



**City of Pittsburg**  
65 Civic Avenue • Pittsburg, California 94565

September 28, 2016

Michael Simmons, Foreperson  
Contra Costa County Grand Jury  
725 Court Street  
P.O. Box 431  
Martinez, Ca 94553

RE: City of Pittsburg Response to Grand Jury Report No. 1614, "Where Will We Live?"

Dear Mr. Simmons,

As requested, the following is in response to Grand Jury No. 1614, "Where Will We Live?" in the format you requested. Please note that because many of the Grand Jury's findings are general and not necessarily specific to the City of Pittsburg, we do not have the basis to agree or disagree on many of the findings since we do not have all of the information to review from the cities/agencies in Contra Costa County as the Grand Jury did when they prepared this report. We appreciate the time that and the Grand Jury spent considering these matters.

**List of Findings**

Finding #1: PDAs recognize the importance of housing near transportation and jobs for developing prosperous communities.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #2: Plan Bay Area 2040 seeks to combine transportation, jobs and housing as a solution to the needs of our growing population.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #3: While State law mandates that ABAG conduct the RHNA process, a city is not required to subsidize and/or build the units; it is only required to demonstrate that local zoning will not impede development.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #5: Inclusionary zoning programs provide incentives and regulatory waivers to builders and developers who produce both affordable and market rate homes within the same project.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.



Finding #6: PDAs recognize the importance of housing near transportation and jobs for developing prosperous communities.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #8: Inclusionary Housing Ordinances sometimes include the option for the developer to pay in lieu fees instead of constructing AH units.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #9: The city supplements the shortage of funds for AH by requiring builders to pay impact fees, in lieu fees, or other construction and remodeling fees.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #10: Infill costs less to service than new development because it takes advantage of the existing infrastructure.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #11: The elimination of redevelopment agencies resulted in a reduction of the number of AH units constructed in the city by eliminating major source of funding for affordable development projects.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #12: The city delegates to the builder, owner, or management company of AH properties the responsibility for gathering and validating AH clientele information, as well as maintaining lists of potentially interested buyers.

Response: Pittsburg agrees with this finding.

Finding #13: There is no accessible centralized information source for available AH, which compounds the problems created by the AH shortage for those who are searching for affordable housing.

Response: Pittsburg disagrees with this finding. Information may be derived at the following website: <http://www.lowincomehousing.us/CA/pittsburg.html>

### **City's Response to Grand Jury Recommendations**

Recommendation #1: The city should consider increasing AH in PDAs.

Response: The City of Pittsburg has implemented this. Housing Element Policy 1.1D focuses AH on sites within the PDAs.



Recommendation #2: the city should consider adopting an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.

Response: The City of Pittsburg has implemented an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (PMC Section 18.86).

Recommendation #3: The city should explore rehabilitating existing housing stock as AH for purchase or rental, and identify funding to do so.

Response: The City of Pittsburg implements this on an ongoing basis as opportunities arise. One example is utilizing CDBG funding for our Housing Rehabilitation Program.

Recommendation #5: The city should explore increasing existing "impact fees" or "linkage fees" or enacting such fees in order to generate revenue with which to assist funding of AH.

Response: The city evaluates and analyzes development impacts and appropriate associated fees for individual projects on an ongoing basis. The City currently allows for payment of in-lieu fees associated with new residential development for AH requirements.

Recommendation #6: The city should consider designating an employee within the city's planning or housing department to coordinate with property management to maintain current waiting and interest lists of available AH and ensure information is posted on the city website, and identifying funding to do so.

Response: The City of Pittsburg has a Housing Authority. Staff in both the Housing Authority and Planning Departments are available to answer questions and connect individuals interested in AH. The Housing Authority maintains a list on the website.

Recommendation #7: The city should consider seeking federal, state, and local funding sources for AH.

Response: The City of Pittsburg implements this on an ongoing basis as opportunities arise (see Housing Element policy 2.1A/B and policy 2.4 B/C/D/E).

Recommendation #8: The city should consider partnering with for-profit and not-for-profit builders to secure land suitable for AH, and identify funding to do so.

Response: The City of Pittsburg implements this on an ongoing basis as opportunities arise (see Housing Element policy 1.4C and policy 2.1 C/D/E/G and policy 2.4I/J).

Recommendation #11: The city should consider undertaking an education initiative in the earliest phase of affordable planning projects in order to alleviate community concerns regarding AH, and identify funding to do so.



Response: The City holds public study sessions, workshops and public hearings in conjunction with the CEQA process and preliminary plan review process. Frequent workshops and public hearings alleviate community concerns regarding AH.

Recommendation #13: The city should consider identifying all infill and vacant land not in PDAs and encourage use of it for AH through tax incentives, density bonuses, etc.

Response: The City of Pittsburg has implemented this. A vacant and underutilized parcel inventory is available in the Housing Element (see Tables 4-3 & 4-4) and opportunity sites appropriate for AH within the Railroad Avenue Specific Plan (RASP) are identified in the RASP (see RASP Table 2.1 & section 2.1.2). The Successor Agency also has a list of available properties in its long range property management plan where residential units may be constructed.

Recommendation #15: The city should consider creating an easily accessible, online central repository with all relevant information on deed-restricted housing units to assure that inventory of AH is maintained, and identify funding to do so.

Response: The City has an inventory list available upon request. Funding is not available for staffing to monitor website posting.

Respectfully,



Joe Sbranti  
City Manager