

4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

This chapter provides a discussion of the existing conditions and potential impacts relating to police, fire, educational, recreational and library services from the East Washington Place project.

A. *Police Protection*

The following describes current conditions and potential impacts of the project with regard to police services in Petaluma.

1. **Regulatory Framework**

A number of existing policies and programs regulate public services in Petaluma, as seen in Table 4.12-1.

2. **Existing Conditions**

As of 2008, the Petaluma Police Department employed a total of 77 police officers, with a service ratio of 1.31 officers per 1,000 residents.¹ This is consistent with the current nationally-accepted standard service ratio of 1.25 officers per 1,000 residents. In addition, it is slightly higher than the ratio of 1.3 officers per 1,000 residents included in General Plan 2025. The Department also has a recommended emergency response time of three minutes.² The Department has a Traffic Unit with a Serious Traffic Offender Program (S.T.O.P.), K-9 Unit, Bicycle and Motorcycle Patrol, SWAT Team, Hostage Negotiation Team, Gang Enforcement and Street Crimes Units, Investigation Unit and volunteer Reserve Community Service Officer Program.²

The project site is located in the West Area Command. The police station serving the project site is located at 969 Petaluma Boulevard North, approximately one mile northwest of the site.

3. **Standards of Significance**

The proposed project would have a significant impact related to police services if it would:

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities, need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

¹ Lt. Joe Edwards, Petaluma Police Department, written communication with Lisa Katz (DC&E), June 17, 2008.

² Lt. Joe Edwards, Petaluma Police Department, written communication with Lisa Katz (DC&E), June 17, 2008.

TABLE 4.12-1 **PETALUMA GENERAL PLAN 2025 POLICIES AND PROGRAMS—POLICE PROTECTION**

Policy/Program Number	Policy/Program
<i>Community Facilities, Services, and Education Element</i>	
Goal 7-G-6	Provide police services that are responsive to citizens' needs to ensure a safe and secure environment for people and property in the community.
Policy 7-P-31	Maintain a minimum standard of 1.3 police officers per 1,000 population.
Policy 7-P-35	Incorporate, into new development to the extent deemed appropriate and feasible, the Development Code Urban Design Standards for crime prevention. ^a

^a Conformance with this policy will be addressed in the staff evaluation of the project during the entitlement hearings.

Source: City of Petaluma General Plan 2025, May 2008.

4. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the impacts of the proposed project on police services in the City of Petaluma.

a. Project Impacts

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities, need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

Assuming an employment generation rate for retail uses of one employee per 450 square feet, the 380,000 project would result in a net increase of approximately 845 employees.³ Implementation of the project would not add any new residents to the site. However, the project could generate additional calls for police service and a need for additional patrol time related to crime, traffic and parking.⁴ Based on consultation with the City Police Department, the proposed uses would not result in the need for new police facilities, such as a sub-station, either on- or off-site. Furthermore, the project would not require the Department to expand existing facilities off-site or add new personnel.⁵ Thus, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

³ Association of Bay Area Governments, September 1991, *1987 Input-Output Model and Economic Multipliers for the San Francisco Bay Region, Projections Working Paper 91-7*.

⁴ Matthew Stapleton, Petaluma Police Sergeant. Written communication with Betsi Lewitter, City of Petaluma's Planning Department, May 20, 2005.

⁵ David Sears, Captain, Petaluma Police Department. Personal communication with Ted Heyd, DC&E December 11, 2008.

b. Cumulative Impacts

A list-based approach has been used for this cumulative analysis. The analysis considers the development projects listed in Appendix E (Cumulative Projects) and whether this project would have significant cumulative impacts on police services in combination with the cumulative projects.

Cumulatively, the proposed project in addition with the other projects could result in a cumulative impact associated with the need for increased police staffing, as the projects will result in an increase in residents, customers and employees and therefore increase the number of full-time equivalent police necessary for adequate staffing ratios and patrol coverage. As noted in the General Plan EIR, the City closed its South McDowell Boulevard substation in 2006 and is investigating an expansion.⁶ At this time, the City Police Department has adequate capacity to provide service for the project as well as other projects on the list.⁷ Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact on police services related to the physical impacts of expanding and/or constructing police facilities would be considered *less than significant*.

5. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Since no new significant impacts related to police services were identified as a result of the proposed development, no mitigation measures are required.

B. Fire Protection

The following describes current conditions and potential impacts of the proposed project with regard to fire services in Petaluma. Wildfire hazards and emergency evacuation are addressed in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials chapter (Chapter 4.7) of this EIR.

1. Regulatory Framework

The Community Facilities, Services, and Education Element of the General Plan 2025 address the protection of the community from risks associated with urban fires. Relevant fire service policies related to the General Plan are listed in Table 4.12-2.

2. Existing Conditions

The Petaluma Fire Department provides fire, rescue and emergency medical services for the City of Petaluma and southern Sonoma County. The service area covers approximately 160 square miles

⁶ City of Petaluma General Plan 2025 EIR, September 2006, page 3.4-6.

⁷ David Sears, Captain, Petaluma Police Department. Personal communication with Ted Heyd, DC&E December 11, 2008.

TABLE 4.12-2 **PETALUMA GENERAL PLAN 2025 POLICIES AND PROGRAMS— FIRE SERVICES**

Policy/Program Number	Policy/Program
<i>Community Facilities, Services, and Education Element</i>	
Policy 7-P-17	Achieve and maintain a minimum ratio of one fire suppression personnel per 1,000 population served or a similar level of response service to meet increased call volumes.
Policy 7-P-17(A)	Fund additional staff to insure minimum ratio is maintained as population increases occur.
Policy 7-P-18 (C)	Maintain and modernize emergency response facilities, including fire stations, as needed to accommodate population growth.
Policy 7-P-19	Maintain a four minute travel time for a total of 6-minute response time for emergencies within the City.
Policy 7-P-19 (B)	Ensure that transportation improvements are provided for additional development so as not to adversely impact emergency response times.
Policy 7-P-30	Maintain cooperative agreements for mutual aid at a State level and automatic aid at a local level.

Source: City of Petaluma General Plan 2025, May 2008.

and a population of 70,000 people. In 2007, the Fire Department responded to 5,050 calls.⁸ As of October 2008, there are 58 paid personnel on staff, of these 51 are line personnel, including 19 paramedics, and are divided among three platoons that work 24-hour rotating shifts. These personnel include one Fire Chief, three battalion chiefs and nine captains. All firefighters are EMT certified. The minimum staffing for each shift is 15 personnel. This includes the staffing of three paramedic engine companies, one ladder company and two advanced life support ambulances. The Department has an adopted service level standard of four minutes response time to emergency calls to 90 percent of the city.

The Fire Department provides service from the following locations:

- ◆ Station 1 (Fire Administration) – 198 'D' Street
- ◆ Station 2 (Training Facility) – 1001 N. McDowell Boulevard
- ◆ Station 3 – 831 S. McDowell Boulevard
- ◆ Fire Prevention Office (at City Hall) -- 22 Bassett Street (mailing address is 11 English Street)

⁸ Fire Chief Chris Albertson, Petaluma Fire Department, written communication with Lisa Katz (DC&E), June 18, 2008.

The proposed project is located less than two miles from both Stations 1 and Station 3. The Fire Department plans to construct a new facility to replace Station 1 in the future. The new station will be located at 307 Petaluma Blvd South, about 1.5 miles from the project site. Stations 2 and 3 will eventually be modernized; however, these facilities will remain in their existing locations.⁹

The Petaluma Fire Department also provides emergency medical transport service to the City of Petaluma and to a 160-square-mile county area surrounding the city. The Ambulance Service augments and supports the fire fighting forces of the department. The Ambulance Service is designed as an enterprise fund and the fees charged for service cover almost all expenditures of the program. There are two first line ambulances on-duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week. At least two out of three of the first line engines are staffed with a paramedic 80 percent of the time.

Currently, the Fire Department employs a staff of 58 paid personnel. If measured against the industry standard of one personnel per 1,000 population, the City of Petaluma is adequately staffed. The City of Petaluma has an adopted personnel level standard of one fire suppression personnel per 1,000 population served, as stated in General Plan Policy 7-P-17.

In 2003, the City of Petaluma undertook a *Standards of Coverage Study* for its Fire Department. The study found that the City's three fire stations are well located and adequate for current service needs for the City of Petaluma. To be fully adequate for future service needs, the study recommended that the fire stations need to be expanded and modernized to facilitate the increase in crews and the addition of a third ambulance for the Department. Additionally, the report noted that Fire Station 1 should be relocated to a modern, larger facility about 500 feet from its current location. At the earliest this would occur in mid-2009.⁸

3. Standards of Significance

The proposed project would have a significant impact related to fire protection services if it would:

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

4. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the impacts of the proposed project on fire prevention and response services in the City of Petaluma.

⁹ Fire Chief Chris Albertson, Petaluma Fire Department, written communication with Lisa Katz (DC&E), June 18, 2008.

⁸ Fire Chief Chris Albertson, Petaluma Fire Department, written communication with Lisa Katz (DC&E), June 18, 2008.

a. Project Impacts

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

The project would result in an increase of approximately 380,000 square feet of new commercial uses, including a combination of office and retail. This additional development, and the resulting increase in the number of employees and patrons, would result in a slight increase in calls for fire and emergency medical service. The proposed project would not add residents to the project site and would not change the targeted ratio of one Fire Suppression personnel per 1,000 residents.

However, the proposed project would constitute a fire hazard during construction due to the site's proximity to the Fairgrounds and the potential exposure of combustible construction materials to the fallout from firework mortars.¹⁰ This issue is further analyzed and addressed in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this EIR.

The Petaluma Fire Department has an adopted service level standard, which is a four-minute travel time (six minute response time) to emergency calls to 90 percent of the city. Given the proposed project's proximity to the City's fire stations, East Washington Place would be served in the required six minutes response time.¹¹

The City of Petaluma's Fiscal Year 2008 Budget states that the Department will continue to pursue the relocation plans for Fire Station 1, due to its age and structural deficiencies, and the facility modernization for Fire Stations 2 and 3, in response to the *Standards of Coverage Study* done for the City's Fire Department mentioned above. Individual environmental review would be required for each of these projects.

As a result, the approval of the proposed project would not require any additional facilities in addition to what is currently planned to meet future demand in the community. Thus, the project would not require construction of new Fire Department facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, which would otherwise have the potential to adversely affect the environment. As a result, a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

¹⁰ Mike Haberski, Battalion Chief, City of Petaluma Fire Department, personal communication with Ted Heyd, DC&E, December 11, 2008.

¹¹ Mike Haberski, Battalion Fire Chief, Petaluma Fire Department, personal communication with Ted Heyd, DC&E, December 11, 2008.

b. Cumulative Impacts

A list-based approach has been used for this cumulative analysis. The analysis considers the development projects listed in Appendix E (Cumulative Projects) and whether this project would have significant cumulative impacts on fire services in combination with the cumulative projects.

The City has recognized the need to upgrade its fire stations based on cumulative growth of which the project is a part. However, as stated in the project-specific impact discussion, the project would not require additional fire service facilities (i.e. station houses) above and beyond those already identified for relocation or modification in the City's Fiscal Year 2008 Budget. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact in relation to fire services. A *less-than-significant* cumulative impact would occur because the City is planning for these improvements.

Although possible reductions in response times are not the basis for determining whether significant cumulative impacts would occur under CEQA, they are an important consideration in relation to new development. In combination with other projects, operation of the proposed project will impact the Fire Department's response times and potentially contribute to lower levels of service as a result of increased demand. The Fire Department's resources are already strained by limited staff (15 on duty at any given time) and the cumulative growth in Petaluma, of which this project is a part, would affect the fire department's ability to respond to multiple incidents simultaneously. Currently, it is not uncommon for the fire department to have two or more incidents running at the same time. This type of simultaneous activity strains available resources. With the proposed increases in growth, the numbers of simultaneous incidents will also increase, potentially delaying subsequent calls for assistance and impacting the resources of the City's mutual aid neighbors.¹²

5. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Since no significant impacts related to the provision of fire services have been identified, no mitigation measures are required.

C. Schools

The following describes current conditions and potential impacts of the proposed project with regard to educational services in Petaluma.

¹² Michael Ginn, Battalion Chief/Fire Marshal, City of Petaluma. Personal email correspondence, October 30, 2006.

1. Regulatory Framework

a. City of Petaluma General Plan

The Community Facilities, Services, and Education Element of the General Plan address education services within the City. Relevant policies and programs are listed in Table 4.12-3.

b. California Government Code Section 65996(a)

The Petaluma City Schools (PCS) has adopted mitigation fees to compensate for growth impacts from projects such as the proposed project and other projects in the city. California Government Code Section 65996(a) states that no additional mitigation beyond the payment of adopted mitigation fees is permitted to address fiscal issues.

2. Existing Conditions

Petaluma City Schools (PCS) serves the project site. There are two districts within PCS; one focuses on elementary education and the second on junior and high school education. The former, the Petaluma City Elementary School District (ESD), is comprised of six elementary schools with an enrollment of approximately 2,070 students for the 2007-2008 school year.¹³

The latter, Petaluma Joint Union High School District (JUSD), consists of two junior high schools, a community day school serving grades 7 to 9, two high schools, two small alternative/continuation high schools (one at each comprehensive high school site) and a continuation high school, with a combined enrollment of approximately 5,280 for the 2007-2008 school year. Additionally, there are two charter schools operating under the PCS umbrella. Of these, Live Oak Charter School currently leases buildings on the Sonoma-Marin Fairground, across Kenilworth Drive from the project site.

Schools are funded through the State Facilities Program, bonds and developer fees. In order to help pay for new schools, PCS collects \$0.36 per square foot of new commercial development to compensate for growth impacts.

PCS is limited by State law as to how much it can collect from new development. Funding of school facilities has been impacted by the passing of SB 50, which limits the impact fees and site dedication that school districts can require of developers to off-set the impact of new development on the school system. The PCS has student generation rates for residential development.

¹³ Deputy Superintendent Steve Bolman, Petaluma City Schools, written communication with Lisa Katz (DC&E), on June 19, 2008.

TABLE 4.12-3 **PETALUMA GENERAL PLAN 2025 POLICIES AND PROGRAMS—EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

Policy/Program Number	Policies and Programs
<i>Community Facilities, Services, and Education Element</i>	
Policy 7-P-12	Work with school districts to ensure availability of appropriate sites for all schools needs and to identify alternative short or long term uses for school facilities and sites that may not be needed because of decreased enrollment.
Policy 7-P-14	Recognize the continued need for expanded child care services.
Policy 7-P-14 (C)	Consider the impact of residential and commercial development projects on the supply of child care.
Policy 7-P-14 (D)	Encourage child care facilities in city government buildings, new housing or office/industrial developments.

Source: City of Petaluma General Plan 2025, May 2008.

3. Standards of Significance

The proposed project would have a significant impact related to public schools if it would:

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

4. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the impacts of the proposed project on schools in the City of Petaluma.

a. Project Impacts

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

The project would generate an estimated net increase of 845 employees. As allowed for by State law, as well as Petaluma City School (PCS) policy, some employees who do not live within the PCS may choose to send their children to school in the districts. Additionally, new jobs created by the project could attract new residents into the city, resulting in increased growth. The number of new PCS students, if any, generated by the project in this way is likely to be small and is too speculative for meaningful impact assessment under CEQA. Also, the PCS schools nearest the project site are not over capacity. As noted in the General Plan EIR, the PSD was at 92 percent capacity. Live Oak Charter School, in closest proximity to the project site, was at 87 percent capacity. All school within the PSD are under capacity and could conceivably accommodate the students, if any,

that may be generated by the project.¹⁴ Moreover, the California State Legislature has determined that school impact fees shall be the exclusive method of mitigating the school facilities impacts of a project, has set limits on school impact fees, and has determined that payment of school impact fees shall be deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation.¹⁵ Consequently, the impacts of the project on school facilities would be *less than significant*.

b. Cumulative Impacts

A list-based approach has been used for this cumulative analysis. The analysis considers the development projects listed in Appendix E (Cumulative Projects) and whether this project would have significant cumulative impacts related to schools in combination with the cumulative projects.

As growth continues in the Petaluma area, the demand for school facilities will increase. Depending on the location and scale of newly required facilities, the construction of them could result in significant impacts. Since it is unknown at this time what specific improvements to school facilities would be needed, it would be speculative to attempt to analyze the potential impacts. However, no matter what improvements are ultimately determined to be needed, the project would not contribute to the combined demand for new or expanded facilities. As a result, the project would have *no impact* on cumulative demand for schools services.

5. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Since no significant impacts related to schools were identified as a result of the proposed project, no mitigation measures are required.

D. Parks and Recreation

The following describes current conditions and potential impacts of the proposed project with regard to parks and recreational facilities in Petaluma.

1. Regulatory Framework

This section lists relevant policies from State law and the Petaluma General Plan.

a. The Quimby Act

Cities and counties have been authorized since the passage of the 1975 Quimby Act (California Government Code §66477) to pass ordinances requiring that developers set aside land, donate conservation easements or pay fees for park improvements. Revenues generated through the Quimby

¹⁴ City of Petaluma General Plan 2025 EIR September 2006, page 3.4-5.

¹⁵ California Government Code Sections 65995, 65996(a) and 65996(b).

Act cannot be used for the operation and maintenance of park facilities.¹⁶ A 1982 amendment (AB 1600) requires agencies to clearly show a reasonable relationship between the public need for the recreation facility or park land and the type of development project upon which the fee is imposed.

b. Petaluma General Plan

The Recreation, Music, Parks, and the Arts Element of the General Plan contains policies and programs that address the parks and recreational needs of the community. Relevant policies are listed in Table 4.12-4.

c. Special Development Fees

As of August 2005, the City of Petaluma adopted a collection of special development fees on new construction within the city. One of these fees pertains to Park Land Acquisition and Development, as allowed by the Quimby Act. The purpose for this fee is to provide funds for the construction and implementation of improvements to key elements of the City park system sufficient to accommodate the increased necessity generated by new development. Table 4.12-5 shows the schedule of fees based on the type of development.

2. Existing Conditions

Currently, the City has a total of 41 parks available for Petaluma residents. The closest recreational facilities to the project site are the swim center and skate park, which are located directly adjacent to the project site, and the Kenilworth Teen Center and Kenilworth Park located within a one block radius.

The City of Petaluma breaks its parks into two categories: community parks and neighborhood parks. Community parks have a larger service area with facilities and recreation activities in excess of those supplied at neighborhood parks. Neighborhood parks are intended to provide playgrounds and other recreation facilities for a localized area. As of June, 2008, the City of Petaluma has approximately 123 acres of community parks and 75 acres of neighborhood parks. Compared to Petaluma's 2000 population of 54,500 residents, the City's inventory of park acres gives the City a ratio of 2 acres of community parks per 1,000 residents and 1.4 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents.¹⁷ The City has adopted a citywide parks standard of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents and as of October 2005, the City provided 5.1 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

¹⁶ California State Park's website. <http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/795/files/quimby101.pdf>, accessed on December 9, 2008.

¹⁷ Scott Brodhun, City of Petaluma Parks and Recreation Division, personal communication with Lisa Katz (DC&E), June 17, 2008.

TABLE 4.12-4 **PETALUMA GENERAL PLAN 2025 POLICIES AND PROGRAMS—PARKS AND RECREATION**

Policy/Program Number	Policies and Programs
<i>Recreation, Music, Parks, and the Arts Element</i>	
Policy 6-P-1	Develop additional parkland in the city, particularly in areas lacking these facilities and where new growth is proposed, to meet the standards of required park acreage.
Policy 6-P-5	New parkland or recreation facilities, beyond those identified in the General Plan, may be required as part of any development review process.
Policy 6-P-6(A)	Revise the City’s park in lieu fees/dedication requirements to achieve the General Plan standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents.

Source: City of Petaluma General Plan 2025, May 2008.

Portions of the project site are temporarily being used by community sports organizations, including Little League, for sports activities that have been long-standing, but permissive, uses on-site prior to the School District’s sale of the property to a private party. These specific recreational facilities, including the Little League’s Carter Field, are not owned by the City of Petaluma, and there are no agreements with the City to provide or allow public use.

These recreational facilities are not part of the City’s park system, and the site is not referenced in the City’s General Plan 2025 as park property, however is recognized as a joint use facility in the General Plan, and is part of the park and recreation space inventory.

Because the property is not publicly owned, the current and continued use of the property by the community sports groups is dependent on the owner’s authorization. The community sports organizations do not have present leases or written agreements with the property owner for continued long-term use of the site, nor did they have leases or written agreements with the School District at the time of the District’s sale of the property.

Since the property owner purchased the property for mixed-use development, the existing recreational activities are not anticipated to continue upon construction commencement. The sports organizations are aware of the temporary nature of their use of the site.

A Negative Declaration regarding the relocation of Carter Field was prepared in 2002. When project construction begins, Carter Field will relocate to a new site. Pop Warner Football also uses a

TABLE 4.12-5 CITY OF PETALUMA PARK LAND ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT FEES

Land Use Type	Open Space Acquisition Fee	Parkland Acquisition Fee (Non-Quimby Act Projects)	Parkland Acquisition Fee (Quimby Act Projects)	Parkland Development Impact Fee
Single-Family Residential	\$5,950/ unit	\$3,209/ unit	\$3,209/ unit	\$5,498/unit
Multi-Family Residential	\$4,006/ unit	\$2,174/ unit	\$2,174/ unit	\$3,702/unit
Commercial	\$1,127/ 1,000 square feet	\$608/ 1,000 square feet	\$608/ 1,000 square feet	\$1,041/ 1,000 square feet
Office	\$1,078/ 1,000 square feet	\$581/ 1,000 square feet	\$581/ 1,000 square feet	\$996/ 1,000 square feet
Industrial	\$686/ 1,000 square feet	\$370/ 1,000 square feet	\$370/ 1,000 square feet	\$634/ 1,000 square feet

Source: City of Petaluma, Development Impact Fees, accessed online <http://cityofpetaluma.net/cdd/pdf/development-impact-fees-matrix08.pdf> on December 16, 2008.

portion of the site for its games. The City of Petaluma Parks and Recreation Division anticipates that Pop Warner could be successfully relocated to the new Kenilworth Junior High School site. The City of Petaluma Parks and Recreation Division has been working with Petaluma City Schools to finalize a joint powers agreement. Once this agreement is approved by the City Council, the Division will confirm these details with Pop Warner.¹⁸

3. Standards of Significance

The proposed project would have a significant impact related to parks and recreational services if it would:

1. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.
2. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered park and recreational facilities, or result in the need for new or physically altered park and recreational facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

4. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the impacts of the proposed project on parks and recreational facilities in the City of Petaluma.

a. Project Impacts

1. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

Implementation of the proposed project may increase demand for park facilities and services among employees and patrons of the project's commercial and office uses, however it is not expected that this increase would be substantial because most of the people that would either work at the site or patronize the retail shops likely already live in Petaluma or nearby cities and use park facilities within those jurisdictions.

Because more trips will be made to the site as a result of the project, it is expected that there would be increased use of nearby recreational facilities, including the Petaluma Swim Center and skate park. Depending on the level of increased usage, physical deterioration of these facilities could be exacerbated. The project applicant would be required to pay impact fees to the City per the authorization of the Quimby Act. While the project includes some on-site, passive recreational amenities, including nine plaza areas, the project applicant proposes to meet its Quimby Act obligation through the payment of fees for off-site recreational improvements. Payment of the fees as

¹⁸ Scott Brodhun, City of Petaluma Parks and Recreation Division, personal communication with Lisa Katz (DC&E), June 17, 2008.

allowed under the Quimby Act would result in the project providing adequate resources to ensure that the project provides enough new recreational opportunities to meet the demand generated by the project. Since the project would meet the maximum allowed requirements for provision of recreational opportunities, potential impacts to parks and recreational facilities resulting from implementation of the project would be considered *less than significant*.

The distribution of the project's Quimby Act fees has not been confirmed by the City at this time, so the physical impacts of the associated recreational improvements cannot be analyzed within the scope of this document. However, when specific improvements are identified by the City, individual environmental review for the project(s) will be required.

2. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered park and recreational facilities, or result in the need for new or physically altered park and recreational facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

Additionally, construction of the project would require the relocation of Carter Little League Field. Though relocation would physically alter the facility, the construction of a new little league field is considered an improvement for the City. The potential impacts associated with relocation of the Little League facility have been analyzed through a prior environmental review process.

b. Cumulative Impacts

A list-based approach has been used for this cumulative analysis. The analysis considers the development projects listed in Appendix E (Cumulative Projects) and whether this project would have significant cumulative impacts on recreational facilities in combination with the cumulative projects.

The proposed project and additional projects in the City of Petaluma would potentially have a significant cumulative impact on the demand for park space and recreational facilities. However, the potential impacts related to the over-use of park facilities would be off-set by the payment of the City's special development fees, thereby avoiding a cumulative impact. Those fees would be used to construct new parks and recreational facilities somewhere in the city. Because of several variables, including but not limited to, the future availability of land, it is not known where the city would construct such facilities. It is therefore not possible for this analysis to identify whether there would be an adverse cumulative physical impact associated with the construction of the new facilities. Any new facilities constructed in the city would be subject to separate environmental review under CEQA. Regardless, as stated above, the project would not substantially exacerbate the demand for parks or recreational facilities in Petaluma. It is expected that most employees and patrons associated with the proposed project would already reside in Petaluma or nearby cities and therefore already use existing parks and recreational facilities in those jurisdictions. Furthermore,

the proposed project would pay fees that would be used to enhance park and recreational amenities. As a result, the project would have a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact on such facilities.

5. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Since no significant impacts related to parks were identified as a result of the proposed project, no mitigation measures are required.

E. Libraries

The following describes current conditions and potential impacts of the proposed project with regard to library services in Petaluma.

1. Regulatory Framework

a. Sonoma County

In 2003, the Sonoma County Library completed a Library Facilities Master Plan. As part of this effort, five main goals were developed to help guide future improvements to the County's libraries and the City library branches within the County. The Facilities Master Plan evaluates the ability of the existing library facilities to meet the five goals and offers recommendations on how facilities can be improved to better serve visiting patrons.

b. City of Petaluma

The City of Petaluma has adopted Library Facilities Impact Fees for the purpose of providing funds for the construction and implementation of improvements to key elements of the City library sufficient to accommodate the necessity generated by new development.¹⁹

2. Existing Conditions

There is one public library that serves Petaluma, which is operated by the Sonoma County Library. It is located at 100 Fairgrounds Drive, less than one mile from the proposed project.

Based on the Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan, published in 2003, a performance standard ratio of 550 to 680 square feet of library space per 1,000 City resident population was recommended.²⁰ Additionally, a standard of 2.4 to 2.5 volumes per capita average was recommended by the Master Plan.

¹⁹ City of Petaluma, *Special Development Fees*, August 2005, page 19.

²⁰ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, available at http://www.sonoma.lib.ca.us/doc/Sonoma_MP_Report.pdf, page 4.

Petaluma's Branch is about 26,400 square feet, capable of serving 38,000 to 48,000 people, while its service area population is over 65,000.²¹ This deficiency is partially offset by the fact that Petaluma residents are able to patronize other Sonoma County Library branches with their assigned library cards. As of 2003, Petaluma's Branch had about 100,787 volumes in its collection, for an average of 1.54 volumes per capita.²² A 2003 study conducted by the County Library showed that a collection size of 177,000 to 195,700 volumes would be needed to provide the Petaluma area with adequate library service through the year 2025.²³ For comparison, the average collection size in California is 1.96 million volumes, and the per capita average is 1.62.²⁴

According to the County's Library Facilities Master Plan, the Petaluma Branch has inadequate shelving, restricting the size of its collection. Other deficiencies included small program areas, amount of seating, outdated technology and lack of an enclosed area for training/tutoring.²⁵ A feasibility study to expand the Branch was recommended by the Master Plan in order to improve its performance standards. This study placed the Petaluma Branch within the second priority group, out of three, for facility improvements. The goal for such improvements would be the enlargement of the Petaluma Branch so that it can better serve the needs of the current and projected future populations.²⁶ The library recently completed an expansion of its community room, however beyond this improvement there are no other plans for expansions or upgrades.²⁷

²¹ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, available at http://www.sonoma.lib.ca.us/doc/Sonoma_MP_Report.pdf, page 58. Note: The service area includes the City of Petaluma, the north Petaluma and Penngrove area, and the surrounding rural areas south to the Marin County border.

²² Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, available at http://www.sonoma.lib.ca.us/doc/Sonoma_MP_Report.pdf, page 58.

²³ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, available at http://www.sonoma.lib.ca.us/doc/Sonoma_MP_Report.pdf, page 58.

²⁴ Providence Associates, Inc., 2001, *San Bernardino County Library Facility Master Plan 2001-2021*, page 28.

²⁵ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, available at http://www.sonoma.lib.ca.us/doc/Sonoma_MP_Report.pdf, page 58.

²⁶ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, available at http://www.sonoma.lib.ca.us/doc/Sonoma_MP_Report.pdf, page 34.

²⁷ Sandy Cooper, Library Directory, Sonoma County Library, personal email communication with Ted Heyd, October 17, 2006.

3. Standards of Significance

The proposed project would have a significant impact related to library services if it would:

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

4. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the impacts of the proposed project on library facilities in the City of Petaluma.

a. Project Impacts

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

The project would not result in a "new" residential population in Petaluma or neighboring cities. It is expected that employees of the offices and retail establishments, as well as visiting patrons, would already reside in Petaluma or adjacent jurisdictions. As such, it is not expected that these people would collectively represent a new population that would increase demand on library facilities. Rather, it can be assumed that employees and patrons associated with the project already use existing library facilities and are therefore part of the current demand. Nevertheless, the applicant would be required to pay the City's Library Facilities Impact Fees, which would provide funds for the construction and implementation of improvements to the library to address its existing deficiencies.²⁸ As a result, *no impact* would occur.

b. Cumulative Impacts

A list-based approach has been used for this cumulative analysis. The analysis considers the development projects listed in Appendix E (Cumulative Projects) and whether this project would have significant cumulative impacts on library facilities in combination with the cumulative projects.

As stated above, the project would not impact Library facilities or the demand for such facilities. As a result, the project could have *no cumulative impact* because it would not contribute to increased, future demand for such facilities.

5. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Since no significant impacts related to libraries were identified as a result of the proposed project, no mitigation measures are required.

²⁸ City of Petaluma, August 2005, *Special Development Fees*, page 19.