policy.

Finally, in addition to satisfying the station area development target for transit extensions, significant collaboration among key stakeholders, including BART, CCTA (the local Congestion Management Agency), and the individual cities

has occurred in compliance with the third element of the MTC's regional TOD policy. These entities, along with representatives from other public agencies, have formed an eBART Partnership Policy Advisory Committee that has met regularly throughout the planning and development of the Proposed Project. The committee has been integral to the funding and advancement of the proposed DMU service.

The existing and projected development around the stations, the preparation of Specific Plans around each of the stations in the project corridor, and the ongoing participation by local and regional stakeholders in helping to implement the Proposed Project, combine to satisfy each of MTC Resolution #3434's criteria for transit investment to east Contra Costa County.

Consistency with BART System Expansion Policy. BART adopted a System Expansion Policy as part of its Strategic Plan in 1999. The policy identifies a uniform set of criteria to be applied to all extensions of BART service. The Proposed Project is the first application of this BART policy. Among the chief elements of the policy is the requirement that one or more Ridership Development Plan (RDP) be undertaken for all proposed expansion projects of the existing BART system. The RDP(s) must demonstrate that a corridor-wide ridership threshold can be achieved through measures such as transit-supportive land uses and investment in access programs and projects. Prior to adopting a system expansion project or planning new station locations, BART must consider whether RDPs developed for each station can collectively demonstrate that the project will achieve a threshold ridership level, and will meet the goals of the System Expansion Policy.

Threshold estimates can be established at both the corridor-wide and station level, but it is the corridor-wide ridership threshold that is considered under the BART System Expansion Policy. In the case of the Proposed Project, this threshold has been defined as 10,100 entries and exits by 2030. Although an individual station may not reach its individual threshold estimate, the corridor-wide threshold estimate must be met in order for the Proposed Project to be favorably evaluated under the System Expansion Policy. In this case, the Proposed Project does meet the corridor-wide threshold, as illustrated in Table 3.3-6.

Overall, the Proposed Project is consistent with applicable local development policies, including the General Plans, development goals and policies of the cities of Pittsburg, Antioch, and Oakley, as well as Contra Costa County; the MTC; and BART.

Table 3.3-6
Comparison of BART System Expansion Policy
Ridership Target with Proposed Project Ridership Forecasts
(weekday entries and exits in 2030)

System Expansion Policy Target	5,801
Proposed Project Ridership ^a	
Railroad Avenue	1,900
Hillcrest Avenue	8,200
Total Corridor Ridership	10,100

Source: Arup for the Ridership Target, 2008; Wilbur Smith Associates for Proposed Project ridership, 2008.

Note:

a. These ridership figures include the Ridership Development Plans.

Construction Impacts

Changes in land uses associated with a project generally occur over long periods of time and would not typically change as a direct result of construction activities. Construction impacts tend to be associated with short-term increases in traffic, noise, dust, and air emissions surrounding a site, which generally do not have substantial long-term impacts on surrounding land uses. In addition to their limited term, construction impacts would not result in conflicts with existing uses because staging areas would not be located in areas where the character of surrounding uses would be adversely affected by construction activities. Construction of the Proposed Project would eventually encourage the changes in land uses along the project corridor, specifically in the areas surrounding the proposed stations. The evaluation of construction impacts is more appropriate for other technical analyses that would have separate impacts associated with construction alone. Those analyses are found within the appropriate technical sections of this EIR.

Hillcrest Avenue Station Options Analysis

Impacts associated with the Hillcrest Avenue Station options in general would be the same as described under the Proposed Project. Although most impacts would result in the same conclusion as for the Proposed Project, additional analysis pertaining to specific land uses around each station option below describes differences between the Median Station and the Northside West, Northside East, and Median Station East options.

Similar to the Proposed Project, development of the station options for the Hillcrest Avenue Station would result in short-term construction-related changes to surrounding land uses. Analyses of construction impacts associated with the development of the Hillcrest Avenue Station Options are found in the appropriate technical sections elsewhere in this EIR.

Impact LU-5 The Hillcrest Avenue Station options would not be incompatible with adjacent and surrounding land use. (LTS)

Northside West Station Option. The Northside West Station option would involve placement of the Hillcrest Avenue Station further east of the proposed Median Station. This location is currently an open field north of SR 4, on the south side of the Union Pacific Railroad Right-of-way (UP ROW), and approximately 3,500 feet east of Hillcrest Avenue. The Northside West Station would be connected to the SR 4 median alignment, via a tunnel crossing that would pass under the westbound lanes of SR 4. The alignment would transition from below grade to at-grade just north of the freeway, and would carry trains to the station via at-grade tracks. A small complex of about two to three structures, associated with a former metal recycling business, sits about 700 feet east of the proposed Northside West Station option location, and is the nearest developed land use to this station location. Should the Northside West Station option be selected, this former recycling business property would be acquired by the year 2030 to allow for maintenance and parking-related facilities. Although the Proposed Project would require the acquisition of this property, this acquisition process would not constitute a conflict with existing adjacent land uses; the metal recycling business is no longer in use so would not be displaced through the acquisition process.

This Northside West Station option includes two possible locations for a maintenance facility. The first location for the maintenance facility extends east of the station platform to a point near the former metal recycling property. As the industrial nature of this use would not be adversely affected by the maintenance activities under the Northside West Station option, land use conflicts would be considered less than significant if maintenance facilities were placed at this location.

The other maintenance facility location option is approximately 8,500 feet (1.6 miles) east of the station platform. This area is located within the City of Antioch, but adjacent to the City of Oakley boundary. There are single family residences within 200 to 300 feet of the proposed facility along Neroly Road, but they are physically separated from the maintenance facility by Neroly Road and the UP ROW. These homes front onto Gold Run Drive, away from the proposed remote maintenance facility site. Of the approximately 11 homes that are located opposite the proposed maintenance facility, 10 appear from aerial photographs to have mature trees in their backyards that screen the residences from Neroly Road, the Mococo Line, and the possible maintenance facility. In addition, if the proposed remote maintenance facility were developed in accordance with this option, the facility would be situated between two other transportation uses, namely, the Mococo Line and the SR 4 Bypass.

Development of the proposed maintenance facility would be compatible with these other uses; therefore, no significant land use conflicts would occur as a result of siting the maintenance facility in this location.

Northside East Station Option. The Northside East Station option would site the Hillcrest Avenue Station east of the Northside West Station option site, also north of SR 4 and adjacent to the UP ROW, in the vicinity of a possible extension of Phillips Lane. (The extension of Phillips Lane and a possible interchange with SR 4 is being studied by the City of Antioch as part of its RDP process.) This station location would require the acquisition of the buildings that were used for metal recycling. No other developed land uses are within one-quarter mile of this station site and thus no land use conflicts would occur.

The Northside East Station location would connect to the SR 4 median alignment via one of the tunnel options crossing under the westbound lanes of SR 4, described earlier for the Northside West Station option. The maintenance facility associated with this station option would be the same as the remote maintenance facility described for the Northside West Station option, approximately 5,200 feet east of the Northside East Station platform. Accordingly, the same less-than-significant land use impacts identified for the Northside West Station remote maintenance facility would apply to the Northside East Station maintenance facility.

Median Station East Option. The Median Station East option would site the Hillcrest Avenue Station east of the Median Station site within the SR 4 median by approximately 950 feet east of the Median Station location and 2,000 feet east of the Hillcrest Avenue interchange. This station location would require the acquisition of the buildings that were used for metal recycling. No other developed land uses are within one-quarter mile of this station site and thus no land use conflicts would occur.

The Median Station East location would connect to the SR 4 median alignment via a tunnel crossing under the westbound lanes of SR 4, described earlier for the Northside West Station option. The maintenance facility associated with this station option would be located at the same site as the maintenance facility described for the Northside West Station option, near the former metal recycling business. Accordingly, the same less-than-significant land use impacts identified for the Northside West Station maintenance facility would apply to the Median Station East maintenance facility.

Impact LU-6 The Hillcrest Avenue Station options would not result in the premature conversion of agricultural land uses. (LTS)

As shown in Figure 3.3-3, most of the project corridor is located within the urban areas of eastern Contra Costa County. However, the most eastern portion of the project corridor (east of SR 160 and between the SR 4 Bypass and UP ROW) contains Farmland of Local Importance. This area would be the location for the possible remote maintenance facility under the Northside West or Northside East Station options. The location of the remote maintenance facility under either the Northside West or Northside East Station options would be the same and occupy the same 8.8-acre footprint. Tailtracks and future access roads for both options would convert an additional 2.9 acres of Farmland of Local Importance.

Although the remote maintenance facility under Northside West and Northside East Station options would convert 11.7 acres of Farmland of Local Importance to transportation uses, it should be noted that the designation of Farmland of Local Importance does not necessarily indicate that lands are in agricultural production. Important Farmland classifications are updated every two years by the FMMP, based on soil quality and irrigation status, aerial photographs, computer mapping information, public review, and field reconnaissance.²² The remote maintenance facility area was used for agriculture in the past, but the land is not currently used as, and is no longer viable for use as, agricultural land because it is now surrounded by the Mococo Line to the northeast, the CCWD canal to the south, and the newly constructed SR 4 Bypass to the southwest. The SR 4 Bypass was opened to traffic in February 2008, so its operation was not considered during the most recent FMMP update in 2006. The construction of the SR 4 Bypass disconnected this area of land from other agricultural lands, essentially making it non-productive for agricultural purposes, although the Farmland of Local Importance designation has not yet been updated. Since the maintenance site and the immediate surrounding area are completely surrounded by transportation uses and a canal, isolating the land and rendering it no longer economically viable for agricultural purposes, the construction of the remote maintenance facility in this area would not prematurely convert agricultural uses. Therefore, this conversion of Farmland of Local Importance is considered a less-than-significant impact.

²² California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program, www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/index.aspx, April 17, 2008.

Impact LU-7 The Hillcrest Avenue Station options would be consistent with local policies that seek to encourage transit-oriented development and would support local efforts to provide a convenient alternative to the automobile. (NI)

Similar to the Proposed Project, the Northside West, Northside East Station, and Median Station East options would be consistent with the development goals and policies of the City of Antioch, as well as Contra Costa County, particularly those aimed at encouraging TOD and protecting agricultural lands. Contra Costa County policies (Land Use Policy 3-12) specifically call for the preservation of agricultural lands, which remain a large part of the County's economy; transit services within existing transportation corridors (Roadway and Transit Policy 5-3); and TOD in the denser, urban areas of the County (Land Use Goal 3-C) to help the County achieve those goals. Any of the Hillcrest Avenue Station options would support these goals by extending transit services into eastern Contra Costa County, which in turn would encourage TOD and aid in reducing the amount of agricultural land that may be needed for development in order to support population growth.

The General Plan for the City of Antioch contains policies that call for denser, mixed-use development close to existing and planned transit systems to encourage transit use, walking, and bicycling to reduce vehicular trips and promote regional connectivity, consistent with the goals and objectives of the Proposed Project (Land Use policies 4.3.2a, 4.3.2c, and 4.4.6.4b, and Circulation Policy 7.5.2a). The City of Antioch is preparing an RDP to guide future development for the station area and promote TOD and the efficient use of land. The Hillcrest Avenue Station options would extend transit services and encourage TOD, which would decrease the demand for lands outside of dense city centers for development, such as the County's farmlands. This would be consistent with applicable local development policies.

The Northside West, Northside East, and Median Station East options would also be consistent with MTC and BART policies. The Proposed Project and Hillcrest Avenue Station options would be identical in their degree of consistency with local policies. Therefore, because the Proposed Project would be consistent with MTC and BART policies, as discussed under Impact LU-4 above, the Hillcrest Avenue Station options would also be consistent with local policies that seek to encourage transit-oriented development, and would support local efforts.

Cumulative Analysis

Cumulative land use impacts may result from the Proposed Project in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development and associated population growth that would occur within

the study area of eastern Contra Costa County as anticipated by the general plans for these communities, the Specific Plans that the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch are preparing for the proposed station areas, and the SR 4 widening project between Loveridge Road and SR 160. This cumulative analysis considers whether the Proposed Project along with other growth along the project corridor and in the station areas would create land use conflicts, divide an existing community, convert agricultural uses, or be unsupportive of local land use policies.

Impact LU-CU-8 The Proposed Project in combination with other foreseeable development would not conflict with existing land uses in the project corridor. (LTS)

As stated under Impact LU-2, the Proposed Project itself would result in some changes to existing land uses within the project corridor, but it would not result in land use conflicts or degrade existing uses. The SR 4 widening project would increase SR 4 to eight lanes of traffic, which would improve traffic congestion in the area, and which could affect properties fronting SR 4, but would not be incompatible with those existing uses. Development of the RDPs in Pittsburg and Antioch would result in changes to land uses within the vicinities of the proposed stations, but the RDPs would seek to intensify and enhance existing land uses by maximizing underutilized and vacant properties within the project corridor and increasing-density within one-half mile of the proposed stations. The changes would be compatible with existing land uses since they would be in support of City, BART, and MTC policies.

Additionally, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) forecasts predict that the communities of eastern Contra Costa County will continue to see rapidly increasing growth in the Bay Area, including nearly 47,000 new residents, 36,000 new jobs, and 18,000 new households by 2030 in Pittsburg and Antioch alone. The Proposed Project, widening of SR 4, and development of RDPs would help the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch accommodate this anticipated growth. For these reasons, the Proposed Project in combination with the other projects within the cumulative context would all support each other in preparing for the intensified and rapid growth that has occurred and is expected to continue in the eastern Contra Costa County region. Although surrounding land uses would change in response to the widening of SR 4 and implementation of the RDPs, the changes would not be adverse and would enhance existing uses so that these projects would not conflict with surrounding land uses.

Together, these projects would not result in major adverse land use conflicts with surrounding existing uses, mainly because they would be developed to enhance and support each other while supporting local and regional transit policies. Individual project impacts would not conflict with existing land uses, so impacts could not combine with other impacts to create a larger, cumulative

adverse impact. For this reason, cumulative land use conflict impacts would be less than significant.

*Impact
LU-CU-9*

The Proposed Project in combination with other foreseeable development would lead to conversion of farmland; however, the Proposed Project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Accordingly, cumulative impacts of farmland conversion would be less than significant. (LTS)

The areas of east Contra Costa County, including the cities of Pittsburg, Antioch, and Oakley, have undergone significant changes over the past several years, and some remaining undeveloped areas will continue to transform into a more urbanized setting. Several areas that were once agricultural have been designated as necessary to support development of transportation infrastructure, including portions of the SR 4 widening projects and the possible development of the Hillcrest Avenue Station Northside East or Northside West option remote maintenance facility. In addition, ABAG's future growth forecasts within eastern Contra Costa County indicate that the eastern portion of the County will continue to experience urbanization, which could lead to development on land currently used for or designated as agricultural. Under the Proposed Project, no land designated as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance would be affected by development of the Median Station. Similarly, development of the Median Station East option would not affect any land designated as Important Farmland, so there would be no cumulative impacts associated with the development of the Median Station under the Proposed Project, or Median Station East option with regard to conversion of farmland.

However, development of the remote maintenance facility under the Northside East Station option and remote maintenance facility option under the Northside West option would affect approximately 8.8 acres of Farmland of Local Importance, which would be converted to non-agricultural uses. The loss of farmland in eastern Contra Costa County has been found to be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact for the SR 4 Bypass project. Consequently, the Northside East Station and Northside West Station options of the Proposed Project in combination with other cumulative projects could result in a loss of agricultural farmland, which is considered a significant cumulative impact. However, as discussed in Impact LU-6, the land where the Northside East Station and Northside West Station options remote maintenance facility would be located is isolated and no longer economically viable for agricultural purposes. While the cumulative loss of agricultural farmland would be significant, only two of the station location options would have the possibility to add to the cumulative loss of farmland. In addition, under the Northside East Station and Northside West options, the contribution to the cumulative

loss of farmland would be less than cumulatively considerable because only a small amount of Farmland of Local Importance, which is now isolated and not economically viable for agricultural use, would be acquired for development of the Northside East Station and Northside West options remote maintenance facility. Therefore, the Proposed Project's contribution would be less than significant.