

## 4.12 Public Services and Recreation

This section addresses the potential impacts that development under the Inner Harbor Specific Plan View could have to public services, including police protection services, fire protection and emergency services, and public schools provided in Redwood City. This section also addresses the potential physical impacts regarding recreational facilities that could occur with implementation of the Specific Plan or the development project. This section also presents a project-level analysis of the Harbor View project, which is located largely within the Specific Plan Area.

### 4.12.1 Environmental Setting

#### Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The Redwood City Fire Department (Fire Department) provides fire protection and suppression, and emergency medical service, in the Specific Plan Area. The Fire Department is currently staffed by 91 personnel including captains and battalion chiefs, firefighter-paramedics, firefighters, fire prevention staff, training staff, and administrative staff located at seven stations (Redwood City, 2012). All Fire Department staff includes full-time employees, and the Department operates pursuant to a minimum daily staffing requirement of 26 on-duty staff (Redwood City, 2010a).

The Fire Department is the official fire service provider in the City, however, automatic aid is provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection-CALFIRE/San Mateo County Fire, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, Woodside Fire Protection District, and the San Carlos Fire Department. The Redwood City Fire Department and these other fire departments participate in a countywide automatic aid agreement system and the Greater Alarm Plan, which is a countywide response plan that allows continuous coverage from the closest fire protection resources to an incident within San Mateo County (San Mateo, 2010). The Fire Department is also a signatory to various statewide mutual aid agreements (Redwood City, 2012). The Fire Department also works with American Medical Response, a private company which provides paramedic ambulance service under a joint powers agreement with San Mateo County (Redwood City, 2010b). All fire department units first out units are equipped with advanced life support equipment and a firefighter/paramedic (Redwood City, 2010b).

In case of a large-scale emergency or area-wide disaster, the Fire Department is responsible for direct intervention and to be on the front lines to help maintain public safety and provide infrastructure repair, alongside the Police Department, Redwood City Public Works Department, and the San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services (Redwood City, 2010a).

The Plan Area would be served by Fire Station #9, which also serves the Downtown area. Fire Station #9 is located at 755 Marshall Street, approximately 1.6 miles west of the Plan Area. The current travel time from this station to the Plan Area is less than approximately five minutes.

Response from this station is currently provided with an engine staffed by a fire captain and two firefighters, one ladder truck staffed with a fire captain and three firefighters, and one duty battalion chief. (Redwood City, 2012).

Fire Station #11 located at 1091 Second Avenue at Broadway would also serve the Plan Area from approximately 2.2 miles to the southwest. Travel time from this station to the Plan Area is less than approximately 7 minutes. Station #11 currently houses a fire captain, two firefighters, and a 1,500 gallons-per-minute (gpm) pumper (Redwood City, 2012).

The Fire Department's minimum daily staffing requirement of the 26 on-duty staff allows it to reach their goal of responding to calls for service within five minutes at least 85 percent of the time (Redwood City, 2010a).

## **Police Protection**

The Redwood City Police Department (Police Department) provides police service within the Redwood City limits. The Police Department provides service from one central police station – its headquarters located within the Plan Area at 1301 Maple Street. There are no police substations.

The Police Department consists of 135 full-time employees: 94 sworn members and 30 non-sworn support staff, part time and volunteer staff. The sworn employees include one police chief, one deputy police chief, two captains, four lieutenants, 12 sergeants, and 74 officers. The officer-to-population ratio in Redwood City is approximately 1:1079 [2013 citywide population is 80,872] officers per 1,000 residents, however, the City does not use an officer-to-population ratio as a specific goal for police service.

The Police Department has permanently staffed police patrol areas (beats). The Plan Area is located in Beat 2. Beat 2 has officer coverage 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Typically, a minimum of one officer is assigned to patrol Beat 2 during the three patrol shifts (day, swing, and midnight). Also in Beat 2, motorcycle officers frequently conduct traffic enforcement activities to address specific complaints (Redwood City, 2012). Emergency units are routinely on patrol within their assigned beat, making emergency dispatch and response relatively immediately.

Incoming calls to the Police Department are divided into three categories: Priority 1 involves life-threatening situations, Priority 2 are not life-threatening, but necessitate immediate response, and Priority 3 includes all other calls. Response times in the vicinity of the Plan Area are typically less than 2 minutes for emergency calls, approximately 6 minutes for priority calls, and less than 15 minutes for routine calls (Redwood City, 2012). Citywide the average response time is 2.22 minutes for emergency calls, 5.5 minutes for urgent calls, and 12.5 minutes for routine calls. These response rates are within the City's established response time goal of five minutes or less for all emergency calls (Redwood City, 2010a).

## Schools

The Plan Area is located within the boundaries of the Redwood City School District (RCSD) and the Sequoia Union High School District (SUHSD).

The Plan Area is served by Taft Elementary School located about 2.0 miles to the south at 903 10th Street, west of US 101. Taft Elementary had 540 students in attendance during the 2013-14 school year (CA Department of Education, 2015) and a capacity of approximately 569 students (Redwood City, 2010a). RCSD generally assigns students to neighborhood schools based on where they live. Students are guaranteed placement in their neighborhood school if space is available at the time they enroll. If the neighborhood school does not have space at the time of enrollment, students are assigned to another school. Students may apply to attend a neighborhood school outside of their residence area. Hoover Elementary (about 1.5 miles south) and Orion Elementary (about 1.0 mile west) are also located in the vicinity of the Plan Area.

The Plan Area is served by Sequoia High School located at 1201 Brewster Ave, about 1.5 miles west of US 101 and the Plan Area. Sequoia had approximately 2,031 students in attendance during the 2013-2014 school year (CA Department of Education, 2015) and a capacity of approximately 2,200 (Redwood City, 2010a). The SUHSD has an open enrollment policy, in accordance with State Education Code requirements. Acceptance of students can only occur while there is space in the freshman class at each individual school. Once the freshman class is full, no more students will be accepted.

## Parks

As referred to in the CEQA Guidelines and as used by City staff, the terms "parks" and "parkland" are used in this EIR to refer to parks and other recreational facilities available to the general public, including publicly owned land provided and maintained for active recreational purposes, to distinguish them from public spaces and plazas, which can provide public gathering space, but do not provide distinctly recreational facilities for either children or adult active play. Likewise, the City defines "open space" as "publicly owned land specifically set aside for the preservation of natural resources," rather than for active recreation (Redwood City, 2010b).

Redwood City has approximately 225.42 acres of active developed parkland and approximately 700 acres of designated open space.<sup>1</sup> Parks in the sphere of influence area contribute an additional 7.5 acres, for a total of about 232.92 acres of developed parkland citywide.<sup>2</sup> Parkland is not evenly distributed throughout the City, and some areas have a relative "excess" of parkland when compared to other portions. The City has adopted an active park standard of 1,000 residents per 3.0 acres of active parkland (Redwood City, 2010a).

<sup>1</sup> Public park and recreational facilities include community centers, trails, and swimming pools, which may be within City parks. Open space areas provide passive recreational opportunities, but have other primary purposes, such as habitat protection, that preclude the areas from being considered as active developed parkland.

<sup>2</sup> Total excludes 43 acres of school related parklands since a wider public use of school parks is not formalized through a City-School District usage agreement, and therefore no certainty exists that school parks could continue to be relied upon in the long-term to help fulfill park and recreational demands of the City.

The City of Redwood City Parks, Recreation and Community Services Commission approved a Parks and Facilities Needs Assessment Study (*Needs Assessment*) which divided the City into seven planning areas (Redwood City, 2008). The Specific Plan Area is part of the East of US 101 planning area, which includes all areas East of US 101 (except Redwood Shores) in Redwood City and includes no park facilities. The nearest local parks to the Specific Plan Area are Mezes Neighborhood Park and several downtown mini parks in the Downtown planning area, as well as Andrew Spinass Neighborhood Park and Hoover School Park in the Southeast planning area – all located within approximately 0.5 mile of the Specific Plan Area, however there is no connectivity and the access is difficult from the east side of US 101. The *Needs Assessment* identified the East of US 101 planning area as needing approximately 5.70 acres of parks to meet the City’s park standard of 3.0 acres of active parkland per 1,000 of population. Redwood City Parks, Recreation and Community Services staff also indicate residents express significant design for dog park facilities.

The Needs Assessment examined the recreation facilities provided by Redwood City in comparison with surrounding communities. Redwood City’s 1.19 sports fields per 10,000 population is below the mean of 3.34 sports fields per 10,000 population (Redwood City, 2008).

### ***Trails and Open Space***

The Specific Plan Area includes the San Francisco Bay Trail (Bay Trail), a proposed 400-mile trail that would connect communities to each other and the Bay through nine counties and 47 cities. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has been overseeing planning and construction of the Bay Trail, in cooperation with local jurisdictions.<sup>3</sup> Within Redwood City, a major local gap in the Bay Trail exists in the vicinity immediately south of the Plan Area - the Cargill Property - through the bay-side industrial area and across Redwood Creek within the Plan Area (Redwood City, 2010a).

As previously mentioned, Redwood City has approximately 700 acres of designated open space that can be used for passive recreation (walking, boating, exploring, etc.). The majority of open space within the City is on the Bayfront lands, including Bair, Bird, and Greco Islands, which comprise portions of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge – all within the Bay side vicinity of the Specific Plan Area (Redwood City, 2010a). Active water-focused recreation also exist in these Bayfront lands, notably the Bair Island Aquatic Center.

---

<sup>3</sup> According to ABAG, mid-term goals (to be built within the next 6-10 years) for the Bay Trail within the plan area include: 2,466.7 feet of trail between Whipple Road and Bair Island Road, 1,541.8 feet of trail on Bair Island Road, and 10,724.1 feet of trail by the Cargill Levee between Seaport Boulevard and Bayfront Park. Long-term goals (to be built within the next 11-15 years) within the plan area include: 2,455 feet by Redwood Creek, crossing between Bair Island Road and Blomquist, and 1,929.7 feet by Blomquist between Maple Boulevard and Seaport Boulevard. Overall, 19,117.3 feet (approximately 3.62 miles) still remains to be completed within Redwood City.

## 4.12.2 Regulatory Setting

### Senate Bill 50

The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, or Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), restricts the ability of local agencies to deny project approvals on the basis that public school facilities (classrooms, auditoriums, etc.) are inadequate. School impact fees are collected at the time when building permits are issued. Payment of school fees is required by SB 50 for all new residential development projects and is considered full and complete mitigation of any school impacts. School impact fees are payments to offset capital cost impacts associated with new developments, which result primarily from costs of additional school facilities, related furnishings and equipment, and projected capital maintenance requirements. As such, agencies cannot require additional mitigation for any school impacts.

### Redwood City Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Strategic Plan 2004

The *Redwood City Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Strategic Plan* (Strategic Plan) provides a framework of principles and policies to help guide the Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department (Parks Department) in the proper direction. The Strategic Plan identifies the purpose, vision, and values the Parks Department uses, along with the goals and objectives.

### Parks and Facilities Needs Assessment 2008

The *Needs Assessment* is an inventory and qualitative assessment of the City's current and anticipated needs for parks and recreational facilities. It identifies next steps to help the City expand and maintain its parkland. The *Needs Assessment* includes many specific recommendations that would help realize the goal of having 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons while also ensuring the appropriate distribution of such parklands throughout the City. The *Needs Assessment* includes recommendations for ongoing review and assessment of facilities and development/implementation of a long-range replacement plan.

### Quimby Act: California Government Code Section 66477

California Government Code §66477, commonly known as the Quimby Act, was intended to help local communities generate the resources necessary to provide park and recreational facilities. The Quimby Act allows cities to enact fees on new development to be used in the acquisition and/or preservation of park, recreation, or open space facilities as well as improvements on those facilities.

Current City park fees and dedication requirements intended to maintain the park standard are applied only to new residential development; a citywide Nexus Study to determine new commercial development's relationship to the park standard and fee/dedication needs has been completed, but the City has not adopted a park fee or dedication requirement for new commercial development (Redwood City, 2012).

## City of Redwood City Municipal Code

Chapter 30, Article XII, of the City Municipal Code is the Quimby Act Implementation Ordinance, applicable to subdivisions within City boundaries. Section 30.143 – *Parkland Standard*, requires new subdivisions provide active parkland at the ratio of 3.0 acres to each new 1,000 people that the new development would potentially house. Section 30.145 establishes a fee requirement that is calculated by subtracting any dedicated acreage from the parkland requirement and multiplying the result of the calculation by a per acre land and site improvement cost. Proponents of new development must either provide the required parkland acres/resident ratio as part of their proposal or pay the in-lieu fee to the City for use in the acquisition or maintenance of park, recreational, or open space facilities.

## Emergency Services Plan

The City’s Emergency Services Plan outlines the organizational structure and chain of command for emergency operation procedures, and the functional responsibilities of the City’s departments during an emergency. The Police Department, Fire Department, and Public Works Services Department are responsible for direct intervention in the event of a large-scale emergency. During a disaster, they are on the “front lines” to maintain public safety and provide infrastructure repair. The remaining City departments provide support functions based on their areas of expertise. The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) is operated by City staff.

## Redwood City General Plan

The Redwood City General Plan’s *Building Environment Element* and *Public Services Element* include the following policies about public services relative to the Specific Plan and the Harbor View project. These policies were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The consistency of the proposed Specific Plan and the Harbor View project with relevant policies that are also considered land use policies are evaluated in Section 4.8, *Land Use and Planning*, in this chapter of the EIR. The policies directly applicable to public services and recreation are summarized as follows:

- Policy PS-11.1: Work with the Police Department to determine and meet community needs for law enforcement services.
- Policy PS-11.2: Work with the Fire Department to determine and meet community needs for fire protection and related emergency services.
- Policy BC-1.1: Require parkland dedications and/or provision of on-site usable public space for significant development projects involving new residential construction.
- Policy BC-1.3: Enhance street corridors, parkways, and public property between buildings to serve as functional recreation and green space.
- Policy BC-1.5: Consider all opportunities to create and acquire lands for parks, community gardens, rooftop gardens, and community gathering places.

- Policy BC-2.2 Prioritize acquisition of land for active parks in areas where population is anticipated to grow and/or parkland is deficient.
- Policy BC-3.1 Incorporate flexible design characteristics into the renovation of existing and development of new parks and community facilities. Consider incorporating education with recreation opportunities.
- Policy BC-3.2: Continue to build, renovate, and maintain parks and community facilities in a manner that is environmentally responsible.
- Policy BC-5.5: Develop a strategy for the reclaiming of Redwood Creek as a functional natural waterway with recreation amenities along its banks.
- Policy BC-5.6: Provide access to water-based recreation opportunities in San Francisco Bay and along bayfront lands.

The General Plan restates the City's commitment to providing adequate parkland and facilities. The above General Plan policies and related programs identified in the General Plan perpetuate and strengthen the City's goal of providing 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons. While the General Plan land use map (see Figure 4.9-3 in Section 4.9, *Land Use and Planning*, of this EIR) does not designate any new lands as parks, the General Plan includes programs that would implement the recommendations of the *Needs Assessment* (described above), which focus on parkland acquisition, operation and maintenance.

### 4.12.3 Project Baseline

Baseline conditions reflect the condition of the Specific Plan Area and Harbor View project site as it existed at the time of the issuance of the Notice of Preparation of the EIR was issued on November 6, 2014. Specific conditions are described above in *Environmental Setting* and documented throughout.

### 4.12.4 Significance Criteria

Based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would cause significant adverse impacts to public services and recreation if it would:

#### 1) Public Services

- a) Result 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 for any of the public services:

1. Police Protection
2. Fire Protection
3. Schools
4. Parks
5. Other public facilities

## 2) Recreation

- a) 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.
- b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

## **Approach to Analysis**

This section analyses the potential public services effects on police and fire protection services, schools, parks use, and recreational facilities. No other public facilities are considered in this CEQA analysis.

### ***Inner Harbor Specific Plan***

The increases in population and land use intensity that would result from development under the Specific Plan were evaluated based on the web-based information regarding the various public services agencies with jurisdiction over the Specific Plan Area and their service capabilities, service ratios, response times, and performance objectives. Additionally, development under the Specific Plan was evaluated for conformity with the goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan related to public services and recreation. While there are existing use within the Plan Area that include residential and employment population, the number or total onsite service population is minimal and not factored in as existing uses to be removed, thus ensuring a conservative analysis.

### ***Harbor View Project***

The analysis of the Harbor View development project in this section relies largely on the data described above for the Specific Plan. Increases in population and land use changes specific to the development project are estimated to which the evaluation of the potential effects on public services and recreation was applied. As discussed in Section 4.11. *Population, Housing and Employment*, the Harbor View project would result in more total employee population than what would occur under with the Specific Plan (5,600 compared to 4,814), but would have less total population than would occur under the Specific Plan (5,600 compared to 6,024).

### ***Cumulative***

The Specific Plan and Harbor View project's contribution to cumulative impacts on public services and recreation would be considered significant if, either together or independently, combined with other cumulative projects, their contribution to a significant cumulative effect (if one is found) is determined to be considerable.

## **4.12.5 Program-Level Impacts of the Inner Harbor Specific Plan**

**Impact PSR-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could result in an increase in calls for police services, but would not require new or physically altered police facilities, the**

**construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives (Criterion 1a1). (Less than Significant)**

Development under the Specific Plan would increase land use intensity and overall density in and around the Plan Area. The related population increase (net increase of 1,210 residents and approximately 4,814 employees) could result in an increase in police service calls.<sup>4</sup> Conversely, development under the Specific Plan would introduce new occupied buildings and active uses on sites currently vacant and underused, and this development and revitalization of the area with population and foot-traffic in the Plan Area nearly all times of could thereby reduce demand for police services related to issues associated with isolated, underutilized areas (e.g., vagrancy, dumping, vandalism, loitering).

Overall, activity in the Plan Area would increase, and the resulting demand for additional police service or routine patrol may also experience and increase. The Police Department headquarters from which it provides all dispatch services is located in the Specific Plan area at 1301 Maple Street, within the Plan Area. Moreover, as previously indicated in the *Environmental Setting*, the Redwood City Police Department is currently able to meet or exceed its established response time goal of five minutes or less for all emergency calls (Redwood City, 2010a). This is achieved from the one central police station within the City and the Plan Area, therefore implementation of the Specific Plan would not generate the need for additional facilities.

Given these circumstances, it is reasonable to find that the existing police facilities within the Plan Area are adequate to meet the needs of the new population, and no new or physically altered police facilities would be required, the construction of which could have significant environmental effects. Increased population and development under the Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impact on police services.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

**Impact PSR-2.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical response services, but would not require new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives (Criterion 1a2). (Less than Significant)**

Development under the Specific Plan would increase land use intensity and overall density in and most of the Plan Area. Housing development anticipated with implementation of the Specific Plan could add up to 450 housing units in the Plan Area, and accommodate growth of up to approximately 428 households and 1,210 residents.<sup>5</sup> An estimated net increase of 1.19 million

---

<sup>4</sup> Other than persons residing in Docktown live-aboards, the analysis conservatively assumes that the new residents in the Plan Area do not already reside in Redwood City and particularly near the Plan Area.

<sup>5</sup> The Specific Plan program proposes includes 550 residential units, however 100 are conservatively considered existing watercraft used as private live-aboards along Redwood Creek - uses that would occur in another location (WD-2 district) in the Specific Plan Area (see Table 3-2 in Chapter 3 of this EIR).

square feet (msf) of commercial building area and 4,814 employees could also occur in the Plan Area with the Specific Plan.

A net increase of development and onsite population as a result of development under the Specific Plan would generate additional calls for fire and emergency medical response services. Specifically, the increased demand may require additional personnel or equipment based out of Station #9, 755 Marshall Street in the future in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or response times, or it may require the construction of new or altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. As previously indicated in the *Environmental Setting*, the Redwood City Fire Department is currently able to meet or exceed their response time goal 85 percent of the time (Redwood City, 2010a). Under current traffic conditions, it takes approximately three minutes to access the Plan Area from the nearest fire Station #9, which is less than the City's standard for emergency response time (five minutes or less for 85% of all calls).

Once key factor in response times is the potential for emergency vehicles responding to the Plan Area to experience delay due to increased traffic and development in the Plan Area. As analyzed in Impact TRANS-10.SP in Section 4.14, *Transportation and Traffic*, in this EIR, while traffic associated with the Specific Plan could potentially slow emergency response, traffic congestion along northbound Maple Street would not worsen emergency travel times beyond the City's threshold (see Table 4.14-11). Therefore it is not anticipated that construction of new or modified facilities would be needed for the Fire Department to continue to maintain its current response times, or warrant constructing new facilities to do so. Regardless, the analysis in several sections of this EIR address potential effects resulting from construction activities – namely construction period noise, emissions from construction equipment, earth movement and dust, water quality, and construction traffic. These analyses include consideration of construction activities near sensitive receptors and habitats. Where warranted, mitigation measures are identified.

Therefore, the effect of development and resulting new population in the Plan Area would not result in a significant environmental impact under CEQA. As such, the impact on fire protection and emergency medical response services would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

**Impact PSR-3.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could result in new students for local schools, but would not require new or physically altered school facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives (Criterion 1a3). (Less than Significant)**

Development under the Specific Plan is assumed to include up to 450 new residential units (see footnote 5 above) within the Plan Area, potentially increasing the student enrollment at local schools. This analysis conservatively assumes that new residents in the Plan Area do not already have students attending public schools in the RCSD or SUHSD. These new students would be added to district-wide enrollments incrementally over time as development under the Specific Plan occurs. No specific horizon date for new residential development can be established, as

development will occur through private development and depending on market conditions and opportunities; this programmatic analysis assumes effects through Year 2040.<sup>6</sup>

Based on a student yield factor used by the RCSD of 0.954 grade Kindergarten through 8th grade (K-8) students per multifamily unit, the new residential component (450 units) of the Specific Plan would generate approximately 430 K-8 students. In addition, based on a student yield factor supplied by the SUHSD of 0.10 high school student per multifamily unit, the residential component of the Specific Plan would generate approximately 45 grade 9-12 students. Therefore, the total number of K-12 public school students expected to be generated by development under the Specific Plan would be approximately 475.

As described in the *Environmental Setting* of this section, students who live within the school attendance area get first priority for attending their neighborhood school. However, if classes are already filled at the time they apply, students would be assigned to another school that has space available in the district (RCSD, 2015). Therefore, if Taft Elementary is at full capacity, potential elementary students from the Specific Plan Area would be assigned to another school in the District. There appears to be space available at Sequoia High School to accommodate the additional 45 students potentially generated by the residential units in the Specific Plan over the next 25 years. According to the Redwood City General Plan, the RCSD has preliminarily identified sites that might be suitable for new school facilities to accommodate an increase in enrollment within the district (Redwood City, 2010). However, it remains speculative to evaluate possibilities for development of any new school facilities without definitive detailed information on specific future school district needs and facility expansion plans.

Pursuant to Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), applicants for individual development projects would be required to pay school impact fees established to offset potential impacts from new development on school facilities. Therefore, although development under the Specific Plan could indirectly increase resident populations and potential student enrollment in Redwood City, payment of fees mandated under SB 50 would mitigate the potential impact of increased student enrollment in Redwood City schools. Therefore, no additional mitigation would be required.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

**Impact PSR-4.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and recreation centers, but not to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated, nor would it cause the necessity for new or expanded facilities (Criterion 1a4 and 2a,b) (Less than Significant)**

---

<sup>6</sup> During preparation of this EIR the City received a preliminary project application for a private residential development of approximately 157 townhomes in the IH-1 zoning district proposed by the Specific Plan Area. However, as of publication of this EIR, the City is still considering that project application and working with the project sponsor on the development program and site layout.

The approximately 1,210 new residents resulting from the up to 450 new residential units under the Specific Plan would increase demand for convenient parks and recreational facilities nearby. The Specific Plan proposes 3.2 acres of open space to be used for active playfields, as shown in Tables 3-1 and 3-1 in Chapter 3 of this EIR. As described in Section 3.3.2 of that chapter, the proposed Open Space-Land (OS-2) zoning district would, *“provide an opportunity to develop a great public place, in the form of an iconic public gathering and green spaces. The district is intended to facilitate active and passive recreation within the Inner Harbor area, which can include public and private plazas, parks of all sizes, sports fields, trails, recreational facilities, boathouses, and ancillary commercial or supportive facilities such as seating, restrooms, and food and drink vendors and kiosks. Any areas developed for active recreation should also be adaptable to facilitate larger gathering spaces for public events such as public concerts and festivals.”* While there are currently underdeveloped natural areas in the Plan Area, they are not used or accessible for public recreation. Overall, the Specific Plan would introduce a range of parks and recreational facilities.

As indicated in the *Environmental Setting* in this section, the City’s goal is to provide 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. With the inclusion of 3.2 acres of open space proposed by the Specific Plan, this would nearly offset the acreage required for the increase in residential population; applying the ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents, approximately 3.6 acres of parkland would be warranted for the 1,210 Specific Plan residents. Consistent with the City’s Municipal Code, as discussed in the *Regulatory Setting* above, future development in the Specific Plan Area would be required to comply with the applicable parkland dedication or in-lieu fee requirements, as well as Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department Strategic Plan policies. No subdivision proposal is included with the Specific Plan analyzed in this EIR at a programmatic level. Also, the Specific Plan outlines that certain development projects provide community benefits, some of which could contribute to publically accessible parks and recreation facilities and areas within the Plan Area (as discussed in Chapter 3 of this EIR). Overall this is not a trigger for significant effects under CEQA.

Development under the Specific Plan would not result in increased demand for new facilities or result in or accelerate substantial physical deterioration or existing facilities. Also, the new facilities proposed under the Specific Plan would be developed pursuant to existing policies and standards and in accordance with all mitigation measures identified in this EIR, including those addressed construction-period effects. . The impact of development allowed under the Specific Plan on parks and recreation under CEQA would therefore be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

## 4.12.6 Project-Level Impacts of the Harbor View Project

**Impact PSR-1.HV: Development of the Harbor View project would result in an increase in calls for police services, but would not require new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives (Criterion 1a1). (Less than Significant)**

The Redwood City Police Department provides service from one central police station – its headquarters located within the Plan Area at 1301 Maple Street, which is approximately 800 feet west of the Harbor View Project site. The Harbor View project could generate approximately 5,600 employees on the project site, thereby prompting a potential increase in the demand for police services to the project area due to increased human activity and structures on the project site. This analysis also considers that given the type of commercial office tenants that would likely occupy the proposed buildings in a campus setting proposed, and given the onsite amenities proposed for use by those employees, the increased employment population on the site could occur beyond typical daytime hours. Also, this analysis conservatively assumes that the new employees on Harbor View do not already work in Redwood City and particularly near the Plan Area.

However, as discussed for the Specific Plan, this increase in employees would not warrant the construction of new or physically altered police facilities to maintain current service ratios, although additional staff or equipment may be warranted. The Redwood City Police Department is currently able to meet or exceed its established response time goal of five minutes or less for all emergency calls. The development of the project would have a less-than-significant impact on police services.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

**Impact PSR-2.HV: Development of the Harbor View project could result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical response services, but would not require new or physically altered fire protection or emergency medical facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives (Criterion 1a2). (Less than Significant)**

Development of the Harbor View project could potentially increase demand for fire and emergency medical response services. The approximately 5,600 new employees and new commercial office uses that would occur with the project could generate additional calls for fire and emergency medical response services due to increased human activity and structures on the project site. As mentioned above, the proposed new employment population on the Harbor View project site could occur beyond typical daytime hours given the nature of development and proposed onsite amenities for Harbor View project employees. This analysis also conservatively assumes that the new employees on Harbor View do not already work in Redwood City and particularly near the Plan Area.

Per General Plan Policy PS-11.1, and as warranted for this project-level CEQA analysis, the City has considered the project for triggering any specific fire protection and emergency medical

response expansion needs. During the building permit review phase the City will further consider the project's compliance with all local and state fire and safety codes and requirements, including adequate water facilities and resources (see Section 4.15, *Utilities and Service Systems*, in this Chapter 4 of the EIR). The project would be served by Fire Station #9, which also serves the Downtown area. Station #9 is located at 755 Marshall Street, approximately 1.6 miles west of the project. Additional personnel or equipment based out of Station #9, 755 Marshall Street may be required in the future in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or response times, or it may require the need for a new fire department facility to service the area. As previously mentioned, the Redwood City Fire Department is currently able to meet or exceed their response time goal 85 percent of the time. It is also likely that the commercial office development of Harbor View may have private security services typical of this type of land use and businesses likely to occupy the Harbor View buildings.

Overall, the effect of new uses and resulting new employment population on the project site does not represent increases that would warrant the construction of new or physically altered facilities to maintain current service ratios, although additional staff or equipment may be warranted. The impact of the Harbor View project on fire protection and emergency medical response service would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

**Impact PSR-3.HV: Development of the Harbor View project could result in new students for local schools, but would not require new or physically altered school facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives (Criterion 1a3). (Less than Significant)**

The RCSD and SUHSD predict demand for school facilities using a student generation rate based on the number of residential units that would be developed for a project. Because the project does not propose to develop any residential units on site, the project would not directly increase the number of students attending schools in either district. This analysis maintains the conservative assumption that the new employees with the Harbor View project do not already reside in the areas and have school aged students in RCSD and SUHSD. Because the project does not propose any residential construction, it would not be required to pay fees towards new school facilities under SB 50. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact to local public schools.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

**Impact PSR-4.HV: Development of the Harbor View project could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and recreation centers, but not to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated, nor would it cause the necessity for new or expanded facilities (Criterion 1a4 and 2a,b) (Less than Significant)**

On-site recreational amenities proposed for Harbor View include fitness areas and training rooms and a one-acre High Garden covering the roof of a parking garage and featuring basketball, volleyball, putting green and bocce ball (see Figures 3-16 and 3-17 in Chapter 3 of this EIR). It is unlikely that the employees generated by the Harbor View would increase the demand and use of nearby parks and recreational facilities given the onsite recreational facilities proposed as part of the project. In fact the project could reduce existing potential demand by providing these onsite amenities. The City's applicable parkland dedication or in-lieu fee requirements would not apply to the Harbor View project since it does not involve residential uses.

Additionally, the project proposes to create a 4.32 acre Waterfront Park on the City-owned parcel, formerly known as the Cemex parcel and within the area east of proposed Lane A to be designated Open Space-Land (OS-2) zoning and included lit recreational fields (see Figure 3-5 and 3-17 in Chapter 3 of this EIR). Amenities within this park would include a soccer field, picnic areas, playground, restrooms, two volleyball courts, and waterfront access. The project applicant would work with the Redwood City Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Department to establish this publicly accessible recreation area. The Waterfront Park acreage is not confirmed as part of the Harbor View project.

The proposed recreational opportunities with the Harbor View project would not only reduce any potential demand on existing nearby recreational facilities, but would also provide much needed recreational opportunities in the east side of US 101, which currently lacks recreational areas and connectivity to nearby recreational areas. Therefore, the Project would benefit the City's existing neighborhood and regional parks system rather than increasing the use of existing parks such that substantial and physical deterioration of facilities would occur, be accelerated, or cause the need for new or expanded facilities. The Harbor View project would have a less than significant impact on parks and recreation.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

## 4.12.7 Cumulative Impacts

**Impact PSR-1.CU: Construction activity and operations for development under the Specific Plan and/or the Harbor View project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects with the vicinity of the Plan Area and Harbor View project site, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact to public services and recreation. (Less than Significant)**

The cumulative geographic context for public services and recreation considerations for Development under the Specific Plan consists of the Specific Plan Area in addition to all areas of the City, as public services and recreation facilities are provided citywide.

Cumulative projects considered are those in the Specific Plan vicinity that would also involve construction activity, including those in the development forecasts conducted for this EIR based on the countywide transportation model and the US 101/SR84 (Woodside Road) Interchange

Improvement Project and other approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects citywide, including the nearby San Mateo County Replacement Jail and several recent, existing, and anticipated projects underway in downtown Redwood City under the Downtown Precise Plan (see Section 4.03 *Cumulative Analysis* in this chapter for detail). These cumulative development projects would increase demand for police and fire protection services. These developments, however, would provide additional tax revenue and other development fees that would go toward paying for increased public services. Cumulative development, in combination with development under the Specific Plan and/or development of the Harbor View project would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact on police and fire services.

Regarding schools, as stated above pursuant to Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), individual project applicants would be required to pay school impact fees established to offset potential impacts from new development on school facilities. As described in the setting section, students who live within the school attendance area get first priority for attending their neighborhood school. However, if classes are already filled at the time they apply, students would be assigned to another school that has space available in the district. Considering the existing educational facilities citywide and in the vicinity of the Plan Area, the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities and the impact would be less than significant.

The Specific Plan includes the provision of 3.2 acres of open space that would provide both active and passive recreational opportunities, and the Harbor View project proposes approximately one-acre of recreational facilities for onsite use by employees of its proposed commercial office uses. Given the proposed new facilities, the resident and employee population generated with development under the Specific Plan and/or the new employee population resulting from the Harbor View project, combined with growth from other cumulative projects described above, would not result in the substantial or accelerated physical deterioration of existing facilities due to increased use or demand and cause a significant cumulative impact. Moreover, neither the Specific Plan and/or Harbor View project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to the existing deficit of local-serving parkland per resident.

The effect of the development under the Specific Plan and/or the Harbor View project, in combination with other cumulative development, would not be cumulatively significant. The impact is less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None Required.

---

## References – Public Services and Recreation

California Department of Education Educational Demographics Unit (2014). Sequoia High School: G:\13xxx\D130467.00 - Inner Harbor Redwood City Specific Plan EIR\03 Working Documents\2014-6\_Settings Sections\References\psvs\_rec\School Enrollment by Ethnicity - Enrollment by Ethnicity for 2013-14\_Sequoia HS.htm. Accessed July 27, 2014.

- California Department of Education Educational Demographics Unit (2015). Taft Elementary School 2013-2014 Enrollment. <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/Enrollment/GradeEnr.aspx?cChoice=DistEnrGr2&cYear=2013-14&cSelect=4169005--Redwood%20City%20Elementary&TheCounty=&cLevel=District&cTopic=Enrollment&myTimeFrame=S&cType=ALL&cGender=B>. Accessed April 1, 2015.
- City of Redwood City (2008). *Parks and Facilities Needs Assessment Study*. [https://www.redwoodcity.org/government/bcc/plan/agendas/2008/planagenda\\_20081216\\_Parks-and-Facilities-Needs-Assessment.pdf](https://www.redwoodcity.org/government/bcc/plan/agendas/2008/planagenda_20081216_Parks-and-Facilities-Needs-Assessment.pdf). September 24, 2008.
- City of Redwood City (2010a). *New General Plan Draft EIR*, [http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/eir/generalplaneir\\_draft.html](http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/eir/generalplaneir_draft.html), May 2010.
- City of Redwood City (2010b). *Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan*, August 2010.
- City of Redwood City (2012). *Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*, prepared by Wagstaff/MIG, February 24, 2012.
- Port of Redwood City (2010). *Port of Redwood City Wharves 1 and 2 Redevelopment Project Draft EIR*. March 2010.
- Redwood City School District (RCSD) (2014). My School Locator – Elementary School for 1301 Maple Street, Redwood City, CA: <http://locator.decisioninsite.com/?StudyID=104636>. Accessed July 27, 2014.
- RCSD, 2015. <http://www.rcsd.k12.ca.us/Page/1>. Accessed April 6, 2015.
- San Mateo County, *San Mateo County Sheriff's Office Maple Street Replacement Facility Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration*, November 2010.
- Summit Public Schools (2014). <http://www.summitps.org/schools/school-locations/summit-everest>

This page intentionally left blank