

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 proposed project with regard to police services in Petaluma.

1. **Regulatory Framework**

The current Petaluma General Plan has two objectives within the Community Health and Safety Element that are relevant to the proposed project in regards to adequate police service:

- ◆ Maintain safety services at an appropriate level.
- ◆ Prevent loss of life and property due to fire or crime.

The 2025 General Plan has several goals and policies in the Community Facilities, Services, and Education Element related to police services.

- ◆ 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 1.4 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.

2. Existing Conditions

As of 2005, the Petaluma Police Department employed a total of 74 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. However, it is slightly lower than the goal included in the proposed General Plan. 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.), a K-9 Unit, Bicycle and Motorcycle Patrol, a SWAT Team, a Hostage Negotiation Team, Gang Enforcement and Street Crimes Units, an Investigation Unit, and a volunteer Reserve Community Service Officer Program.³

The proposed project 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:

- ◆ 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.

¹The City of Petaluma Draft General Plan 2025, July 2006, Community Facilities, Services, and Education section, page 7-17.

² Lt. Joe Edwards, Petaluma Police Department, written communication with Chantal Charette (DC&E), September 13, 2005.

³ City of Petaluma Police Department's website, <http://cityofpetaluma.net/police/index.html>, accessed on August 15, 2005.

4. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the impacts of the proposed project on police services in the City of Petaluma. For the following analysis, both the existing and proposed General Plans were reviewed to determine whether there would be different conclusions under either Plan. Unless otherwise stated below, the following impact analysis and its conclusions would apply under the implementation of either General Plan scenario.

a. Project Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for police services by adding 227 new units, which will consist of approximately 613 residents,⁴ and up to 298,038 square feet of commercial space. The additional residents would decrease the ratio of officer to residents slightly to 1.30 officers per 1,000 residents.⁵ This would be acceptable compared to the national standard, as mentioned above. However, based on the proposed General Plan goal of having 1.4 officers per 1,000 residents, there would be a need for an additional 0.86 officers to support the proposed project.⁶ However, this small increase in staffing would not result in the need for new police facilities.

However, a comparison of similar sized retail and residential projects in Petaluma led the Petaluma Police Department to believe that East Washington Place project would generate over 1,000 additional calls for service.⁷ Due to this increase in traffic and demand on the City's public safety system, the Petaluma Police Department has requested that a sub-station be included in the proposed project's plans. This sub-station would be strategically located to alleviate the pressure on the Department for rapid deployment of emergency services not only within the project area, but city-wide. The sub-station would need to be of adequate size to accommodate a reasonable num-

⁴ 2000 Census, Petaluma, 2.7 people per household.

⁵ Based on the 2005 population estimate of 56,400 for the city.

⁶ The anticipated project population of $613 / 1,000 \times 1.4 = 0.86$.

⁷ Matthew Stapleton, Petaluma Police Sergeant. Written communication with Betsi Lewitter, City of Petaluma's Planning Department, May 20, 2005.

ber of personnel and vehicles and would require design elements that afford appropriate security to those employed at the Department. If this facility were to be included in the project it would not have any new substantial environmental effects other than those evaluated as a part of the project as a whole in this EIR, since the police sub-station would not function significantly different from the retail uses proposed for the project. Thus, this impact is considered *less than significant*. If the facility were not included in the project, it would not be necessary to consider the potential impacts related to the construction of the facility as part of this EIR. The Police Department has stated that lack of a substation could adversely affect response times, however, this would not result in a significant impact in relation to the CEQA guidelines, which focus on impacts occurring from facility construction.

b. Cumulative Impacts

A list-based approach has been used for this cumulative analysis. The analysis considers the development projects listed in Appendix C (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 association with the other cumulative projects occurring under the 1987 and 2025 General Plan may require new or expanded facilities to house the increased police staffing, as the projects will result in an increase in residents, customers, and employees and therefore the number of full-time equivalent police necessary for adequate staffing ratios and patrol coverage. However, 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* since it would not involve the expansion of physical facilities, besides the sub-station suggested for the project plans.

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. Policies and mitigation measures that are identified in other sections of this

EIR addressing the project as a whole would also apply to any impacts associated with the construction of a police service sub-station within the project site since it falls within the scope of analysis for the project as analyzed in this EIR.

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 (4.7) of this EIR.

1. Regulatory Framework

The Community Health and Safety Element of the existing Petaluma General Plan and the Community Facilities, Services, and Education Element of the proposed General Plan address the protection of the community from risks associated with urban fires. Relevant fire service policies in regards to the proposed plan are listed in Table 4.12-1.

2. Existing Conditions⁸

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 and a population of 70,000 people. In 2003, the Fire Department responded to 4,800 calls. As of May 2006, there are 57 paid personnel on staff, of these 51 are line personnel, including 17 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.⁹ The minimum staffing for each shift is 15 personnel. This includes the staffing of three paramedic en-

⁸ Petaluma Fire Department's website.

<http://www.cityofpetaluma.net/fire/index.html>, accessed on June 8, 2005.

⁹ Smith, Patricia, Administrative Assistant, Fire Department, City of Petaluma. Personal communication with Jose Moreno, DC&E, May 24, 2006.

TABLE 4.12-1 **PETALUMA GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND PROGRAMS –
 FIRE SERVICES**

Policy/ Program Number	Policies and Programs
Existing General Plan	
<i>Community Health & Safety Element</i>	
Policy 19	The City shall continue to assure a four-minute response time for emergency vehicles unless other fire suppression measures approved by the fire chief have been instituted.
Policy 21	Fire hazards shall be mitigated where appropriate with proper siting, use of fire-resistive materials and landscaping, and/or installation of early warning systems (alarms and sprinklers).
Program 17	Periodically update fire-protection requirements for new construction and remodeled buildings to reduce the impact of planned growth on fire department capabilities.
Proposed General Plan	
<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.
Policy 7-P-17(A)	Fund additional staff to insure minimum ratio is maintained as population increases occur.
Policy 7-P-17(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.

gine 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.¹⁰

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)

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 next three to four years. The new station will be located at 307 Petaluma Blvd South. Stations 2 and 3 are currently being modernized, however, these facilities will remain in their existing locations.¹¹

The Petaluma Fire Department also provides emergency 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 firefighting forces of the department.

Currently, the Fire Department is understaffed by six personnel, if measured against the industry standard of one personnel per 1,000 population. As of June 2006 the City of Petaluma does not have an adopted personnel level standard. The Ambulance Service is designed as an enterprise fund and the fees charged for service cover all expenditures of the program. There are two first line ambulances on-duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week. At least two

¹⁰ Albertson, Chris, Fire Chief, City of Petaluma. Personal communication with Jose Moreno, DC&E, June 13, 2006.

¹¹ Michael Ginn, Battalion Chief/Fire Marshal, City of Petaluma, Personal Communication, November 28, 2006.

out of three of the first line engines are staffed with a paramedic 80 percent of the time.¹²

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 geographically located and adequate for current service needs for the City of Petaluma. To be fully adequate for future service needs, the fire stations need to be slightly expanded and modernize to facilitate the increase in crews and the addition of a third ambulance for the Department. Additionally, Fire Station 1 is planned to be relocated to a modern, larger facility about 500 feet from its current location. At the earliest this would occur in mid-2008.¹³

3. Standards of Significance

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

- ◆ 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. For the following analysis, both the existing and proposed General Plans were reviewed to determine whether there would be different conclusions under either Plan. Unless otherwise stated below, the following impact analysis and its conclusions would apply under the implementation of either General Plan scenario.

¹² City of Petaluma Fire Department's website.
<http://cityofpetaluma.net/fire/ems.html>, accessed on June 8, 2005.

¹³ Albertson, Chris. Fire Chief, City of Petaluma. Personal communication with Jose Moreno, DC&E. June 13, 2006.

a. Project Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for fire services by both adding 227 new units and approximately 613 residents,¹⁴ and up to 298,038 square feet of commercial space. Additionally, the proposed project would constitute as a fire hazard during its construction from the fallout from firework mortars.¹⁵ This issue is further analyzed and addressed in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this EIR.

As mentioned above, the Fire Department does have an adopted service level standard, which is a four-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 four minutes response time.¹⁶

Based on the City's 2005 population estimate of 56,400, the project could increase the population to 57,013 with the addition of 613 residents. As a result, the targeted ratio of one Fire Suppression personnel per 1,000 residents in the proposed General Plan would be surpassed, but by a negligible amount (13 people).¹⁷ Although slight, this increase may result in the need for additional Fire Department personnel. Because the addition of staff would be minimal in order to meet targeted service ratios, the construction of new facilities would not be required. New staff, if necessary, could be accommodated in existing fire stations. The City of Petaluma's Fiscal Year 2006 Budget states that the Department will continue to pursue the relocation plans for Fire Station 1 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.

¹⁴ 2000 Census, Petaluma, 2.7 people per household.

¹⁵ Ginn, Mike. Fire Marshall, City of Petaluma. Personal communication with Chantal Charette, DC&E. September, 2005.

¹⁶ Albertson, Chris. Fire Chief, City of Petaluma. Personal communication with Jose Moreno, DC&E. June 13, 2006.

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 impacts 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 C (Cumulative Projects) and whether this project would have significant cumulative impacts on fire services in combination with the cumulative projects.

In accordance with CEQA, if the project would significantly contribute to the need for new fire service facilities in combination with the other cumulative projects, the construction of which would have significant environmental impacts, a significant cumulative impact would occur. 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 2006 Budget. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact in relation to fire services.

While a project's contribution to a cumulative effect on fire service response times is an important consideration in relation to new development, it is not the basis for determining whether significant cumulative impacts would occur under CEQA. 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.¹⁸

Therefore, because the project would not significantly contribute to the need for new facilities that would significantly impact the environment, it would not have a significant cumulative impact under CEQA. However, it is recognized that the project would add to increased demand for fire response services in combination with other projects. Through its 2005 and 2006 Fiscal Year budgets, the City is addressing this issue through allocating more resources to the Fire Department and by planning to upgrade and fully staff its three fire stations.

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.

1. Regulatory Framework

a. City of Petaluma General Plan

The Parks, Recreation, Schools and Child Care Element of the existing Petaluma General Plan and the Community Facilities, Services, and Education Element of the proposed General Plan address education services within the City. Relevant policies and programs are listed in Table 4.12-2.

¹⁸ Michael Ginn, Battalion Chief/Fire Marshal, City of Petaluma. Personal email correspondence, October 30, 2006.

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

Policy/Program Number	Policies and Programs
Existing General Plan	
<i>Parks, Recreation, Schools & Child Care Element</i>	
<i>Child Care Facilities</i>	
Policy 30	Seek out large businesses and employment centers to provide child care for their employees' children.
Program 29	Work with schools to promote the use of school impact fees for child care facilities.
<i>Activities for Teenagers</i>	
Policy 35	Indoor and outdoor recreation opportunities shall be made available for teenagers.
Proposed General Plan	
<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 (C)	Encourage child care facilities in city government buildings, new housing or office/industrial developments and require it in large development projects where a legal nexus between the new development and the need for childcare can be established.

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 2,000 students for the 2005-2006 school year. 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 5,492 for the 2005-2006 school year. Additionally, there are two charter schools operating under the PCS umbrella.¹⁹ Elementary school-age residents of the proposed project would attend McKinley Elementary School, located at 110 Ellis Street in Petaluma, approximately a half mile from the project. Enrollment capacity is 328 students and current enrollment is 262 students. These figures apply for the 2005-2006 school year.²⁰

Junior high students would attend Petaluma Junior High School, located at 700 Bantam Way, which is approximately 2 miles from the project site.

¹⁹ Steve Bolman, Deputy Superintendent, Petaluma City Schools. Personal communication with Catherine Reilly, DC&E, June 9, 2006.

²⁰ Steve Bolman, Deputy Superintendent, Petaluma City Schools. Personal communication with Catherine Reilly, DC&E, June 9, 2006.

School year 2005-2006 enrollment was 756 students, out of a capacity enrollment of 880 students.²¹

High school students would attend Petaluma High School, located at 201 Fair Street. This is approximately 1.5 miles from the project site. Capacity of Petaluma High is 1,618 students and enrollment for the school year 2005-2006 was 1,570 students.²²

Schools are funded through the State Facilities Program, bonds and developer fees. In order to help pay for new schools, PCS collects \$2.24 per square foot from new residential development to compensate for growth impacts. The fees for commercial development are \$0.36 per square foot.²³

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. Table 4.12-3 shows these generation rates base on school levels.

3. Standards of Significance

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

- ◆ 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.

²¹ Steve Bolman, Deputy Superintendent, Petaluma City Schools. Personal communication with Catherine Reilly, DC&E, June 9, 2006.

²² Steve Bolman, Deputy Superintendent, Petaluma City Schools. Personal communication with Catherine Reilly, DC&E, June 9, 2006.

²³ Debbie Winkler, Front Desk Receptionist, Petaluma City Schools. Personal communication with Chantal Charette, September 23, 2005.

TABLE 4.12-3 **PCS RESIDENTIAL STUDENT GENERATION RATES**

Type of School	Residential Generation Rate
Elementary	.37 students/unit
Junior High	.09 students/unit
High School	.16 students/unit

Source: Steve Bolman, Deputy Superintendent, Petaluma City Schools. Personal communication with Catherine Reilly, DC&E, June 9, 2006.

4. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the impacts of the proposed project on schools in the City of Petaluma. For the following analysis, both the existing and proposed General Plans were reviewed to determine whether there would be different conclusions under either Plan. Unless otherwise stated below, the following impact analysis and its conclusions would apply under the implementation of either General Plan scenario.

a. Project Impacts

The proposed project would add 227 units under PCS jurisdiction, which would result in an increase in demand for school services. Table 4.12-4 demonstrates the number of students generated by the proposed project to each of the respective schools, according to PCS student generation rates. As shown in Table 4.12-4, implementation of the proposed project would generate 140 students. Only in the case of McKinley Elementary School would the proposed project result in the existing capacity being exceeded. According to PCS, the additional demand at McKinley Elementary School could be met by the addition of modular facilities within the existing school site. Additional staff may also be required to maintain current school service standards.²⁴

²⁴ Steve Bolman, Deputy Superintendent, Petaluma City Schools. Personal communication with Catherine Reilly, DC&E, June 9, 2006.

TABLE 4.12-4 STUDENTS GENERATED BY PROJECT

School	Existing Extra Capacity	Generation Factor	# of Units	Anticipated # of Children	Remaining Capacity
McKinley Elementary	66	0.37	227	84	-18
Petaluma Junior High	124	0.09	227	20	104
Petaluma High School	48	0.16	227	36	12

Since the existing junior and high schools have adequate capacity, there would not be a need to expand the facilities and *no impact* would occur. Since the modular units required to meet the elementary school increase in demand would be located on the existing school site and would be limited – because there would only be the need to provide space for 18 additional students – the potential impacts associated with this expansion would be less than significant.²⁵ Therefore, impacts from the proposed project in regards to educational services would be considered *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 C (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 services will increase. The proposed project, in addition to other projects planned in the city, would generate new students, which in turn could require new or expanded school facilities. Depending on the location and scale of newly re-

²⁵ Steve Bolman, Deputy Superintendent, Petaluma City Schools. Personal correspondence with Ted Heyd, DC&E, November 21, 2006.

quired 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, because the increased demand for classroom space resulting from this project could be accommodated through the addition of modular units on existing school grounds, the project would *not contribute* to any potential significant cumulative impact.

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 Act cannot be used for the operation and maintenance of park facilities.²⁶ 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 Community Character and Parks, Recreation, Schools, and Child Care Elements of the existing Petaluma General Plan, as well as the Recreation, Music, Parks, and the Arts Element of the proposed General Plan contain policies and programs that address the parks and recreational needs of the community. Relevant policies are listed in Table 4.12-5.

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 4.12-6 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.²⁷ The closest recreational facilities to the project site are the swim center and skate park, which are located directly adjacent to the project site.

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 September 2002, the City of Petaluma has approximately 109 acres of community parks and 75 acres of neighborhood parks. Compared to Petaluma's 2000 population of 54,500

²⁶ California State Park's website. <http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/795/files/quimby101.pdf>, accessed on March 30, 2006.

²⁷ City of Petaluma's website. <http://www.cityofpetaluma.net/parksnrec/parkinfo.html>, accessed on April 4, 2006.

TABLE 4.12-5 **PETALUMA GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND PROGRAMS— PARKS AND RECREATION**

Policy/ Program Number	Policies and Programs
Existing General Plan	
<i>Community Character Element</i>	
Policy 27	The City shall require provision of privately owned open space in residential developments of more than 15 units where made necessary by project density or design, or lack of proximity to public parks or open space.
Program 35	Use the development review process to insure that meaningful amounts of usable open space are incorporated in commercial, mixed-use, and industrial areas.
<i>Parks, Recreation, Schools, & Child Care Element</i>	
Policy 1	The City shall require all new residential development to dedicate land or pay a park fee for public parks.
Program 6	Provide incentives for new, large-scale industrial and commercial development and redevelopment to include shower and locker room facilities in order to promote the physical conditioning of employees and their use of public and private recreation opportunities.
Policy 14	The City shall promote private open space and recreation facilities in large-scale residential developments in order to meet a portion of the open space and recreation needs that will be generated by the development.
Proposed General Plan	
<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-1(D)	As part of the City’s Development regulations establish common open space requirements for multi-family development. Such open space shall NOT to be counted toward public park dedication/in lieu fee requirements.
Policy 6-P-4	New parkland or recreation facilities, beyond those identified in the General Plan, may be required as part of any development review and entitlement process.
Policy 6-P-5(A)	Revise the City’s park in lieu fees/dedication requirements to match the General Plan standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents.

TABLE 4.12-6 CITY OF PETALUMA PARK LAND ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT FEES

	Parkland Acquisition	Parkland Development	Open Space	Total Fee	Administrative Charge	Total Charge	Unit of Measurement
Single Family – Detached	\$3,235	\$1,796	\$1,743	\$6,774	\$339	\$7,113	Unit
Single Family – Attached	\$2,763	\$1,534	\$1,488	\$5,785	\$289	\$6,074	Unit
Multiple Family	\$2,179	\$1,210	\$1,174	\$4,563	\$228	\$4,791	Unit
Manufactured Home	\$1,760	\$977	\$948	\$3,685	\$184	\$3,869	Unit
Single Occupancy Units	\$1,110	\$616	\$598	\$2,324	\$116	\$2,440	Unit
Commercial Lodging	-	-	\$322	\$322	\$16	\$338	Rental Unit
Commercial	-	-	0.568	0.568	0.028	0.596	1,000 sq. ft. of building space
Office	-	-	0.332	0.332	0.017	0.349	1,000 sq. ft. of building space
Industrial	-	-	0.702	.0702	0.035	0.737	1,000 sq. ft. of building space

Note: The amount of the Fee for mixed development shall be the sum of the following, as applicable: 1) The amount of the Fee for mixed development shall be the sum measurement set forth in schedule above for each portion of a mixed development.

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. These ratios are below the City's adopted standards of 3 acres per 1,000 residents of community parks and 2 acres per 1,000 residents of neighborhood parks.²⁸

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. The recreational facilities, including the Little League's Carter Field and other playing fields, are not owned by the City of Petaluma, and there are no agreements with the City to provide or allow public use.

The recreational facilities are not part of the City's park system, and the site is not referenced in the City's current General Plan or Draft General Plan 2025 as park property. Since 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 to develop it for commercial and residential uses, the existing recreational activities are not anticipated to continue past 2007, when construction is expected to begin. The sports organizations are aware of the temporary nature of their use of the site. The cessation of permissive, non-public recreational facilities use in this case does not present an environmental impact which is required to be studied as part of the present project.

²⁸ City of Petaluma, *Existing Conditions, Opportunities, and Challenges Report*, 2005, page 98. (<http://cityofpetaluma.net/genplan/pdf/10recreation10-11v2rs.pdf>)

The Little League is in the process of relocating the Carter Field facilities. Petaluma City Schools has approved a Negative Declaration for the relocation of Carter Field to the Petaluma Junior High School. Once funding has been identified, construction of the replacement facilities will occur.

Pop Warner Football also uses a 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. Parks and Recreation has been working with Petaluma City Schools to finalize a joint powers agreement. Once this agreement is approved by the City Council in 2007, Parks and Recreation will confirm its details with Pop Warner.²⁹

3. Standards of Significance

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

- ◆ 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.
- ◆ 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.

²⁹ Jim Carr, City of Petaluma Parks and Recreation Division. Personal Correspondence with Betsi Lewitter, Contract Planner for City of Petaluma, December 20, 2006.

4. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the impacts of the proposed project on parks and recreational facilities in the City of Petaluma. For the following analysis, both the existing and proposed General Plans were reviewed to determine whether there would be different conclusions under either Plan. Unless otherwise stated below, the following impact analysis and its conclusions would apply under the implementation of either General Plan scenario.

a. Project Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for park facilities and services by adding 227 new units, which would consist of approximately 613 residents.³⁰ Although the residents of the proposed project would have access to all City facilities, they would most likely use parks closest to the project site, including the Swim Center, the Skate Park, the Teen Center, Kenilworth Park, Lucchesi Park and Sunset Park. These new residents would require additional parkland to maintain the city's existing recreational standard as mentioned above.

If additional recreational facilities were not provided to meet the needs of the new residents, the increased use of existing recreational facilities, including the Swim Center and Skate Park, could deteriorate those facilities. However, the proposed project would be required to pay impact fees to the City per the authorization of the Quimby Act. While the project includes some on-site recreational opportunities, with small parks and greenways, 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 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 resulting from implementation of the project would be considered *less than significant*.

³⁰ 2000 Census, Petaluma, 2.7 people per household.

The location of where the project's Quimby Act fees will be spent is unknown at this time, so the physical impacts of the associated recreational impacts cannot be analyzed at this time. However, when specific improvements are identified by the City, individual environmental review for the project(s) will be required.

b. Cumulative Impacts

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

The cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project and additional projects in the city of Petaluma would potentially have a significant impact on the demand for park space in the city. 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 and financing, it is not known where the city would construct such facilities. It is therefore, not possible as part of 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.

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

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.

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, about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile from the residential portion of 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.³¹ Additionally, a standard of 2.4 to 2.5 volumes per capita average was recommended by the Master Plan.

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 65,000.³² This deficiency is partially offset by the fact that Petaluma residents are able to patron-

³¹ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, 2003, page 4. (http://www.sonoma.lib.ca.us/doc/Sonoma_MP_Report.pdf)

³² Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, 2003, 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.

ize 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.³³ A recent 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 2025.³⁴ For comparison, the average collection size in California is 1.96 million volumes, and the per capita average is 1.62.³⁵

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.³⁶ 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.³⁷ The library recently completed an expansion of its community room, however beyond this improvement, there are no other plans for expansions or upgrades.³⁸

³³ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, page 58.

³⁴ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, page 58.

³⁵ Providence Associates, Inc., 2001, *San Bernardino County Library Facility Master Plan 2001-2021*, page 28.

³⁶ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, page 58.

³⁷ Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, 2003, page 34.

³⁸ Sandy Cooper, Library Directory, Sonoma County Library, personal email communication with Ted Heyd, October 17, 2006.

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.³⁹ Table 4.12-7 shows the schedule of impact fees per type of residential development.

3. Standards of Significance

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

- ◆ 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. For the following analysis, both the existing and proposed General Plans were reviewed to determine whether there would be different conclusions under either Plan. Unless otherwise stated below, the following impact analysis and its conclusions would apply under the implementation of either General Plan scenario.

a. Project Impacts

The implementation of the proposed project would increase the Library's demand by adding 613 new residents. This increase would only diminish the average volume per capita by 0.02 volumes. Table 4.12-8 shows the projected impacts of the project on the average volume per capita.

³⁹ City of Petaluma, *Special Development Fees*, August 2005, page 19.

TABLE 4.12-7 **PETALUMA'S LIBRARY FACILITIES IMPACT FEES**

Residential Type	Fee	5% Administrative Charge	Total Per Unit Charge
Single Family – Detached	\$242	\$12	\$254
Single Family – Attached	\$206	\$10	\$216
Multiple Family	\$163	\$8	\$171
Mobile Home	\$131	\$7	\$138
Single Occupancy Unit	\$83	\$4	\$87

Source: City of Petaluma, August 2005, *Special Development Fees*, pages 18 to 19.

TABLE 4.12-8 **PROJECTED IMPACTS ON AVERAGE VOLUME PER CAPITA**

Collection Size (in volumes) ^a	Service Area Population	Average Volume per Capita ^b
100,787	65,617 (as of 2000)	$100,787 / 65,617 = 1.54$
100,787	66,230 (with proposed project)	$100,787 / 66,230 = 1.52$

^a Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, page 58.

^b Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning, Inc., 2003, *Sonoma County Library Facilities Master Plan*, page 58.

The 613 new residents resulting from the project could use the facility, but it is unlikely that these residents added to the Library’s service area would alone necessitate the need for a new or physically altered facility, given the relatively small average volume per capita increase that would result from 613 residents. For this reason, potential impacts related to library services from implementation of the project would be *less than significant*. Nevertheless, the applicant would be required to pay the City’ Library Facilities Impact

Fees, which would provide funds for the construction and implementation of improvements to the library to address its existing deficiencies.⁴⁰

b. Cumulative Impacts

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

The proposed project and other reasonably foreseeable developments in the area would generate a cumulative demand on library services. The Sonoma County Library has already acknowledged the existing deficiencies at the Petaluma Branch, however, it is not known when improvements would take place to address these deficiencies. The payment of Library Facilities Impact Fees from other development projects in the City would help to fund the necessary improvements.

The improvements could have environmental impacts, but these potential impacts would be analyzed under separate environmental review when the specific scope and scale of the improvements is known. Given the undefined nature of the improvements, it would be speculative to make a determination in this analysis about the potential cumulative impacts that they would have.

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.

⁴⁰ City of Petaluma, *Special Development Fees*, August 2005, page 19.

CITY OF PETALUMA
EAST WASHINGTON PLACE EIR
PUBLIC SERVICES