

This section evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project on public services. Public services, in this context, include fire protection and emergency medical services, police protection, schools and parks. The information in this section is based upon a review of City documents, as well as consultation with staff from the various cities, counties, districts and agencies potentially affected by the project.

4.11.1 FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

4.11.1.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Shasta County Fire Department (SCFD), based in Redding, and the Cottonwood Fire Protection District (CFPD), located in Cottonwood, provide fire suppression services to unincorporated areas of Shasta County in the vicinity of the proposed Vineyards at Anderson project. These areas include the portion of the project area that currently lies within unincorporated Shasta County. The Anderson Fire Protection District (AFPD) provides fire suppression to all areas within the Anderson City limits, as well as to some unincorporated areas adjacent to the City. Both the SCFD and CFPD maintain automatic and mutual aid agreements with adjacent fire districts. (See **Figure 4.11-1, Fire District Boundaries.**)

CDF/Shasta County Fire Department

County Service Area 1 (CSA #1) provides funding for fire protection for all the unincorporated areas within the county that are not in a fire protection district. The Shasta County Fire Department (SCFD) is funded through CSA #1 and contracts with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF, also known as CAL FIRE) to manage and oversee the operation of the SCFD.

Within the SCFD service area, Station 43 is the closest "staffed" fire station to the project area. It is located at 6103 Airport Road in Redding. During the fire season (June 1 through October 31), Station 43 is staffed by one Fire Captain, two Fire Apparatus Engineers and five firefighters daily. Assigned personnel staff and maintain two Type III state-funded fire engines, one county-funded Type II fire engine and one state-funded bulldozer unit. During the non-fire season, the station is typically staffed daily by one Fire Captain, one Fire Apparatus Engineer and four firefighters. During the non-fire season, assigned personnel staff and maintain two county-funded Type II fire engines. During the non-fire season, the station also has approximately 7-10 volunteer firefighters that provide additional staffing.

In 2006, Station 43 responded to 1,225 incidents: 121 structure fires, 12 fire menace standbys, 25 public assists, 101 wildland fires, 749 medical aids, and 44 other fires. According to Jim Diehl, Shasta County Fire Marshal and Battalion Chief with CAL FIRE/Shasta County Fire Department, the estimated response time to the north end of the project area is 8 minutes. Mr. Diehl has also stated that the proposed project is not expected to result in any impact to operations at Station 43.

The SCFD also maintains Station 55, which is a bit closer than Station 43 described above. This fire station is located at 17952 Gas Point Road in Cottonwood. However, because Station 55 is staffed solely by volunteers, response staffing varies based upon the availability of the 14 volunteer firefighters. These volunteers staff and maintain one Type III county-funded fire engine, one Type II county-funded fire engine, one county-funded water tender, and one county-funded rescue unit.

In 2006, Station 55 responded to 116 incidents: 5 structure fires, 1 fire menace standby, 5 public assists, 7 wildland fires, 83 medical aids, and 15 other fires. The estimated response time to the southwest corner of the project area is 7 minutes. According to Mr. Diehl, the proposed project is not expected to result in any impact to operations at Station 55.

Cottonwood Fire Protection District

The Cottonwood Fire Protection District (CFPD) station is located at 3271 Brush Street in Cottonwood. The CFPD station is manned by three staff firefighters (one Chief, two Fire Captains and one Administrator), plus twelve volunteers. Within the crew there are five Fire Apparatus engineers, 15 firefighters, one paramedic, four EMTs and one First Responder. The District has the following emergency response vehicles at its disposal: two water tenders, one Type I engine, three Type II engines, one Type II/III engine, and one utility vehicle. In 2006, CFPD personnel responded to 727 incidents: 47 structure fires, 77 traffic collisions, 23 fire menace standbys, 27 public assists, 42 wildland fires, 464 medical aids, 27 smoke checks, 29 false alarms, 21 vehicle fires, and four miscellaneous. Jim Flaherty, the Cottonwood Fire Protection Interim District Chief, has stated that response time to the proposed project site from the Cottonwood station would be approximately nine minutes.

Anderson Fire Protection District

Services provided by the AFPD include fire suppression, search and rescue, decontamination and extrication. The District has five paid positions, one seasonal firefighter and 17 volunteers. The AFPD has two stations; Station 1 is located at East Center Street and Station 2 is located at the corner of Howard and Douglas Streets. Whereas Station 2 serves as the current base of operations, Station 1 is an older station that houses two antique fire trucks that are used for parades only. A future fire station is also planned at the corner of North Street and Ravenwood Road to service the northern portions of the city. The AFPD currently has a number of fire suppression units, including: three Type I engines, one Type II engine, two Type III engines, four structure engines, two wildland engines and one 3,000-gallon water tender. The AFPD also maintains and operates a decontamination unit and a breathing support unit.

In 2006, the AFPD responded to 1,990 incidents: 19 structure fires, 99 traffic collisions, 12 fire menace standbys, 106 public assists, 41 wildland fires, 1,184 medical aids, 26 smoke checks, 38 false alarm, 17 vehicle fires, and 448 miscellaneous.

According to Andy Nichols, Battalion Chief and Fire Marshall with the AFPD, response time to the proposed project site is approximately four minutes.

The Anderson Fire Protection District has an Automatic Aid Agreement with both the CFPD and SCFD. The areas of the proposed project that are currently located outside their district are located within this Automatic Aid area. Although the Automatic Aid Agreement officially lapsed in 1993, the AFPD intends to continue to provide automatic aid under the terms of the old agreement until a new agreement is executed.

The ISO (which stands for Insurance Services Office) is an organization that collects information about fire protection capabilities in communities throughout the United States for the purpose of determining insurance rates. The ISO establishes an ISO "rating" for communities using a Fire Suppression Rating Schedule (FSRS). The schedule rates the major elements of a community's fire suppression system and develops a numerical grading called a Public Protection Classification (PPC). The FSRS determines a Public Protection Classification from 1 to 10. Class 1 represents the best public protection, and Class 10 indicates less than the minimum recognized protection.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

Most insurance companies in the country use ISO's classifications in calculating premiums for homes and business properties. (In general, the price of fire insurance in a community with a good PPC is substantially lower than in a community with a poor PPC.) Also, by considering a community's infrastructure and ability to suppress fires, ISO ratings can help communities evaluate their fire protection services. The City of Anderson was last rated in 2007 and received an overall ISO rating of 5. However, a few outlying areas exist that are currently without fire hydrants. In these situations, an ISO rating of 8 is applied to area properties.

Regional Hospitals and Ambulance Service

There are two major medical centers in the City of Redding that offer a comprehensive range of inpatient and outpatient medical services. Shasta Regional Medical Center, located at 1100 Butte Street, has 165-beds and specializes in cardiac care and laser surgery. Mercy Medical Center Redding, located at 2175 Rosaline Avenue, has 264-beds with programs specializing in cancer and cardiac disease treatment. Both of these facilities provide emergency medical services and serve communities throughout Northern California.

In addition to the medical centers, three other specialty facilities exist in the City of Redding. Patients Hospital is an inpatient and outpatient acute hospital with 10 suites. It primarily provides elective surgeries and does not provide emergency medical services. The Redding Specialty Hospital is a medical facility that provides psychiatric, chemical dependency and acute physical rehabilitation programs. The Veterans Medical Center, the only veterans medical facility north of Sacramento, provides care and treatment for acute medical and chronic problems, medical examinations, and a full range of diagnostic services for qualified veterans.

Ambulance service within Shasta County is provided by American Medical Response (AMR), located at 1368 Bechelli Lane in Redding, and Mercy Medical Center, which operates an ambulance service located at 2435 North Street in Anderson. Both Mercy Medical Center and Shasta Regional Medical Center provide 24-hour air ambulance service.

4.11.1.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

LOCAL

City of Anderson General Plan

The City of Anderson General Plan Safety Element addresses fire protection and related water supply issues within the city limits. **Table 4.11.1-1** analyzes the consistency of the Specific Plan with related City General Plan policies. While this Draft EIR analyzes the project's consistency with the City of Anderson General Plan pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), the determination of the project's consistency with this General Plan ultimately rests with the City of Anderson City Council. Environmental impacts associated with project inconsistencies with General Plan policies are addressed under the impact discussions of this EIR.

**TABLE 4.11.1-1
SPECIFIC PLAN CONSISTENCY WITH CITY OF ANDERSON GENERAL PLAN POLICIES
FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES**

City of Anderson General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
Maintain the present level of fire protection in developed areas and extend the same or greater level of service to new developments. (FP-2)	Yes	The Specific Plan identifies development of a fully-equipped fire station to serve the development.
Ensure that fire safety is considered when capital improvements (such as water line extensions) and development proposals are planned. (FP-3)	Yes	Specific Plan Policy 5.2.23 states, "The [water] system will be looped where feasible to provide redundancy of service to the various phases of the project. In areas of lesser demand where looped systems are not provided, water mains will be sized to provide the necessary fire flows."
Coordinate annexations into the City of Anderson to annex these lands to the Anderson Fire Protection District at the same time. No areas of the City should be served by any other fire protection district. (FP-4)	Yes	According to the Specific Plan, "The intent of the project is to annex the entire site into the Anderson Fire Protection District." (pg. 66) Specific Plan Policy 6.5.1 also states, "Anderson Fire Protection District shall provide fire protection services for the entire project area."
New public safety facilities such as fire stations shall be located in or near commercial areas or adjacent to public parks. (FP-5)	Yes	As shown on Figure 3.0-3, the fire station would be located within 800 feet of commercial development.
Continued review of all new development projects by the Anderson Fire Protection District. (FI-1)	Yes	Prior to recordation of final maps and approval of improvement plans for the site, the Anderson Fire Protection District will review the maps and improvement plans for adequacy of fire safety measures. This is standard practice for any new development within the City of Anderson.
Cooperate with the Anderson Fire Protection District in sizing new water lines and locating hydrants. (FI-2)	Yes	See analysis of project consistency with General Plan Policy FI-1 above.
Develop landscape guidelines and a vegetation management and weed abatement program for open-space areas to reduce the risk of wildland fire. (FI-6)	Yes	The Anderson Fire Protection District recently adopted a Vegetation Management District to control wildfire hazards in the incorporated portion of the Specific Plan area. Further, Specific Plan Policy 6.5.4 provides for additional areas to be annexed as needed.
Require a financial impact analysis during the review of development projects so the financial impacts to the Anderson Fire Protection District of providing required public facilities and services will be explained and require that each project properly compensate for the full cost of providing those facilities and services through fee and other programs. (FI-7)	Yes	A draft public facilities financing plan was completed for the project by David Taussig & Associates. (See Appendix 4.11-1.) According to that draft financing plan, expenses to the AFPD could be adequately compensated by a Community Facilities District (CFD).
The Spheres of Influence for the Anderson Fire Protection District and the City should be the same. (FI-9)	Yes	The City of Anderson will petition Shasta County LAFCo to detach territory within the Specific Plan area from the Cottonwood Fire Protection District and Shasta County Fire Department and annex it

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

City of Anderson General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
		to the Anderson Fire Protection District. See also the analysis of project consistency with General Plan Policy FP-4 above.

The Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan

The proposed Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan contains various goals and policies regarding fire protection. Specific Plan policies relevant to fire protection within Phase 2 of the proposed project area in the context of CEQA are summarized in **Table 4.11-1.2**. This table also provides an evaluation of Phase 2 relative to the pertinent Specific Plan policies as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d). The final authority for interpretation of these policy statements and determination of the project's consistency ultimately rests with the City Council.

**TABLE 4.11.1-2
PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) CONSISTENCY WITH VINEYARDS AT ANDERSON SPECIFIC PLAN POLICIES
FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES**

Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan Policies	Consistency with Specific Plan	Analysis
The number and location of fire hydrants within the Southwest Pressure Zone shall be approved by the AFPD prior to construction. (Policy 5.2.7)	Yes	Prior to the City's approval of improvement plans for any subdivision, the improvement plans are submitted to the Anderson Fire Protection District for review of adequacy of fire safety measures.
The [water] system will be looped where feasible to provide redundancy of service to the various phases of the project. In areas of lesser demand where looped systems are not provided, water mains will be sized to provide the necessary fire flows. (Policy 5.2.23)	Yes,	The Vesting Phase 2 Tentative Map indicates looped water lines for much of the proposed development. Because this is a Specific Plan policy, where water lines are not proposed to be looped, conditions of approval will require that Phase 2 improvement plans be reviewed by the City Engineer in order to ensure that adequate fire flows can be met.
Anderson Fire Protection District shall provide fire protection services for the entire project area. (Policy 6.5.1)	Yes	Phase 2 of the proposed project is already located within the Anderson Fire Protection District service boundaries and an AFPD fire station will be located within Phase 2.
Homes located on cul-de-sacs longer than 600 feet (including roadways served by emergency egress roadways) shall be fitted with automatic sprinkler systems. Cul-de-sacs shall be provided with paved egress routes as described in Chapter Four: Circulation. (Policy 6.5.3)	Yes	As shown on the Vesting Phase 2 Tentative Map, all cul-de-sacs longer than 600 feet would be provided with paved secondary access roads. Further, because this is a Specific Plan Policy, it will be required that homes located on cul-de-sacs longer than 600 feet (including roadways served by emergency egress roadways) be fitted with automatic sprinkler systems as a condition of project approval.
The Anderson Fire Protection District's Vegetation Management District shall annex additional areas, as needed. (Policy 6.5.4)	Yes	The Anderson Fire Protection District has established a Vegetation Management District to control wildfire hazards in the incorporated portion of the Specific Plan area. As a result, the

Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan Policies	Consistency with Specific Plan	Analysis
		vast majority of Phase 2 is already located within the Vegetation Management District. When the unincorporated portion of the Specific Plan area is annexed into the City and into the Anderson Fire Protection District, the land that is located outside of the Vegetation Management District would subsequently be annexed into the Vegetation Management District as well.
The fire station shall be phased at the discretion of the Anderson Fire Protection District and funded by the CFD. (Policy 6.5.6)	Yes	As indicated on the Vesting Phase 2 Tentative Map, the fire station site would be dedicated to the City during buildout of Phase 2.

Uniform Fire Code (UFC)

The 2001 Edition of the Uniform Fire Code (UFC), published by the Uniform Fire Code Association, stipulates a fire suppression water flow requirement of 1,500 gallons per minute (gpm) for a duration of two hours for one and two family buildings having a fire area in excess of 3,600 square feet. The Code also stipulates a maximum spacing of 500 feet for fire hydrants. Because the maximum water flow obtainable from one hydrant is approximately 1,000 gpm, it is assumed that the water flow requirement of 1,500 gpm will be met with two adjacent hydrants. The fire suppression water flow requirement must be met with a minimum distribution system pressure of 20 psi (residual pressure).

4.11.1.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The City of Anderson considers impacts concerning fire protection and emergency medical services to be significant if the project:

- 1) Results in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives; or
- 2) Exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

METHODOLOGY

The analysis of fire protection impacts is based upon: City of Anderson General Plan objectives, goals and policies; the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan goals and policies; field and site observations; consultations with SCFD staff, CFPD staff and AFD staff; and review of relevant documents.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

PROGRAM LEVEL (PROJECT BUILDOUT) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Fire Protection

Impact 4.11.1.1 The scope of the proposed project would result in substantial impacts associated with the need to provide new fire protection facilities and equipment, and the provision of fire-fighting personnel, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times and other performance objectives. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

At buildout, the proposed project would include significant residential, commercial and on-site recreational development on 2,248 acres. Approximately 331 acres of the 2,248-acre project site are currently served by the AFPD. Of the remaining 1,917 acres, 1,132.5 acres are located within the boundaries of SCFD and 785 acres are located within the CFPD boundaries. Prior to buildout of the project, these 1,917 acres are proposed to be annexed to the Anderson Fire Protection District service area.

Currently, the AFPD is staffed by six paid full-time staff members, three seasonal firefighters, 17 volunteers and one receptionist. It is estimated that six additional paid staff members and 20 volunteer fire fighters would be required to service the project area. Further, there would be a need for an additional fire station and a ladder truck.

The project would be required to pay City development impact fees, which include fees for fire facilities. Existing and future area residents would also be responsible (through taxes or other assessments) for providing adequate funding for the operation of any future expanded fire protection services. The proposed project and other future development would be required to participate in a community facilities district established to fund fire protection and other community services.

While revenues generated by impact fees from project development and implementation of a community facilities district would be capable of funding the cost of the additional professional staff members and equipment, conversations with current AFPD Battalion Chief, Andy Nichols, indicate that obtaining the additional volunteers may be challenging for the AFPD. Although recruiting 20 additional volunteers to provide services to the proposed project may pose a challenge, there is currently no other system in place to fully staff the AFPD. Maintaining staff levels in volunteer fire departments is a nationwide problem. According to Battalion Chief Nichols, no proposals currently exist that are likely to resolve this issue in the near future.

In order to improve response times within the project area, the developer has offered for dedication a one-acre site for the construction of a fire station. The station would be developed, outfitted and staffed during buildout of Phase 2 utilizing funds acquired through development impact fees and the CFD. According to the Fiscal Analysis for the project conducted by David Taussig & Associates (see **Appendix 4.11-1**), costs associated with fire protection services at project buildout would be approximately \$3,000,000.

Because the Anderson Fire Protection District would be capable of funding the new station, equipment and additional emergency response services that would be required by the project, the project's impact concerning fire protection services is considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Wildland Fire Hazards

Impact 4.11.1.2 Implementation of the proposed project would locate homes and structures near wooded areas and expose residents to wildland fire hazards. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

Implementation of the proposed project would place numerous homes and other structures on oak covered ridge tops, potentially exposing residents to wildland fire hazards. Pursuant to Government Code Section 51179, the 331-acre portion of the proposed project site that is located within city limits is located in a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone". The remaining 1917±-acre unincorporated portion of the project site is located in a "Wildland Area That May Contain Substantial Forest Fire Risks and Other Hazards", pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 4125.

The fire safety of the proposed residences largely depends upon their location with respect to topography, the continuity and loading of fuels around them, and the structural design of the residential units. The potential for structural damage from wildfires is greater in certain locations because of the nature of potential fire behavior, which is affected by topography, fuels, humidity, and wind, among other factors.

A number of policies in the Specific Plan reduce the potential for catastrophic impacts resulting from a wildfire. For example, Policy 6.5.3 requires that homes located on cul-de-sacs longer than 600 feet be fitted with automatic sprinkler systems, and that these cul-de-sacs include paved egress routes to facilitate emergency evacuation. Further, Policy 6.5.4 provides for the Anderson Fire Protection District to annex additional lands into the Vegetation Management District as these lands are annexed into the City.

Additionally, during the City's review of improvement plans for the site, the Anderson Fire Protection District would be given the opportunity to review and comment upon the adequacy of fire safety measures. During the review of improvement plans, the City and AFD would determine whether particular roadways are designed to accommodate emergency vehicles, including adequate turn radius, turn-outs and driveway design, as well as whether temporary and permanent emergency vehicle access routes are provided for phased development and buildout of the site.

All of these measures serve to reduce potential impacts to future residents and their structures resulting from a wildland fire. However, because the Vegetation Management District only applies to common areas within the project site, the following mitigation measure will be required.

Mitigation Measures

MM 4.11.1.2 Project CC&Rs shall require residents to maintain defensible space around residential structures by removing and clearing away brush, flammable vegetation, or combustible growth in a manner consistent the requirements of the Anderson Fire Protection District's Vegetation Management District and Public Resources Code Section 4291.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to the issuance of building permits for residential structures.

Enforcement/Monitoring: Anderson Fire Protection District.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

The proposed project design, intended review of improvement plans by the City of Anderson and AFPD, and implementation of the above mitigation measure would substantially lessen wildland fire hazards and minimize the risk to future residents and structures. This would result in impacts from wildland fire hazards for the project being **less than significant**.

PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Fire Protection

Impact 4.11.1.3 The Vineyards at Anderson Phase 2 project would require additional fire protection services over existing levels. However, due to project features this impact is considered **less than significant**.

Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project would result in 722 new residences as well as nonresidential structures associated with a private recreation center, a public park, a new AFPD fire station and 20,000 square feet of commercial development. The Phase 2 project area is located predominantly within the City of Anderson with only a small portion of the project area being currently located in unincorporated Shasta County. All of the project area that is located inside city limits is served by the Anderson Fire Protection District (AFPD). The limited area of Phase 2 that is located outside of city limits is currently located within the service area of the Cottonwood Fire Protection District (CFPD). However, the unincorporated portion of Phase 2 could not develop as proposed until it is annexed to the City. Subsequent to this annexation, if approved, the project proposes to detach the previously unincorporated portion of Phase 2 from the CFPD and annex it to the Anderson Fire Protection District. As a result, all of Phase 2 would be served by the AFPD.

During development of Phase 2, the project proposes to dedicate a 1.0-acre fire station site adjacent to Anderson Hills Parkway to the City. The City would then develop the site for use by the Anderson Fire Protection District with funding made available through the CFD. This station would be outfitted with all necessary equipment to service the project area. According to AFPD Battalion Chief Andy Nichols, Phase 2 buildout would require the addition of three paid staff and seven volunteer firefighters to service the increased population at the desired level of service.

Because the Anderson Fire Protection District would be capable of funding the additional services that would be required by Phase 2 through impact fees and the proposed community facilities district that would be established by the City, the project's impact as a result of Phase 2 is considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Wildland Fire Hazards

Impact 4.11.1.6 Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project could potentially locate homes and other structures near wooded areas and would expose residents to wildland fire hazards. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project could place a portion of the 722 homes and other structures near wooded areas, thereby exposing future residents to wildland fire hazards. The secondary access roads and pedestrian trails, which are proposed as part of Phase 2, would provide fuel breaks that would help slow the spread of fire in some areas. Areas of Phase 2 with

no trails or secondary access roads located between the residences and steeper drainages would be the most susceptible to wildland fire hazards. However, these areas would benefit from the recently adopted Vegetation Management District as well as the fuel reduction efforts required under **MM 4.11.1.2** described herein above. Additionally, the proposed construction of a fire station within Phase 2 would provide for greater fire protection measures for future residents and their homes and would reduce the potential impacts from wildland fire hazards to a level that is **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

Implement mitigation measure **MM 4.11.1.2**.

4.11.1.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUMULATIVE SETTING

This cumulative setting condition includes: land uses and planned development under the City of Anderson General Plan Land Use Element (including those areas within the City's sphere of influence); and existing land use conditions; planned and proposed land uses in communities near the City (e.g., the cities of Redding and Shasta Lake, and the community of Cottonwood).

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Fire Protection

Impact 4.11.1.7 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development in the area, would increase the amount of development and population within the AFPD service area and require additional fire and emergency services. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

The AFPD has indicated that the District would be capable of accommodating the project and cumulative conditions within their district with the addition of: a new station in the downtown area as currently planned by the District; a new station in the project area; acquisition of a ladder truck; and additional staffing. Development of new facilities could, depending on their location, result in construction-related environmental effects to biological resources, cultural resources, water quality, air quality and noise. Within the project area, the site of the proposed fire station has been analyzed for potential environmental impacts. These potential impacts are addressed in the appropriate sections of the EIR (i.e., Section 4.9 for biological resources and Section 4.10 for cultural resources). Facility planning outside of the Specific Plan area, however, is in the early stages and no specific proposals have been made for site development.

The proposed project and other future development would likely be required to participate in any assessments or funding structures that would be established by the District. As noted earlier, the project would be required to pay City development impact fees, which include fees for fire protection services and facilities, and the project area would be subject to funding from a community facilities district.

With the provisions described above, the Vineyards at Anderson project would be compensating for and mitigating the impacts that it would have on fire protection and emergency services in the area. These contributions would also benefit the capacity of the AFPD

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

in general. Therefore, it is determined that, concerning fire protection and emergency services, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts and the range of any cumulative impacts that may be associated with the proposed project would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.11.2 LAW ENFORCEMENT

4.11.2.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

CITY OF ANDERSON POLICE DEPARTMENT

The City of Anderson Police Department provides law enforcement services to the City of Anderson. The Department's service area boundaries are coterminous with the city limits. The Anderson Police Department provides all aspects of law enforcement including patrol, investigations, traffic enforcement, and traffic collision investigations. The Department has one central office, located at 2220 North Street at the intersection with Martha Street, approximately 2.5 miles from the center of the Vineyards at Anderson project site. According to Police Chief Dale Webb, the Department's only facility is operating at maximum capacity with the current number of personnel and equipment. Although no plans have been developed to construct a new facility at this time, the City has been collecting impact fees in anticipation of developing a new facility in the not too distant future.

As of December 2007, there were 20 sworn officers on the City's police force and 11 full-time support personnel employed by the Department. With 6.55 square miles of service area, law enforcement coverage in the City of Anderson is approximately 3.05 sworn officers per square mile. Pursuant to City Council Resolution 06-25, the Anderson Police Department strives to maintain a service ratio of 1.66 to 1.74 sworn officers per 1,000 persons, or an average 1.70 sworn officers per 1,000 persons.

According to Police Chief Dale Webb, response times vary greatly in the Department's service area based on weather and traffic conditions. The current average response time for the department is eight minutes.

The Anderson Police Department is funded through various sources, including the City's General Fund which provides the Department with approximately 61.4 percent of its budget. The remaining 38.6 percent of the Department's budget is funded through miscellaneous grants. The Anderson Police Department currently represents the largest General Fund expense for the City with approximately 61 percent of the overall budget going to the Department. Sales and property taxes comprise the largest sources of income for the General Fund, contributing roughly 66 percent between the two.

SHASTA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

Police protection services for the unincorporated portions of the project area are currently provided by the Shasta County Sheriff's Department. As of December 2007, there were 105 sworn officers in the Sheriff's Department and 141 full-time support personnel employed by the

Department. With roughly 3,781 square miles within the Department’s service area¹, law enforcement coverage in the County is approximately 0.028 sworn officers per square mile. Based upon a population of 80,762 within the Department’s service area,² the County currently has a service ratio of 1.30 sworn officers per one thousand residents.

The Sheriff’s Department operates a station at 2490 Radio Lane in Redding, where four sworn officers are on duty daily. They also operate one satellite substation in Anderson near the Anderson Outlet Mall for use by the beat officer. This satellite station is located less than two miles from the center of the project site.

For emergencies, additional personnel are available through the full resources of the Sheriff’s Department and mutual aid agreements with the California Highway Patrol and Anderson Police Department. Response times for an emergency average two to five minutes travel time depending on the location. Calls are dispatched through SHASCOM, the 911 Emergency Dispatch Center serving Shasta County, the City of Anderson, the City of Redding, and the City of Shasta Lake.

4.11.2.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

LOCAL

City of Anderson General Plan

The City of Anderson General Plan Safety Element addresses police protection within the city limits. **Table 4.11.2-1** analyzes the Specific Plan’s consistency with the City of Anderson’s General Plan policies relating to police protection that are relevant in the context of CEQA. While this EIR analyzes the Specific Plan’s consistency with the City’s General Plan pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), the determination of the project’s consistency with this General Plan ultimately rests with the City of Anderson City Council.

**TABLE 4.11.2-1
SPECIFIC PLAN CONSISTENCY WITH CITY OF ANDERSON GENERAL PLAN POLICIES
POLICE PROTECTION**

City of Anderson General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
Consider the fiscal impacts of development in order to ensure that the City has adequate financial resources to fund community projects and programs. (PPP-2)	Yes	In support of the Specific Plan, a draft public facilities financing plan was completed for the project by David Taussig and Associates. (See Appendix 4.11.1) This report includes an analysis of the financial impacts associated with providing police services to an expanded City population.
Assure that all development in the City pays for its fair share of the cost of necessary public service and facilities. (PPP-3)	Yes	See analysis of project consistency with General Plan Policy PPP-2 above.
Maintain a service ratio of 1.7 sworn officers per 1,000 persons. (PPP-4)	Yes	Policy 6.4.2 of the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan states, “The Anderson Police Department’s target service ratio shall be

¹ Service area does not include the City of Redding or City of Anderson as these cities provide their own police services.

² Department of Finance, E-1 Report. 2007.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

City of Anderson General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
		maintained for the Plan Area.”
Require a financial impact analysis during the review of development projects so the financial impacts to the City of providing required public facilities and services will be explained and require that each project properly compensate for the full cost of providing those facilities and services through fee and other programs (PPI-1)	Yes	See analysis of project consistency with General Plan Policy PPP-2 above.

The Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan

The proposed Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan contains various goals and policies regarding police protection. Specific Plan policies relevant to police protection within Phase 2 of the proposed project area in the context of CEQA are summarized in **Table 4.11-2.2**. This table also provides an evaluation of Phase 2 relative to the pertinent Specific Plan policies as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d). The final authority for interpretation of these policy statements and determination of the project’s consistency ultimately rests with the City Council.

**TABLE 4.11.2-2
PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) CONSISTENCY WITH VINEYARDS AT ANDERSON SPECIFIC PLAN POLICIES
POLICE PROTECTION**

Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan Policies	Consistency with Specific Plan	Analysis
The City of Anderson shall provide police service for the project, using centralized facilities and maintaining current service ratios. (Policy 6.4.1)	Yes	According to Chief Webb, the City of Anderson Police Department would be able to maintain the Department’s current service ratio and serve Phase 2 of the proposed project by hiring an additional 1.5 officers. Chief Webb has also indicated that Phase 2 could be served using existing facilities.
The Anderson Police Department’s target service ratio shall be maintained for the Plan Area. (Policy 6.4.2)	Yes	See analysis of project consistency with Specific Plan Policy 6.4.1 above.

4.11.2.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The City of Anderson has determined that law enforcement impacts are considered significant if implementation of the project would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.

METHODOLOGY

The analysis of law enforcement impacts is based on consultation with City of Anderson Police Department staff, consultation with Shasta County Sheriff Department staff, and review of applicable documents. Assuming the average of 2.655 persons per dwelling unit (based on 2007 Department of Finance data) and the development of 5,228 potential residential units, the complete Specific Plan project may result in a population increase of 14,040 people at buildout. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that all residential units on the project site would be occupied.

PROGRAM LEVEL (PROJECT BUILDOUT) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Law Enforcement

Impact 4.11.2.1 The proposed scope of development would require additional police staffing and equipment. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

At buildout, the proposed project would result in 5,288 new residential units, four public parks, nine private recreation areas, approximately 26 miles of pedestrian trails, two schools, a mixed use Village Center, and approximately 240,000 square feet of commercial space. The related population growth would be approximately 14,040 people.

City of Anderson General Plan policy PPP-4 specifies a target service ratio of 1.7 sworn police officers per 1,000 population. Further, City of Anderson City Council Resolution 06-25 specifies a target service ratio of 1.66 to 1.74 sworn police officers per 1,000 population. With a projected population increase of 14,040 as a result of the proposed project, the City would typically require an additional 24 officers to maintain this targeted service ratio. However, the Anderson Police Department currently has 20 sworn police officers, or a ratio of 1.89 officers per 1,000 population. Therefore, the City would require an additional 22 officers at project buildout in order to maintain adequate service levels.

Along with the addition of new personnel, new equipment (i.e., fully equipped police cars) would also be required as a result of the project's development. Further, as indicated by Chief Dale Webb, the Police Department's only facility is operating at maximum capacity with the current number of personnel and equipment. It is therefore anticipated that project implementation would result in the eventual need for new or expanded police facilities. However, it is unknown at this time whether the existing facility could be enlarged to accommodate the additional officers or if a new site would be acquired.

As the Department receives its funding from the City of Anderson's General Fund and various grant sources, remaining shortfalls in revenue needed to fund additional staffing and equipment would come from fees associated with the City of Anderson Community Facilities District (currently set at \$250 per dwelling unit per year with an index for inflation). Additionally, the City has adopted a police and corporation yard impact fee that will pay for facility upgrades as growth occurs. This fee is currently set at \$1,196 per single-family dwelling unit, \$1,196 per duplex dwelling unit, \$419 per multiple-family dwelling unit and \$1.96 per square foot for commercial development. The combination of these fees is expected to adequately compensate for the need for additional officers, equipments and facilities.

The proposed project is not expected to have a significant impact on the response times of the Department due to the proximity of the site in relation to the police station. While the project

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

may result in short-term increased traffic congestion (e.g., along North Street and West Anderson Drive, as well as at the intersections of SR 273 with North Street, South Street and Pleasant Hills Drive), all road segments and intersections would be improved to ensure that adequate levels of service and, corresponding emergency response times, are maintained. (For a full discussion of traffic related impacts and proposed mitigation measures see Section 4.4, Transportation and Circulation, of this EIR.) Overall, this impact relating to law enforcement services is considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Law Enforcement

Impact 4.11.2.3 Phase 2 would consist of new residential units, a private recreation center, commercial development and a public park that would require additional law enforcement and police protection. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

The proposed Phase 2 component of the Vineyards at Anderson project would result in 722 new residential units, a private recreation center, 20,000 square feet of commercial development, and a public park. As a result, Phase 2 would increase demand for law enforcement services in the City of Anderson and may result in an increase in criminal activity, medical calls, and traffic-related problems in the vicinity.

In order for the Department to maintain its current service ratio of 1.64 to 1.74 sworn officers per 1,000 population, the Department would need to hire an additional one and one half (1.5) officers as a result of Phase 2. As identified in **Appendix 4.11.1** (Fiscal Analysis), the City is proposing a community facilities district fee of \$250 per household per year, which the City anticipates would provide adequate funding for additional police officers when supplemented with existing taxes currently being paid into the general fund. Police Chief Webb has indicated that the Department can accommodate the additional personnel with existing facilities and equipment.

As described under Impact 4.11.2.1, the proposed project is not expected to affect the response times of the Department or trigger the need for additional facilities that cannot be readily funded through available financing mechanisms. The project would be required to pay City development impact fees, which includes fees for police facilities. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.11.2.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUMULATIVE SETTING

Because law enforcement services from the City's police department are limited to the City of Anderson, this cumulative setting condition includes existing land uses and planned development under the City of Anderson General Plan Land Use Element (including those areas within the City's sphere of influence).

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Law Enforcement Services and Facilities

Impact 4.11.2.5 The proposed project, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development, would increase the population within the City of Anderson's Police Department service area and require additional law enforcement services under cumulative conditions. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

The addition of the Vineyards at Anderson could add approximately 722 new homes and 1,917 residents as a result of Phase 2, with an additional 12,123 people and 4,567 residential units at project buildout. Therefore, total buildout of the project could potentially result in 5,288 new residential dwelling units and a population increase of approximately 14,040 people, as well as 240,000 square feet of commercial space, four public parks and nine private recreation centers to the Anderson City Police Department's service area. Under cumulative conditions, the planned, proposed, and approved projects in the City of Anderson would exceed the Department's staffing ratio. In order to maintain acceptable staffing ratios, 22 additional officers would need to be hired to maintain adequate law enforcement services associated with the project's contribution. Overall, the demand for new facilities and additional staff would increase under cumulative conditions. Providing increased services would require acquisition of service vehicles, increased staffing levels and new facilities. New facilities could (depending on their location) result in construction-related environmental effects to biological resources, cultural resources, water quality, air quality and noise. No plans for new or expanded police facilities have been identified at this time. The existing funding mechanisms (i.e., General Fund, City development impact fees and miscellaneous grants) could help to fund facility improvements and staffing needs. Based on the Fiscal Analysis provided in **Appendix 4.11.1**, the proposed project would provide adequate funding for its cumulative contribution to future law enforcement service needs. Therefore, the cumulative impacts on police protection resulting from the proposed project are considered to be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

4.11.3 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

4.11.3.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The Specific Plan area is located entirely within the Anderson Union High School District, but is divided between three elementary school districts. These districts are the Cascade Union Elementary School District, the Cottonwood Union School District, and the Happy Valley Union Elementary School District and Anderson Union High School District. (See **Figure 4.11-2, School District Boundaries.**) Each district has two or more schools within the district. Each of the schools within the four districts, their location relative to the project site, attendance levels during the 2005-2006 school year, and student capacities are provided in **Table 4.11.3-1** below.

**TABLE 4.11.3-1
PROJECT AREA SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

School Name and Location	Approximate Distance to Project Area ¹	Grades Served	2005-2006 Enrollment	Theoretical School Capacity
Cascade Union Elementary School District				
Anderson Heights Elementary School 1530 Spruce Street Anderson, CA 96007	1.5 miles	K-5	263	540
Meadow Lane Elementary School 2770 Balls Ferry Road Anderson, CA 96007	2.9 miles	K-5	477	810
Verde Vale Elementary School 19415 Jacqueline Street Anderson, CA 96007	3.5 miles	K-5	227	480
Anderson Middle School 1646 West Ferry Street Anderson, CA 96007	2.0 miles	5-8	570	930
Community Day School 1697 Mill Street Anderson, CA 96007	2.0 miles	2-8	18	90
Anderson Union High School District				
Anderson Community Day School and Anderson Community Day Transition School 5250 West Anderson Drive Anderson, CA 96007	1.6 miles	9-10	18	30
North Valley High School ² 20083 Olinda Road Anderson, CA 96007	1.6 miles	11-12	118	140
Anderson High School 1471 Ferry Street Anderson, CA 96007	1.9 miles	9-12	813	1,200
Anderson New Technology High School 2098 North Street Anderson, CA 96007	2.4 miles	9-12	202	220
Oak View High School 20111 Olinda Road Anderson, CA 96007	1.8 miles	9-12	144	Variable ³

School Name and Location	Approximate Distance to Project Area ¹	Grades Served	2005-2006 Enrollment	Theoretical School Capacity
West Valley High School 3805 Happy Valley Road Cottonwood, CA 96022	5.0 miles	9-12	1,074	1,200
Cottonwood Union School District ⁴				
East Cottonwood Elementary 3425 Bush Street Cottonwood, CA 96022	2.7 miles	K-2	498	450
North Cottonwood Elementary School 19920 Gas Point Road Cottonwood, CA 96022	2.3 miles	3-5	N/A	500
West Cottonwood Junior High 20512 West First Street Cottonwood, CA 96022	2.4 miles	6-8	694	600
Cottonwood Community Day School 20512 West First Street Cottonwood, CA 96022	2.4 miles	6-8	12	15
Happy Valley Union Elementary School District				
Happy Valley Primary 16300 Cloverdale Road Anderson, CA 96007	8.4 miles	K-4	304	325
Happy Valley Elementary School 17480 Palm Avenue Anderson, CA 96007	5.5 miles	5-8	267	350

Source: Education Data Partnership website and personal communication with school district superintendents.

Notes: ¹ Measured to approximate center of project area. ² North Valley H.S. is a continuation school. ³ Oak View H.S. is an independent study school. ⁴ Overcapacity issues at East Cottonwood and West Cottonwood campuses have been resolved by relocating students to the new North Cottonwood campus, which opened in January 2007.

Available Funding and Financing Mechanisms

State aid and revenues for school districts come in the form of various programs including the Home-to-School Transportation Program, the School Improvement Program, Class Size Reduction, State Lottery revenue and various instructional materials. Local sources of funding for the districts include property taxes and various fees, with County/District Secured Roll taxes typically comprising the greatest local revenue. Other major local revenue sources include County/District Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds and County/District Supplemental Taxes. Additional local sources of funding include Tax Relief/Homeowners Exemptions and Tax Relief/Timber Yield Taxes. Districts also received Federal funding in the form of Drug/Alcohol/Tobacco Funds and various grants.

In addition to the funding sources identified above, the school districts potentially impacted by the project are also supported by the following types of fees and sources of funding:

Developer Fees: State law authorizes school districts to impose School Facility Fees (Developer Fees) as a condition of the issuance of building permits to finance certain school facility costs. Each of the school districts potentially impacted by the project are currently levying fees against developers at the rates of \$2.63 per square foot for residential development and \$0.42 per square foot for commercial/industrial land uses. In order to establish developer fees, each of the districts are required to develop a justification report that demonstrates the nexus between the fee that is imposed and the need for public facilities created by the new development.

Mello-Roos: The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act was established in 1982 to provide a method for local public agencies to form Community Facilities Districts (CFDs) over specific areas, which need not be contiguous. Mello-Roos provisions may be used to finance the construction, expansion, rehabilitation, or acquisition of any real or other tangible property with an estimated useful life of five years or more and which will be constructed, owned, or operated by a public agency. One method by which a Mello-Roos CFD can be established is on a district-wide basis. The tax rate needed and bonding capacity are placed before the voters and requires a "2/3 yes" vote for approval.

ADA Funds: School enrollment or, more accurately, average daily attendance (ADA), is a major factor in school funding for staffing and operation. The State of California uses ADA figures as a factor in determining the distribution of general education funds. A trend of declining enrollments is creating financial difficulties for many districts. The California County Superintendents Educational Services Association projected in 2001 that, statewide, nearly 40 percent of all school districts were experiencing declining enrollment. As enrollment declines, funding is lost, resulting in budget cuts and reduction of personnel. Therefore, increases in student enrollment from new projects are often welcomed by school districts in order to generate related funding.

4.11.3.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50)

The "Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998," also known as Senate Bill No. 50 (Stats. 1998, Ch. 407), governs a school district's authority to levy school impact fees. This comprehensive legislation, together with the \$9.2 billion Education Bond Act approved by the voters in November 1998 as "Proposition 1A", reforms methods of school construction financing in California.

Prior to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Government Code Sections 65995-65998), case law allowed cities to consider and impose conditions to mitigate impacts of new development on school facilities. The 1998 School Facilities Act suspended this authority, commonly referred to as *Mira* authority.

Government Code Section 65995, as amended by SB 50, establishes the dollar amount school districts may impose on new development. The statute provides that, with limited exceptions, the amount of any fees, charges, dedications, or other requirements may not exceed the following:

- 1) In the case of residential construction, one dollar and ninety-three cents (\$1.93) per square foot of assessable space.
- 2) In the case of any commercial or industrial construction, thirty-one cents (\$0.31) per square foot of chargeable covered and enclosed space. (Gov. Code Section 65995, subd. (b)).

These amounts were to be adjusted for inflation in the year 2000, and every two years thereafter (Id., subd. (b)(3)).

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

Under specified circumstances, school districts may impose alternative fees pursuant to Government Code Sections 65995.5 and 65995.7 (Level 2 and/or Level 3 fees, respectively). If State funding expires at any time, school districts may impose up to 100 percent of the State average cost of school facilities on new development (alternative Level 3 fees).

Government Code Section 65995(e) states that a city or county does not have the ability to condition any land use approval, whether legislative or adjudicative, on the need for school facilities. In addition, Government Code Section 65995(f) prohibits a city or county from imposing a requirement to participate in a Community Facilities District ("CFD," also known as Mello-Roos district). Government Code Section 65995(g)(1) further states that a developer's refusal to participate in a CFD cannot be a factor in considering a "legislative or adjudicative" act. However, Government Code Section 65995(g)(2) further states that a "person can voluntarily elect" to pay a fee through a CFD.

The Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006 (Prop 1D)

This act was approved by California voters in November 2006 and provides for a bond issue of \$10,416,000,000 (ten billion four hundred sixteen million dollars) to modernize existing facilities, construct new facilities to relieve overcrowding, and fund career technical facilities. Funds will be targeted to areas of greatest need and must be spent according to strict accountability measures. Because the measure passed, bond money will be available to provide funding for projects previously approved by voters in local school bond elections that couldn't be completed without matching funds. Every district that is overcrowded or has schools in need of modernization is eligible for its fair share of Proposition 1D funds.

LOCAL

City of Anderson General Plan

The City of Anderson General Plan does not contain any specific policies regarding public schools or educational facilities. As such, no evaluation of the Specific Plan relative to General Plan policies regarding public schools or educational facilities is possible.

The Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan

The proposed Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan contains various goals and policies regarding public education. However, the Specific Plan does not contain any specific policies regarding public schools or educational facilities within Phase 2 of the proposed project area. As such, no evaluation of Phase 2 relative to Specific Plan policies regarding public schools or educational facilities is possible.

4.11.3.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Impacts to schools are considered significant if the project results in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives.

METHODOLOGY

The analysis of public school impacts is based upon consideration of the estimated number of students generated by the project and consultations with the Cascade Union Elementary School District, Happy Valley Union Elementary School District, Cottonwood Union School District and Anderson Union High School District.

PROGRAM LEVEL (PROJECT BUILDOUT) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts on Schools and Related Facilities

Impact 4.11.3.1 Implementation of the project would increase student enrollment at schools within the Anderson Union High School District, Cascade Union Elementary School District and Cottonwood Union School District, and may increase student enrollment at schools within the Happy Valley Union Elementary School District. The project would also require new school facilities and related services. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

The Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan considers projections for the growth in student population likely to occur as a result of the project. These numbers, along with the corresponding student generation rates, are provided in **Table 4.11.3-2** and **Table 4.11.3-3** below. It is important to note, however, that these tables also include the growth in student population resulting from the previously approved Sanderson Subdivision (i.e., Phase 1). By including those students potentially generated by the 242 single-family residential units associated with Phase 1, a more conservative estimate of school impacts is provided.

It is also important to note that, although the Happy Valley Union Elementary School District overlays a portion of the project area, there is no development proposed within that portion of the project area. As such, only in cases of interdistrict transfers would increased enrollment in the Happy Valley Union Elementary School District occur as a result of the project.

**TABLE 4.11.3-2
SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT - ESTIMATED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (K-8) STUDENT GENERATION RATES**

	Land Use	Density	Area (Acres)	Dwelling Units	Generation Rates	Students
VLD	Very Low Density	0.2 DU/AC	29.8	6	0.168	1
AG/VLD	Agriculture Very Low Density	0.2 DU/AC	26.1	6	0.168	1
LD	Low Density	4.0 DU/AC	265.6	1,062	0.168	178
MLD	Medium Low Density	6.0 DU/AC	217.9	1,307	0.168	220
MD	Medium Density	10.0 DU/AC	192.3	1,923	0.168	323
HD	High Density	20.0 DU/AC	32.1	642	0.168	108
MU	Mixed Use	10-20 DU/AC	46.0	585	0.168	98
Totals				5,530		929

Source: Table 6.1 of the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan (pg. 62).

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

**TABLE 4.11.3-3
SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT - ESTIMATED HIGH SCHOOL (9-12) STUDENT GENERATION RATES ¹**

	Land Use	Density	Area (Acres)	Dwelling Units	Generation Rates	Students
VLD	Very Low Density	0.2 DU/AC	29.8	6	0.168	1
AG/VLD	Agriculture Very Low Density	0.2 DU/AC	26.1	6	0.168	1
LD	Low Density	4.0 DU/AC	263.6	1,062	0.168	178
MLD	Medium Low Density	6.0 DU/AC	224.5	1,307	0.168	220
MD	Medium Density	10.0 DU/AC	191.8	1,923	0.084	162
HD	High Density	20.0 DU/AC	32.1	642	0.084	54
MU	Mixed Use	10-20 DU/AC	46.0	585	0.084	49
Totals				5,530		665

Source: Table 6.1 of the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan (pg. 62).

1 High school rates are subject to change.

As seen in the tables above, the project could potentially generate approximately 1,591 students for area schools at full buildout. Of those, it is estimated that approximately 929 would be elementary students and approximately 665 would be high school students. These estimates are based on student generation rates projected in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan (Table 6-1, pg. 62).

Elementary School Students

In an effort to consolidate impacts within a single elementary school district as well as encourage cohesiveness within the community, the project proposes to reorganize school district boundaries such that the entire project area would be located within the Cascade Union Elementary School District. If this were to occur, the estimated 929 elementary school students generated by the project would be attending schools located within the Cascade Union Elementary School District, and only in cases of interdistrict transfers would students generated by the project be attending schools located within the Cottonwood Union School District or the Happy Valley Union Elementary School District.

In response to the Notice of Preparation prepared for the project, both the Cascade Union Elementary School District and Cottonwood Union School District superintendents indicated that they would not support such a consolidation. Thus, it must be assumed that no such reorganization of school district boundaries would occur, and that students would be attending whichever school district represents the property on which their home is located.

Given the approximately twenty plus-year buildout period for the project, it is extremely difficult to determine with accuracy future enrollment in either the Cascade Union Elementary School District or Cottonwood Union School District as a result of growth outside of the Specific Plan area. Further, a review of the school districts' facilities master plans was inconclusive as to plans for future expansion or consolidation of services. However, based on the current ability of the Cascade Union Elementary School District and the Cottonwood Union School District to accommodate additional students (1,295 students and 359 students respectively), and the distribution of proposed residential land uses within the Specific Plan area relative to school district boundaries, it appears that sufficient capacity is currently available within the school

districts to accommodate the estimated 929 elementary school students anticipated as a result of the project.

In order to plan for and address this growth in student population, Specific Plan Policy 6.2.1 provides for two Cascade Union Elementary School District school sites within the Specific Plan area, each at least 12 acres in size.

Although additional elementary school facilities may be necessary to accommodate the potential increase in student population, the existing funding mechanisms under Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), bond measures within the school district, and state developer fees (\$2.63 per square foot for residential development and \$0.42 per square foot for commercial development), would offset funding impacts on the various school districts caused by the proposed development. Further, pursuant to state law, payment of statutory fees represents full and complete school facilities mitigation. Per California Government Code Section 65995(h) and Section 65996(b), the existing fee mechanisms would fully mitigate the financial effects of the student population associated with the proposed project. Therefore, potential impacts to the elementary school districts would be **less than significant**. Any additional school facilities that may be developed by the state and school districts as a result of increasing student populations would be required to address site-specific physical impacts to the environment that may be caused by the development of those facilities.

High School Students

The addition of 665 students to the Anderson Union High School District (AUHSD) would increase the District's current enrollment by approximately 28 percent and would exceed the District's maximum capacity by approximately 100 students. More relevant, however, is the project's potential impact on Anderson High School because it is the AUHSD campus that is both closest to the project area and the high school that is most often attended by students in the City of Anderson. Under buildout conditions, the project could potentially increase current enrollment at Anderson High School by approximately 82 percent and exceed the school's maximum capacity by approximately 287 students. However, similar to the discussion with regard to the elementary school districts, it is extremely difficult to determine with accuracy future enrollment in the AUHSD given the approximately twenty plus-year buildout period for the project.

Similar to the elementary school discussion above, although additional high school facilities may be necessary to accommodate the possible increase in student population, the existing funding mechanisms under Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), bond measures within the school district, and state developer fees (\$2.63 per square foot for residential development and \$0.42 per square foot for commercial development), would offset funding impacts on the various school districts caused by the proposed development. Further, pursuant to state law, payment of statutory fees represents full and complete school facilities mitigation. Per California Government Code Section 65995(h) and Section 65996(b), the existing fee mechanisms would fully mitigate the financial effects of the student population associated with the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to the AUHSD would be **less than significant**. Any additional school facilities that may be developed by the state and AUHSD as a result of increasing student populations would be required to address site-specific physical impacts to the environment that may be caused by the development of those facilities.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts on Schools and Related Facilities

Impact 4.11.3.2 Implementation of Phase 2 would increase student enrollment at schools within the Anderson Union High School District, Cascade Union Elementary School District and the Cottonwood Union School District. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

Tables 4.11.3-4 and **4.11.3-5** are provided below in order to project the increase in student populations resulting only from Phase 2 of the overall Vineyards at Anderson project. Unlike Tables 4.11.3-2 and 4.11.3-3 in the program level analysis above, these tables do not include the students generated as a result of Phase 1 development, or buildout after Phase 2.

**TABLE 4.11.3-4
PHASE 2 OF THE VINEYARDS AT ANDERSON SPECIFIC PLAN
ESTIMATED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (K-8) STUDENT GENERATION RATES**

	Land Use	Density	Area (Acres)	Dwelling Units	Generation Rates	Students
LD	Low Density	4.0 DU/AC	78.6	295	0.168	50
MD	Medium Density	10.0 DU/AC	45.5	427	0.168	72
Totals				722		122

Source: Table 6.1 of the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan (pg. 62) and Phase 2 Tentative Map.

**TABLE 4.11.3-5
PHASE 2 OF THE VINEYARDS AT ANDERSON SPECIFIC PLAN
ESTIMATED HIGH SCHOOL (9-12) STUDENT GENERATION RATES ¹**

	Land Use	Density	Area (Acres)	Dwelling Units	Generation Rates	Students
LD	Low Density	4.0 DU/AC	78.6	295	0.168	50
MD	Medium Density	10.0 DU/AC	45.5	427	0.084	36
Totals				722		86

Source: Table 6.1 of the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan (pg. 62) and Phase 2 Tentative Map.

¹ High school rates are subject to change.

Phase 2 of the proposed project includes up to 722 residential dwelling units, which could potentially generate 122 elementary school students and 86 high school students. These estimates are based on student generation rates established in the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan (Table 6.1, pg. 62) and the number of dwelling units identified on the Phase 2 Tentative Map. As stated above, development of Phase 2 would increase the enrollment at the Anderson Union High School District, Cascade Union Elementary School District, and Cottonwood Union School District and may increase student enrollment at schools located within the Happy Valley Union Elementary School District.

Phase 2 of the project area is located entirely within the Anderson Union High School District and divided between the Cascade Union Elementary School District and the Cottonwood Union School District. Although, the project proposes to reorganize school district boundaries such that none of Phase 2 would be located within the Cottonwood Union School District, the

superintendents of both elementary school districts have indicated that they would not support such a reorganization. Thus, it must be assumed that no such reorganization of school district boundaries would occur, and that students would be attending whichever school district represents the property on which their home is located.

Based on the addition of 122 elementary school students as a result of Phase 2, as well as current capacity within the Cascade Union Elementary School District and Cottonwood Union School District (1,295 students and 359 students respectively), there appears to be sufficient capacity at the two elementary school districts to accommodate the potential increases in student population in each district resulting from Phase 2.

The addition of 86 students from Phase 2 buildout to the Anderson Union High School District would increase the District's current enrollment by approximately four percent. More relevant, however, is the project's potential impact on Anderson High School because it is the AUHSD campus that is both closest to the project area and the high school campus that is most often attended by students from the City of Anderson. As such, if all high school students resulting from Phase 2 attended Anderson High School, it would increase enrollment by approximately 11 percent. Because the high school currently has capacity for an additional 387 students, it is anticipated that the potential increase of 86 students resulting from Phase 2 could easily be accommodated.

Even if additional facilities are required to accommodate an increase in student population resulting from Phase 2, the existing funding mechanisms under Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), bond measures within the school district, and state developer fees (\$2.63 per square foot for residential development and \$0.42 per square foot for commercial/industrial development), would offset funding impacts on the various school districts caused by the proposed development. Further, pursuant to state law, payment of statutory fees represents full and complete school facilities mitigation. Per California Government Code Section 65995(h) and Section 65996(b), the existing fee mechanisms would fully mitigate the financial effects of the student population associated with the proposed Phase 2 project and this impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.11.3.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUMULATIVE SETTING

As noted above, the Specific Plan area is located entirely within the Anderson Union High School District, but is divided between three elementary school districts. These districts are the Cascade Union Elementary School District, the Cottonwood Union School District, and the Happy Valley Union Elementary School District and Anderson Union High School District. Cumulative impacts concerning schools primarily concerns these districts. The increased population associated with the proposed project (as evaluated above), and cumulative conditions would result in increased student populations within these districts.

The descriptions above of existing conditions within these school districts, student-per-household generation rates, and available funding mechanisms are applicable in the context of the cumulative setting. SB 50 enables school districts to levy Levels 1, 2, and 3 developer impact fees

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

on new residential, commercial and industrial development. Further, additional funding is currently available for each of the school districts through a variety of different bonds and fees.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Cumulative Impacts on School Facilities

Impact 4.11.3.3 The proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable development proposed in the area, would result in a cumulative increase in student enrollment at schools within the Cascade Union Elementary School District, Cottonwood Union School District, and Anderson Union High School District and may increase student enrollment at schools within the Happy Valley Union Elementary School District. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

The proposed project would contribute cumulatively to increasing demands and capacity constraints of the local school districts. As noted above, given the approximately twenty plus-year buildout period for the proposed project, it is extremely difficult to determine with accuracy the future enrollment in the Cascade Union Elementary School District or other districts as a result of growth outside of the Specific Plan area. As projects are approved and constructed within the City of Anderson and surrounding communities, coordinated planning efforts will continue to implement the expansion of facilities. According to California Government Code Section 65996, SB 50 funding represents mitigation for the impacts on schools.

The school sites that are proposed within the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan area, if needed, would help provide additional capacity to address cumulative enrollment, especially concerning the Cascade Union Elementary School District. However, these school facilities would serve grades K-8 and not grades 9-12, which are also likely to require additional facilities.

Because of SB 50 and the state's determination that such funding mechanisms are adequate mitigation for school impacts from residential projects, the cumulative impact is considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.11.4 PARKS AND RECREATION

4.11.4.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

CITY OF ANDERSON

The Recreation Element of the City of Anderson General Plan (2007) describes the City's park and recreation resources and discusses some of the related issues. The Recreation Element notes, for example, that the City of Anderson owns and maintains three park and recreation facilities totaling 441.7 acres. These parks include:

- The 430-acre Anderson River Park, which provides softball and soccer fields, tennis courts, a playground, an amphitheatre, boating access, fishing opportunities, hiking and equestrian trails, and other recreation resources.

- The 10-acre Volonte Park, which provides baseball fields, playground equipment and a skateboard area.
- The 1.7-acre Veterans Memorial Park, which provides a grass area, basketball court and playground equipment.

Schools are also recognized for the recreational opportunities provided by their grounds. Anderson High School, for example, is located on 98 acres. Of course, classrooms and associated facilities take up considerable space, thus reducing the amount of acreage that is available for recreational use. School grounds also have a variety of restrictions as to who can use the facilities and when they may do so.

The City of Anderson is also the home of the Shasta District Fairgrounds. The fairgrounds are situated on 65 acres and offer a variety of recreation amenities. The facility is classified in the Recreation Element as a "regional park".

There are also several resources for indoor recreation including Frontier Senior Center and the Community Center with an adjoining Arts and Crafts room.

Historically, land for park and recreation facilities has been purchased by, or donated to, the City. The Anderson Subdivision Ordinance provides for land dedication for parks, and for in-lieu fees through which residential developments can be required to facilitate parkland acquisition. As quoted in the Recreation Element, the standard for park and recreation dedications or in lieu fees, as established under the provisions of the Quimby Act, is a maximum of 5 acres per 1,000 population.

4.11.4.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

STATE

Quimby Act

Local governments in California provide an important role in the establishment of parkland and open space for recreational purposes. The 1975 Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) authorized cities and counties to pass ordinances requiring developers to set aside land and/or pay in-lieu fees for park improvements. Revenues generated through the Quimby Act cannot be used for the operation and maintenance of existing park facilities, although they may be used for park rehabilitation.

The intent of the Quimby Act was to assist local municipalities in providing adequate open space for their citizenry by requiring developers to mitigate the impacts of residential development projects. The provisions give authority for passage of land dedication ordinances only to cities and counties. However, if an agency other than a city or county is responsible for providing park and recreation services, the park agency ultimately is the recipient of the land dedication and/or in-lieu fees.

In 1982, the Quimby Act was substantially amended to: further define acceptable uses of, or restrictions on, Quimby funds; provide ratio standards for recreation acreage and population; and provide formulas for determining exactions. Local Quimby Act ordinances must include definite standards for determining the proportion of land to be dedicated and the amount of the fee to be paid. Further, local Quimby Act ordinances must be in effect for a period of thirty

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

days prior to the filing of the tentative subdivision map or parcel map in order to require a dedication of parkland and/or in-lieu fees.

LOCAL

City of Anderson General Plan

The City of Anderson General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element and Recreation Element address parks and recreation within the City's planning area. **Table 4.11.4-1** analyzes the project's consistency with the City of Anderson's General Plan policies. While this Draft EIR analyzes the project's consistency with the City of Anderson General Plan pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), the determination of the project's consistency with this General Plan ultimately rests with the City of Anderson City Council.

**TABLE 4.11.4-1
SPECIFIC PLAN CONSISTENCY WITH CITY OF ANDERSON GENERAL PLAN POLICIES
PARKS AND RECREATION**

City of Anderson General Plan Policies	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
Pursue opportunities for additional open space land in the form of parkland dedication, and public open space easements, leaseholds, land donations/dedications, and gift annuities. (OSI-2)	Yes	The Specific Plan includes 43.4 acres of public parks, approximately 26 miles of pedestrian trails, and 18.0 acres of private recreation centers to serve future residents.
Encourage private facilities and programs to supplement public facilities and programs. (RPP-3)	Yes	The Specific Plan proposes development of nine private recreation centers to serve project area residents.
Establish general purpose community gathering places and facilities. (RPP-4)	Yes	The Specific Plan proposes development of a 5.0-acre community center in order to provide a venue for activities such as arts and crafts, dance and exercise classes, childcare, etc.
Provide parks and open spaces of different sizes and types to respond to the needs of a diverse population, including trails for pedestrian and equestrian use, bicycle pathways, linear parkways and park-like natural areas. (RPP-5)	Yes	The Specific Plan proposes development of four public parks, nine private recreation centers, Class 1 bike trails along West Anderson Drive, and an extensive pedestrian trail network connecting portions of the site.
The parkland dedication standard shall be 5 acres per 1,000 population (for either neighborhood or community parks) consistent with the Quimby Act. (RPP-6)	Yes	Development of the Vineyards at Anderson is projected to result in 14,040 people at buildout. Based on the estimated population and a ratio of 5 acres per 1,000 population, the project proponent would be required to dedicate 70.2 acres of parkland. The project proponent has proposed dedication of 43.4 acres of public parks, 31.5 acres of parkland in the form of pedestrian and bike trails, and the equivalent of approximately 4.5 acres of parkland in the form private recreation area. (The developer does not get full credit for the 18.0 acres of private recreation area because the City provides only 25 percent credit for private recreation.)

City of Anderson General Plan Policies	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
Ensure that neighborhood-park needs as well as community and regional-park needs are met. (RPP-7)	Yes	The project proposes approximately 11 acres of neighborhood parks and approximately 32 acres of community parks.
Provide non-motorized linkages between parks and open spaces. (RPP-10)	Yes	The Specific Plan proposes approximately 26 miles of pedestrian trails (i.e., non-motorized access routes) to connect neighborhoods with schools, parks and other portions of the Specific Plan area.
Develop and promote community trails to provide health benefits for all residents. (RPP-14)	Yes	See analysis of consistency with General Plan Policy RPP-10 above.
Require a financial impact analysis during the review of development projects so the financial impacts to the City of providing required public recreation facilities and services will be explained and require that each project properly compensate for the full cost of providing those facilities and services through fee and other programs. (RPI-10)	Yes	In support of the Specific Plan, a draft public facilities financing plan was completed for the project by David Taussig and Associates. (See Appendix 4.11.1) This report included an analysis of financial impacts associated with developing and maintaining parks.

The Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan

The proposed Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan contains various goals and policies regarding parks and recreation. Specific Plan policies relevant to parks and recreation within Phase 2 of the proposed project area in the context of CEQA are summarized in **Table 4.11.4-2**. This table also provides an evaluation of Phase 2 relative to the pertinent Specific Plan policies as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d). The final authority for interpretation of these policy statements, and determination of the project’s consistency ultimately rests with the City of Anderson City Council.

**TABLE 4.11.4-2
PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) CONSISTENCY WITH VINEYARDS AT ANDERSON SPECIFIC PLAN POLICIES
PARKS AND RECREATION**

Vineyards Anderson Specific Plan Policies	Consistency with Specific Plan	Analysis
Parks and private recreation areas shall be located as indicated by Figure 6-2: Parks and Recreation. Additional areas/facilities may be added. Specific location and distribution may be modified to better fit topography and development objectives. (Policy 6.3.1)	Yes	As shown on the Vesting Phase 2 Tentative Map, the public park and private recreation center associated with Phase 2 are located as indicated by Figure 6-2: Parks and Recreation.
Smaller, one to four-acre private recreation areas shall be constructed by the developer and maintained by the Homeowners Association in areas that are more distant from public parks, or where special natural features can be preserved through inclusion in the common area. (Policy 6.3.4)	Yes	The Vesting Phase 2 Tentative Map includes 3.3 acres for the development of a private recreation center.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

Vineyards Anderson Specific Plan Policies	Consistency with Specific Plan	Analysis
Trails shall provide access to parks and other destinations. (Policy 6.3.6)	Yes	As illustrated on the Vesting Phase 2 Tentative Map, the project proposes roughly 2.8 miles of trails to serve Phase 2.

City of Anderson “Quimby Act” Ordinance

Chapter 16.30 of the City of Anderson Municipal Code codifies the parkland dedication requirements established by the City of Anderson City Council in Ordinance 573. The Code differs from the General Plan and Specific Plan’s parkland dedication requirements of five acres per 1,000 population in that it only requires three acres per 1,000 population. Although the Municipal Code is required by law to be consistent with the City’s General Plan, the law allows a reasonable amount of time for a municipal code to be updated to reflect changes to the General Plan (typically within one year).

4.11.4.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The City of Anderson has determined that a public services impact concerning parks and recreation is considered significant if implementation of the project 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.
- Include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

METHODOLOGY

The project was evaluated for its impacts on parks and recreational services based on a review of the City of Anderson General Plan, the Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan, Chapter 16.30 of the City of Anderson Municipal Code, and consultations with relevant City staff and the project proponent’s engineer.

PROGRAM LEVEL (PROJECT BUILDOUT) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities

Impact 4.11.4.1 Buildout of the proposed project would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

Although the project would contribute significant population to the City of Anderson, and it is expected that future residents would utilize existing parks and recreation facilities in the City of Anderson, the project proposes development of 43.4 acres of public parks, 18.0 acres of private recreation areas, approximately 26 miles of bike and pedestrian trails, and includes

approximately 1,230 acres of common area that would be accessible for passive recreational activities. Further, the City of Anderson requires that each subdivision project provide at least five acres of parkland for every 1,000 persons resulting from the project. Given the 14,040 persons projected as a result of the Vineyards at Anderson project (not including Phase 1), the project would be required to provide at least 70.2 acres of parkland. Not including the common area, and giving only 25 percent credit for the private recreation areas pursuant to the City's Municipal Code, the project proposes development of 79.4 acres of parkland. Thus, the project exceeds the City's parkland dedication requirement by 8.8 acres. As a result, the project's proposed recreational elements would minimize the potential for physical deterioration of existing parks and other recreational facilities to a level that is **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Proposed Park and Recreation Facilities

Impact 4.11.4.2 Buildout of the proposed project would result in the construction of additional park and recreational facilities. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

The environmental effects associated with development of the parks, private recreation areas and trail system within the project area have been addressed elsewhere in this EIR, where feasible. For example, potential impacts to subsurface cultural and paleontological resources are addressed in Section 4.10, potential impacts to biological resources are addressed in Section 4.9, and potential impacts to air and water quality are addressed in Section 4.6 and Section 4.7 respectively. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been provided to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. However, in some instances sufficient details are not yet available for each subsequent phase of development to adequately analyze development of these facilities. For instance, although the general alignment of the trail system has been proposed, outside of Phase 2, it is possible that the final alignment may vary somewhat from the current proposal as subsequent tentative maps are submitted. As a result, a more precise analysis of potential impacts will be necessary during each subsequent phases of development. Because parks and trails were analyzed for Phase 2 and elsewhere where possible, and because each subsequent phases of development would entail its own project level analysis under CEQA, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Existing Park and Recreation Facilities

Impact 4.11.4.3 Implementation of Phase 2 would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

Although Phase 2 is projected to increase the population of the City of Anderson by approximately 1,917 people, and it is expected that future residents would utilize existing parks and recreation facilities in the City of Anderson, Phase 2 of the project includes development of

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

a 9.2-acre public park, a 3.3-acre private recreation center, and approximately 2.75 miles of public access pedestrian trails, and includes approximately 102 acres of common area that would be accessible for passive recreational activities. Further, the City of Anderson requires that each subdivision project provide at least five acres of parkland for every 1,000 persons resulting from the project. Given the 1,917 persons projected as a result of Phase 2, the project would be required to provide approximately 9.6 acres of parkland. Not including the common area, and giving only 25 percent credit for the private recreation center pursuant to the City's Municipal Code, the project proposes development of 13.7 acres of parkland during Phase 2. Thus, Phase 2 exceeds the City's parkland dedication requirement by 4.1 acres. As a result, Phase 2's proposed recreational elements would minimize the potential for physical deterioration of existing parks and other recreational facilities to a level that is **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Proposed Park and Recreation Facilities

Impact 4.11.4.2 Buildout of the proposed project would result in the construction of additional park and recreational facilities. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

The environmental effects associated with development of the 9.2-acre park, 3.3-acre private recreation center, and 2.75 miles of trail in the Phase 2 project area have been addressed elsewhere in this EIR. For example, potential impacts to subsurface cultural and paleontological resources are addressed in Section 4.10, potential impacts to biological resources are addressed in Section 4.9, and potential impacts to air and water quality are addressed in Section 4.6 and Section 4.7 respectively. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been provided to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. As a result, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.11.4.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUMULATIVE SETTING

Regionally, the City of Anderson is part of the Sacramento Valley region of California. The entire 2,248-acre project site is located within the southern limits of the City of Anderson and unincorporated Shasta County. The cumulative setting condition includes: existing land use conditions and planned development identified within the City of Anderson General Plan Land Use Element (including land areas within the City's Sphere of Influence); existing land use conditions; planned and proposed land uses in communities near the City of Anderson (e.g., the communities of Cottonwood and Happy Valley); and the Cities of Redding and Shasta Lake). Future development in the region will continue to place additional pressures on existing recreational facilities and the need for new and expanded recreation facilities.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Cumulative Impacts on Park and Recreational Facilities

Impact 4.11.4.3 The proposed project, considered with other reasonably foreseeable development, would require additional park and recreation facilities under cumulative conditions. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other approved and proposed projects in the City of Anderson and elsewhere in Shasta County, would result in an increased need for additional parks and recreational facilities. Compliance with City requirements for park dedication and/or fees is intended to address a project's contribution to increased park and recreation demands. Each cumulative project within the City would be conditioned to meet its parkland requirements per the City of Anderson Municipal Code, while development outside of the City would be required to meet Shasta County parkland requirements. However, future activities by the City and Shasta County may require additional parkland dedication requirements (above the current 5 acres per 1,000 population standard) as well as fees for the construction of recreation facilities for future development projects (including the proposed project).

As described above in this section, the Vineyards at Anderson project proposes to develop parks and recreation facilities to serve the residents who will live within the project area. It will therefore have a less than significant impact on other City and County recreation facilities, even though project residents may occasionally use those facilities. By providing facilities within the project area, the project will substantially reduce its contribution to cumulative impacts on other City and County facilities. Furthermore, compliance with the City of Anderson Municipal Code would address the project's requirement to contribute to cumulative park and recreation demands of the City and would reduce this impact to **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

REFERENCES

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services Section:

Anderson Volunteer Fire Protection District. June 2007. Battalion Chief Andy Nichols, personal communication.

City of Anderson. 2007. *City of Anderson General Plan – Health and Safety Element*.

Cottonwood Fire Protection District. August 2007. Rod Chadbon, personal communication.

Shasta County Fire Department. June 2007. Jim Diehl, personal communication.

Law Enforcement Section:

California, Department of Finance. 2007. E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change — January 1, 2006 and 2007.

City of Anderson Police Department. June 2007. Police Chief Dale Webb, personal communication.

City of Anderson. 2007. *City of Anderson General Plan – Health and Safety Element*.

Shasta County Sheriff's Office. June 2007. Captain Morgan, personal communication.

Public Schools Section:

Anderson Union High School District. March 2007. Superintendent Randy Palomino, personal communication.

Cascade Union Elementary School District. August 2007. Helen Chiramelli, personal communication.

Cascade Union Elementary School District. June 2007. Superintendent Dr. Wesley Smith, personal communication.

Cottonwood Union Elementary School District. March 2007. Superintendent Dale Hansen, personal communication.

Happy Valley Union Elementary School District. March 2007. Superintendent Dr. Larry Robbins, personal communication.

California Department of Education. Ed-Data. Viewed online March 2007. <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/welcome.asp>

Parks & Recreation Section:

City of Anderson. 2007. *City of Anderson General Plan – Recreation Element*.

City of Anderson. 1990. Ordinance 573.