

**APPENDIX G:
PUBLIC SERVICES DATA**



Allison Dagg

From: Allison Dagg
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 6:51 PM
To: mason.hurley@losbanos.org
Cc: Terri McCracken; Stacy Souza
Subject: Los Banos General Plan 2042 EIR - Fire Protection Service Questions
Attachments: 20220201_LosBanosGP2042EIR_FireDepartment.pdf

Dear Chief Hurley,

PlaceWorks is working with the City of Los Banos to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City's [General Plan 2042](#) (proposed project). The attached letter includes a summary of the proposed project followed by a brief list of questions that I am reaching out to you about that would help us in our analysis of potential impacts to fire protection services. Any assistance you can provide with these questions is greatly appreciated in ensuring we accurately assess environmental impacts.

As noted in the attached letter, we are looking to receive answers to these questions by Friday, February 11, 2022. We would like to set up a phone or video call at your convenience within that timeframe to do so; if possible, please let us know your availability in the next two weeks. If email response is easier, that works too.

Please let me know if there is someone I should reach out to regarding this information instead or if you have any questions. Thank you for your assistance and time.

Sincerely,

ALLISON DAGG
Associate II
she/her



Offices throughout California
cell: 817.371.0099 | adagg@placeworks.com | placeworks.com

2/10/22 Interview with Fire Chief

Attendees: Allison Dagg (PlaceWorks); Stacy Souza Elms (City); Mason Hurley (LBFD)

- 1) Does Los Banos Fire Department (LBFD) have a minimum staffing level at either of its fire stations at any given time? Does the LBFD currently meet that standard?
Currently minimum staffing is 2 personnel at Station 1 and 2 personnel at Station 2 at all times. Currently not always able to meet that requirement. Currently have three shifts (firefighter, engineer, and captain), with three personnel at Station 1; and staffing at Station 2 with captain and engineer. Currently in the hiring process to fill vacancies. Overall, three shifts with funded positions for 16 employees, currently have 13 employees.

Fire Department has a Strategic Plan. Mason will send the MOU and Strategic Plan.
- 2) Are the existing staff and equipment levels at the fire station(s) adequate to meet current demands for fire protection services in LBFD service area? Would implementation of the proposed project impact service levels to drop below the projected future level?
Current staffing levels are deficient. Utilize NFPA 1710 as recommendation – minimum 4 personnel on each engine. This would result in needing 35 people total.
- 3) What are the average response times for fire and emergency services? What is the stated policy for each? Are these times considered acceptable? If not, what is the preferred response time?
Strategic Plan was done in 2019 and includes this info. Average response time is about 5 minutes, which is about the goal they are wanting to reach.
- 4) Are there any existing deficiencies, such as lack of staffing and/or facilities and equipment?
See above.
- 5) Are there any existing plans for expansion or relocation of stations that would serve the project? If so, please described the expansion or relocation.
There are plans and desires to expand current stations. Station 1 needs modifications to improve facility office space and dorms. Need to build Station 3, and planning for Station 4. Identified locations for both of these stations, including recommendation for new station on southeast part of town. Do not currently have funding or designs though.
- 6) Would the proposed project require the LBFD to hire more staff?
For the time frame, 2042, they would probably need plans for a 5th station. Regarding staffing levels, they would need to make sure they include administrative staff to support.
- 7) Would the LBFD need to construct new facilities or expand existing facilities in order to accommodate the proposed project's demand for fire protection services, based on the projected growth through 2042?
See above.
- 8) Does the LBFD recommend standard criteria for assessing the significance of a proposed project's impacts in an EIR or other environmental impact documentation? If so, what are those criteria?
They use the ISO ratings for staffing/equipment needs. City has relied heavily on 2030 General Plan that talks about the ISO rating and keeping up with that standard, which has a 1.5-mile radius for each station.
- 9) Does the LBFD have identified Developer Impact Fees for new development? If so, please describe the fees.
Stacy sent.

- 10) Please provide recommendations that could reduce the demand for fire protection services created by the proposed project.
Focusing on meeting the requirements of NFPA and CalOSHA for amount of personnel and equipment.
12 times in just the last week where they had incidents with both units operating or overlapping with both stations.
- 11) Please provide any current documents on fire protection services in the city including background reports, number of incidents, policy documents, and facility plans that you think would help with preparing the environmental review analysis for impacts to fire services as a result of the proposed project.
He does have scheduled an appointment next month for upgrades to the ISO. No other documents.
ISO from 2016 report – deals with emergency response and also water supply.

Exhibit A

| City of Los Banos | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------|---------------------|
| 2021 Adjusted Development Impact Fees | | | | | | | | | | |
| Development Impact Fees per Unit (Residential)/1,000 Square Feet (Non-Residential) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Fire | Police | Parks & Rec. | Water | Sewer | Storm Drain | Traffic | General Govt. | Admin (3%) | Total Fees |
| Single Family | \$ 1,291.97 | \$ 2,417.56 | \$ 7,217.76 | \$ 6,487.56 | \$ 4,977.87 | \$ 3,037.87 | \$ 1,339.21 | \$ 720.95 | \$ 824.68 | \$ 28,315.42 |
| Multi-family | \$ 1,033.16 | \$ 1,933.84 | \$ 5,773.79 | \$ 5,190.46 | \$ 3,982.71 | \$ 2,430.91 | \$ 927.38 | \$ 577.17 | \$ 655.23 | \$ 22,504.65 |
| Age Restricted | \$ 699.39 | \$ 1,308.40 | \$ 3,906.71 | \$ 3,511.31 | \$ 2,694.85 | \$ 1,644.23 | \$ 723.01 | \$ 390.26 | \$ 446.75 | \$ 15,324.89 |
| Retail | \$ 736.36 | \$ 1,377.21 | \$ - | \$ 3,696.17 | \$ 2,836.57 | \$ 1,731.52 | \$ 6,670.37 | \$ - | \$ 511.45 | \$ 17,559.65 |
| Office | \$ 552.53 | \$ 1,033.16 | \$ - | \$ 2,772.90 | \$ 2,126.92 | \$ 1,298.13 | \$ 1,336.13 | \$ - | \$ 273.18 | \$ 9,392.94 |
| Institutional | \$ 276.26 | \$ 516.58 | \$ - | \$ 1,386.45 | \$ 1,063.97 | \$ 649.06 | \$ 1,616.50 | \$ - | \$ 165.35 | \$ 5,674.18 |
| Industrial | \$ 183.83 | \$ 344.05 | \$ - | \$ 924.30 | \$ 708.63 | \$ 432.37 | \$ 1,134.84 | \$ - | \$ 111.94 | \$ 3,839.95 |

Allison Dagg

From: Allison Dagg
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 6:48 PM
To: gary.brizzee@losbanos.org
Cc: Terri McCracken; Stacy Souza
Subject: Los Banos General Plan 2042 EIR - Police Service Questions
Attachments: 20220201_LosBanosGP2042EIR_PoliceDepartment.pdf

Dear Chief Brizzee,

PlaceWorks is working with the City of Los Banos to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City's [General Plan 2042](#) (proposed project). The attached letter includes a summary of the proposed project followed by a brief list of questions that I am reaching out to you about that would help us in our analysis of potential impacts to police services. Any assistance you can provide with these questions is greatly appreciated in ensuring we accurately assess environmental impacts.

As noted in the attached letter, we are looking to receive answers to these questions by Friday, February 11, 2022. We would like to set up a phone or video call at your convenience within that timeframe to do so; if possible, please let us know your availability in the next two weeks. If email response is easier, that works too.

Please let me know if there is someone I should reach out to regarding this information instead or if you have any questions. Thank you for your assistance and time.

Sincerely,

ALLISON DAGG
Associate II
she/her



Offices throughout California
cell: 817.371.0099 | adagg@placeworks.com | placeworks.com

Interview with Police Chief Gary Brizzee, 2/7/22

Attendees: Allison Dagg (PlaceWorks); Gary Brizzee (LBPD); Stacy Souza Elms (City)

1. Is there a standard ratio of officers per number of population that the Los Banos Police Department (LBPD) wishes to maintain? Does the LBPD currently meet that standard?
FBI standard is 1.5 officers (sworn officers) per 1,000 people. LBPD is at about 1.1 with authorized staffing (48 authorized – i.e., what they aim to hire up to, 44 currently on staff).
1 per 1,000 population including non-sworn (i.e., all employees of the police dept, including admin).
2. Are the existing staff levels and equipment at the station(s) adequate to meet current demands for police services in the project area? Would implementation of the proposed project impact service levels such that they drop below the current level?
Generally staffing is inadequate; so, buildout projections of the project would impact this.
3. Does LBPD have an established target response time for responding to calls? If so, is the LBPD currently meeting those response times?
No current established response time target.
4. How many emergency incident calls does the LBPD respond to per year? What is the response goal for an emergency incident?
Gary will share the 2021 numbers. No response goal.
5. Are there any existing deficiencies, such as lack of staffing and/or facilities and equipment?
Existing staff deficiencies. Department that they've been in since 1969, not enough space for staffing currently. In the design phase of building a new police department (will completely move to the new building). Construction set to be done September 2023, move in in October 2023, project completion in November 2023. Will be a brand-new building at 1111 G Street.
6. Are there any existing plans for expansion or relocation of stations that would serve the project? If so, please described the expansion or relocation.
Answer above.
7. Would the proposed project require the LBPD to hire more staff?
More staff would be needed to meet the projected population.
8. Would the LBPD need to construct new facilities or expand existing facilities in order to accommodate the proposed project's demand for police services, based on the projected growth through 2042?
New facility would be intended to take them through 50 years of growth. Animal control facility includes the shelter and office space. Range facility is a shooting range for training. Both of these would need to be physically expanded.
9. Does the LBPD recommend standard criteria for assessing the significance of a proposed project's impacts in an EIR or other environmental impact documentation? If so, what are those criteria?
No standard criteria.
10. Does the LBPD have identified Developer Impact Fees for new development? If so, please describe the fees.
Stacy can send the Developer Impact Fees. They have been doing annual adjustments.

11. Please provide recommendations, if any, that could reduce the demand for police services created by the proposed project.
Recommendations – largest complaint community wide is traffic related. With development of future neighborhoods, to help reduce traffic responses would be an intelligent design to neighborhood development. Things like intelligent policing as a crime deterrent such as surveillance systems, public camera systems.

12. Please provide any current documents on police services in the city including background reports, number of incidents, policy documents, and facility plans that you think would help with preparing the environmental review analysis for impacts to police services as a result of the proposed project.
2021 Annual report should be released sometime this month (?). Gary will provide their Facility Needs Assessment.

Allison Dagg

From: Allison Dagg
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 6:54 PM
To: mmarshall@losbanosusd.k12.ca.us
Cc: Terri McCracken; Stacy Souza
Subject: Los Banos General Plan 2042 EIR - Public Schools Questions
Attachments: 20220201_LosBanosGP2042EIR_LosBanosUnifiedSchoolDistrict.pdf

Dear Dr. Marshall,

PlaceWorks is working with the City of Los Banos to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City's [General Plan 2042](#) (proposed project). The attached letter includes a summary of the proposed project followed by a brief list of questions that I am reaching out to you about that would help us in our analysis of potential impacts to school services. Any assistance you can provide with these questions is greatly appreciated in ensuring we accurately assess environmental impacts.

As noted in the attached letter, we are looking to receive answers to these questions by Friday, February 11, 2022. We would like to set up a phone or video call at your convenience within that timeframe to do so; if possible, please let us know your availability in the next two weeks. If email response is easier, that works too.

Please let me know if there is someone I should reach out to regarding this information instead or if you have any questions. Thank you for your assistance and time.

Sincerely,

ALLISON DAGG
Associate II
she/her



Offices throughout California
cell: 817.371.0099 | adagg@placeworks.com | placeworks.com

2/10/22 Zoom Interview with LBUSD Superintendent

Attendees: Allison Dagg, Terri McCracken (PlaceWorks); Stacy Souza Elms (City); Dr. Mark Marshall (LBUSD)

- 1) Does Los Banos USD have school capacity numbers, including past, current, and projected capacity numbers, that can be provided?
Newest school has filled up a lot of space, and other schools have more space. Facilities Study that Dr. Marshall can send.
- 2) Does the school district have a generation rate that it uses for enrollment projections? If so, what is the generation rate?
In Facilities Study.
- 3) Are the existing staff and facility levels adequate to meet current demands for school services in the EIR Study Area? Would implementation of the proposed project impact service levels to drop below the projected future level?
Yes. LB has some of the highest salaries in the State given the cost of living. Issue is going to be the teaching shortage.
- 4) Are there any existing deficiencies, such as lack of staffing and/or facilities?
Current facilities at elementary level are still crowded. District needs about two additional elementary schools. On the horizon after that is middle and high schools.
- 5) Are there any existing plans for expansion or relocation of schools that would serve the project? If so, please described the expansion or relocation.
In talks with a local developer for identifying land for 2 elementary schools.
- 6) Would the proposed project require Los Banos USD to hire more staff?
Proportionate to how many students the City gets, as population increases.
- 7) Would the school district need to construct new facilities or expand existing facilities in order to accommodate the proposed project's demand for school services, based on the projected growth through 2042?
Yes. Needs something by the Walmart and by Turlock; location on the west and north.
- 8) Does the school district recommend standard criteria for assessing the significance of a proposed project's impacts in an EIR or other environmental impact documentation? If so, what are those criteria?
Mitigation agreements with developers. When the City proposes a new subdivision, school looks at whether they have capacity and whether development is paying appropriate share.
- 9) Does the school district have identified Developer Impact Fees for new development? If so, please describe the fees.
Yes. School requests separate mitigation fee to fill in the gap between State required and what will actually help. Dr. Marshall can send the developer impact fees for the schools, and Stacy will send an example letter regarding this from a past project.
- 10) Please provide recommendations, if any, that could reduce the demand for school services created by the proposed project.
N/A.
- 11) Does the school district have a Facilities Master Plan that can be provided? Please provide any other current documents on school services in the city including background reports, policy documents, and facility plans that you think would help with preparing the environmental review analysis for impacts to schools as a result of the proposed project.
Dr. Marshall will send their Long-Range Master Plan.

Allison Dagg

From: Allison Dagg
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 6:52 PM
To: Joe.Heim@losbanos.org
Cc: Terri McCracken; Stacy Souza
Subject: Los Banos General Plan 2042 EIR - Parks & Recreation Questions
Attachments: 20220201_LosBanosGP2042EIR_Parks&Recreation.pdf

Dear Mr. Heim,

PlaceWorks is working with the City of Los Banos to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City's [General Plan 2042](#) (proposed project). The attached letter includes a summary of the proposed project followed by a brief list of questions that I am reaching out to you about that would help us in our analysis of potential impacts to parks and recreation services. Any assistance you can provide with these questions is greatly appreciated in ensuring we accurately assess environmental impacts.

As noted in the attached letter, we are looking to receive answers to these questions by Friday, February 11, 2022. We would like to set up a phone or video call at your convenience within that timeframe to do so; if possible, please let us know your availability in the next two weeks. If email response is easier, that works too.

Please let me know if there is someone I should reach out to regarding this information instead or if you have any questions. Thank you for your assistance and time.

Sincerely,

ALLISON DAGG
Associate II
she/her



Offices throughout California
cell: 817.371.0099 | adagg@placeworks.com | placeworks.com

2/10/22 Interview with Joe Heim, Parks & Rec Operations Manager

Attendees: Allison Dagg, Terri McCracken (PlaceWorks); Stacy Souza Elms (City); Joe Heim (Parks)

- 1) Is there a standard service ratio (such as park/recreation acreage per population) that the department wishes to maintain? Does the department currently meet that standard?
Joe has a parks master plan (Feb 2021) that has been recently adopted. Posted online on the parks page. They are currently working on the Forestry Management Plan with an April/May/Summer anticipated adoption date.

GP for 2030 encourages 7 acres per 1,000 people. There are 6.3 acres per 1,000 currently. Want parks to be within ¼ to ½ mile radius.
In order to keep the 6.3 acres per 1,000, by 2035 parks master plan needs to add 98 acres of parkland. Want it geared towards more specialty facilities added for new parks.
LB has a lot of large basin parks. Pacheco Park has more use as a community/destination park. Community parks (destination parks) vs specialty parks.
Meadowlands area on east side of town is an example of too many parks.
- 2) Are there any existing deficiencies, such as lack of staffing and/or facilities and equipment?
Yes – deficiencies in staff. Referenced NRPA 2018 document. 18.5 FTE currently. National average per 10,000 residents is 7.9, meaning they should have 31+
City is lacking specialized facilities (sports fields, splash pads, etc.), not overall acreage, and ADA compliant facilities in some areas. Desire for expanded trails system, and more shade and restrooms.
- 3) Are there any existing plans for expansion or relocation of services that would serve the project? If so, please describe the expansion or relocation.
Parks master plan has this information for future renovation updates and needed facilities.
- 4) Would the proposed project require the need to hire more staff or purchase equipment?
See above.
- 5) Would the department need to construct new facilities or expand existing facilities in order to accommodate the project's demand for parks and recreation services, based on the projected growth over the course of the next 20 years?
As population increases, they will want to maintain the parks space per population.
Parks Master Plan covers about 15 years in the future.
- 6) Does your department recommend standard criteria for assessing the significance of a proposed project's impacts in an EIR or other environmental impact documentation? If so, what are those criteria?
None. Projects would need more facilities and additional staff to accommodate growth.
- 7) Does the department have identified Developer Impact Fees for new development? If so, please describe the fees.
Have the developer impact fees from Stacy.
- 8) Please provide recommendations, if any, that could reduce the demand for parks and recreation services created by the proposed project.
Finding 3rd party operators for specialized sports facilities, which would help the parks department relieve a bit of work for staffing and maintenance.
- 9) Please provide any relevant current documents in the city including background reports, policy documents, and facility plans that you think would help with preparing the environmental review analysis for impacts to parks and recreation services as a result of the proposed project.
Sent responses and several documents.
Send link for Joe to upload documents.

1. Is there a standard service ratio (such as parks/recreation acreage per population) that the department wishes to maintain? Does the department currently meet that standard?

The General Plan 2030 update, developed in 2009, calls for 7 park acres per 1,000 people. The 2020 Parks Master Plan Update provided discussion on this topic. The Plan identified that the current population is 41,898 and current acreage is 264.35 acres. This includes right of ways, medians, and wall planters. This translates to 6.3 acres per 1,000 people. By looking at park acreage only, the acreage drops to 220.1 and the ratio to 5.24 acres per 1,000 people. Below, I provide some discussion on service area analysis which the 2020 Parks Master Plan emphasized is as important a metric to utilize as acreage per 1,000. The service area analysis ensures that 1. Residents are within the .25/.50-mile radius that pocket and neighborhood parks provide and 2. Limit park acreage expansion and thereby stress on limited staffing and resources. As Los Banos expands its focus should be on specialty/community/regional facilities as opposed to neighborhood or pocket parks. Pocket and Neighborhood parks will still be needed as large new subdivisions are developed, particularly on the perimeter of the city. The requirement of basins as part of larger subdivision stormwater collection systems will also inevitably require additional acreage. Presently basins developed as parks make up of 86.57 acres, which amounts to 39% of developed park acreage in Los Banos.

Based on the 2020 Parks Master Plan population forecast, the city will need to add 98 acres of park acreage by 2035. **For this reason, it is recommended to maintain the 6.3 acres per 1,000 people ratio**, as opposed to the 7 acres per 1,000 people. To meet this additional acreage the city should focus on the development of a regional sports complex and the continuation of the trail system. These additions will add significant acreage to the park acreage in Los Banos. A regional sports complex would offset costs of operation by providing revenue to the city, while an expanded trail system would become an attractive community-wide destination for new and current residents. The development of Ag Sports Complex would provide the addition of over 20 acres of park land. Trails are very expensive per square foot operationally and should be developed with a simple and sustainable design.

The 2030 General Plan also provides definitions for park types. These include:

- *Pocket Park: Defined as under an acre and intended to serve an area within a ½ mile radius.*
- *Neighborhood Park: Defined as 2-9 acres in size, serving .5-1.5-mile radius, avoiding any major barriers.*
- *Community Park: A community park, with a minimum of 10 acres in size and is intended to serve the entire community.*
- *Specialized use or Regional Park: A special recreation facility.*

The 2020 Park Master Plan altered these classifications for pragmatic purposes. The following changes were made. There is discussion of the definitions of the classifications on page 9-10 of the Parks Master Plan book.

- **Pocket Park:** The Pocket Park definition remained the same.
- **Neighborhood Park:** The Neighborhood Park classification was altered to focus less on acreage and more on usage. The primary reason being that the 2030 General Plan identified parks such as Gardens V Basin Park or Talbott Basin Park as Community Parks

due to acreage, while their characteristics and usage met Neighborhood Park definitions. Similarly, the 2030 General Plan identified Colorado Ballpark and 7th St. Ballpark as Neighborhood Parks, despite their use being specialized or community in definition.

- Community Park: The 2020 Parks Master Plan defined AG Sports Complex, Colorado Ballpark and Pacheco Park as Community Parks. This is due to their use as destination parks intended for community wide use.
- Specialty Park: The 2020 Parks Master Plan focused the Specialty Park classification on specific use recreation facilities. These would include Veterans Park, Henry Miller Plaza and the Miller and Lux building. These facilities separate themselves from a neighborhood park by memorializing or providing special recreation programming. They vary in size.
- Trails: The 2020 Parks Master Plan added the classification of Trails. This classification could fit in the Specialty Park Classification. The Rail Trail, Canal Trail, Page Extensions Trail, and associated pathways would fit into this category. The 2030 General Plan identified the Canal Trail and the Rail into separate classifications.
- No parks presently meet the definition of Regional Parks. AG Sports Complex is the most likely to develop into a regional facility, with over 20 acres of undeveloped land.
- It should also be noted that the acreage listed in the 2030 General Plan is inaccurate. For example, AG Sports Complex is 8.58 acres, but the undeveloped portion of the park is included to count 29.54 acres listed in the 2030 General Plan skewing the total acreage ratio.

There is a map diagram on page 11 of the 2020 Parks Master Plan that shows the service area analysis with .25, .5- and 1-mile service areas. The analysis shows that Los Banos has done an excellent job providing access to its residents. Neighborhood Parks (.50-mile radius) help to provide coverage for nearly the entire city. It will be important for the city to consider .25 mile and .50-mile service areas when adding new subdivisions and it should be a goal of the City to provide 100% coverage of the City via pocket and neighborhood park access. **One major factor identified in the 2030 General Plan and the 2020 Parks Master Plan is the importance of overlapping service area with major road crossings, notably the two state highways that cross the city.** For example, residents living in the Mission area behind the new Starbucks and Burger King should not be expected to cross Highway 165 to visit Davis Park, despite it being the closet park. Current service notes:

- The Colorado area (one playground at Big Page in the area; no neighborhood/pocket park in the area north of Colorado Ballpark). This could be addressed if development occurs to extend the Rail Trail or create a Trail along the Los Banos Creek.
- The south Oliveira and Gardens area presently provides adequate coverage but continued development in the Southeast will require identification of a future park.

- The addition of parks in the Sunrise Ranch and Shaunessy subdivisions will provide additional coverage to areas on the central/east side of the city.
- The Meadowlands subdivision is an example of too much park development. The area is overlapped by several parks and contains nearly 35 acres of park in one subdivision, it also includes: 5 parks and 7 playgrounds and countless park amenities. These park amenities cause a strain to the Lighting and Landscape budget when identifying assets for capital replacement. It further makes creating parks within the District in the Southpointe and Northpointe developments less practicable.

2. Are there any existing deficiencies, such as lack of staffing and/or facilities and equipment?

The primary deficiencies in parks and recreation are specialty facilities and staffing. Los Banos presently provides sufficient neighborhood park access and standard park amenities. **The city lacks specialty facilities such as: a splash pad, swimming pool, updated action sports park, fitness equipment, regional sports facility, pickleball/tennis courts.** The city would benefit from the addition of artificial soccer and baseball/softball fields to reduce the impact of staffing operations as compared to turf fields. The city recently added a dog park, which fulfilled a large need and there is demand for a second dog park in the future. A marquee playground that is fully ADA compliant is also a need. There is also a desire for an expanded/or connected trail system. There is also demand for additional shade and restrooms. Both park amenities come with significant construction costs and restrooms require significant operational cost.

When adding additional non-specialized/community acreage, it is vital that the acreage is within a Lighting and Landscape District to provide funding. The health of the LLDs is a vital source of funding for staffing and operations of parks in Los Banos. The addition of specialized or community acreage should come with the evaluation of possible revenue possibilities. These include rentable shade facilities and rentable athletic facilities. Facilities that will require a net loss, such as a swimming pool, will need to be offset by other funding sources 1. Limiting the expenses on-site (seasonal use, limiting free or subsidized swim use) 2. Maximizing revenue (rentable birthday party rooms or swim use) and 3. Be offset by revenue generated by other sources (athletic facilities, special funding revenues such as a recreation tax). If an amenity is too dependent on the General Fund, it will be vulnerable to economic downturns and will be most likely to be cut first.

Regarding staffing there is a deficiency in staffing:

City of Los Banos population: 40,000 (rounded down)
 2022 Full-Time Equivalents: 18.5
 9 FT and 2 PT – Parks Maintenance
 2 FT and 11 PT – Recreation
 1 FT Manager – Parks and Recreation

The table below shows that Los Banos is still below national categories by every metric regarding parks and recreation staffing.

| | | | |
|--|-----|--------------------------|------|
| National Average FTE per 10,000 Residents | 7.9 | Per Los Banos Population | 31.6 |
| Median Populations 20,000-49,999 FTE per 10,000 Residents | 8.9 | Per Los Banos Population | 35.6 |
| Lowest Quartile Populations 20,000-49,999 per 10,000 Residents | 5.3 | Per Los Banos Population | 21.2 |

3. Are there any existing plans for expansion or relocation of services that would serve the project? If so, please describe the expansion or relocation.

Yes, the most prominent is the addition of a splash pad and re-development of Pacheco Park. The re-development of Colorado Ballpark is also being looked at. Both projects come with substantial cost and require significant project management. The re-development of Pacheco Park would have the following project goals: incorporate multi-use to accommodate all age groups, project a welcoming and interesting image from Pacheco Blvd, allow access to existing and neighboring facilities, provide a comfortable rest stop for visitors, retain, and reinstate elements of the park’s historical feel and character, consider principles of safety, accessibility, security, and visibility and enable design for events and festivals. A splash pad would be the first of its kind in Los Banos.

The Colorado Ballpark redevelopment project includes the addition of Los Banos’ first pump track and renovation of on-site facilities. Project goals include Rejuvenate the park’s active recreation amenities, create memorable Los Banos Little League experience, provide a modern skate park, re-design tennis courts to include pickleball, create safe and well maintained amenities, consider principles of safety, accessibility, security and visibility and enable design for regional use.

The 2020 Parks Master Plan also provides conceptual designs for a regional complex, AG Sports Complex development and an aquatics center but these are very preliminary designs that I would recommend against using.

4. Would the proposed project require the need to hire more staff or purchase equipment?

Yes. The most imminent of the projects is the addition of the splash pad. This asset will impact staff heavily: The seasonal operation will require daily service, increase overtime expenditures, and require the addition of certified aquatics operation personnel. The addition of a contracted provider or staff member will be required for the splash pad’s operation. Increased use of both Colorado and Pacheco would create an impact on recreation and parks staff in terms of programming and clean-up. Sports field maintenance such as field chalking should be identified as a requirement of the park user. Lighting fees should also be required to offset electrical expenses.

The addition of a swimming pool or regional sports complex should come with an identified plan of impact. To limit impact a swimming pool facility should first seek a third-party operator. If a third-party operator is not available, then recreation programming and maintenance staff will need to be added to current staffing. A regional sports complex would also require the addition of maintenance and recreation programming staff due to the size of operation, however, revenue should offset the

additional expenses. In both cases the expansion of management would be required to oversee the operation.

5. Would the department need to construct new facilities or expand facilities in order to accommodate the projects demand for parks and recreation services, based on the projected growth over the course of the next 20 years?

Yes. Much of the available park acreage is presently tied up by basin acreage or is too near residential homes. For the addition of specialty facilities such as: sports fields, swimming pools, tennis courts and other recreation facilities new acreage will need to be added. Additionally, as noted above, additional acreage will be needed to meet park acreage ratio standards as population increases.

6. Does your department recommend standard criteria for assessing the significance of a proposed project's impacts in an EIR or other environmental impact documentation? If so, what are those criteria?

I think Stacy would be the best resource for this question. I do not believe there is a standard set for a project's impact environmentally. Rather, the City identifies if there are environmental issues on-site and addresses any needs at that time. Since 1988 there has only been one incidence of park development in Los Banos where the city developed new acreage, as opposed to a developer. That location is the .99-acre Dog Park, developed at AG Sports Complex. The city has initiated projects on already developed park land such as the Cresthills Arbor, Colorado Skate Park, 7th St. Restroom and Oliveira Soccer fields renovation. The City has also adopted or lease park property such as the HG Fawcett Canal Trail or the Rail Trail. Further, the City lacks any natural or wetland park acreage, though the development of a future trail along the Los Banos Creek corridor may change that.

7. Does the department have identified Developer Impact Fees for new development? If so, please describe the fees.

This question would be best answered by Stacy. There is a Development Impact Fee, but it is handled through the Community and Economic Development Department. The fee is critical to future capital funding for parks in Los Banos. There are essentially four funding sources for Los Banos Parks: 1. General Fund 2. Measure H 3. Park Development Fund 4. Lighting and Landscape Districts.

8. Please provide recommendations, if any, that could reduce the demand for parks and recreation services created by the proposed project.

As previously discussed, finding third-party operators is an ideal path to limiting expenses for items such as a pool. One of the best ways to reduce the impact of additional facilities is to generate revenue, which is why a regional sports complex makes the most sense as a long-term goal for the parks and recreation division. Los Banos has over 300 days of sun and is within 4 hours of at least 6 international airports and centrally located by the i-5 corridor.

In the case of a splash pad, it has been my suggestion that shade structures be rentable with non-exclusive use of the splash pad. This way the community can enjoy the splash pad at no cost, but birthday parties will be able to rent facilities in 4–8-hour time blocks and have an area to set up party supplies. This would generate \$8-12,000 per year and help offset chemical costs. It would not fully offset the cost of a splash pad.

- 9. Please provide any relevant current documents in the city including background reports, policy documents, and facility plans that you think would help with preparing the environmental review analysis for impacts to parks and recreation services as a result of the proposed project.**

The 2020 Parks Master Plan (Executive summary), (Page 5-32 shows a series of service area analyses), (Page 6-2 and 6-3 provides park acreage and park classification discussion), (Page 8-2-8-9 discusses development guidelines).

The 2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan (Page 9 Discusses key destinations, but utilizes 2030 General Plan Regional Facilities including Talbott and Gardens V due to acreage purposes. AG Sports Complex, Colorado Ballpark and Pacheco Park would be ideal locations to connect trail access to however, general connectivity would be the most important element. School access, as identified in the plan would also provide ideal connections), (Page 32-34 provides tables on proposed projects, including sidewalk widening projects), (Page 39 provides a proposed facility map).

The National Recreation and Park Association is an excellent source of parks references. The NRPA recommends one park per every 2,181 residents and 9.9 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

The Park List. Provides lists of amenities and acreage.

Urban Forest Management Draft Documents: I've attached some documents in draft form from our Urban Forest Management Plan creation. You'll see that for example the tree canopy covers 14% of the City.

Pacheco Park Concept: Submitted as part of the Statewide Park Program grant.

Colorado Ballpark Concept: Submitted as part of the Rural Rec and Tourism Grant.

(Parks Only, not including right of ways, medians, wall planters):

Park List:

| | |
|------------------------------|-------|
| 7th St. Ballpark | 5.92 |
| AG Sports Complex | 8.58 |
| Airport Park | 0.35 |
| Big Page Park | 1.23 |
| Catholic Park | 0.26 |
| Citrus I Park | 0.3 |
| Citrus II Basin Park | 2.4 |
| City Park | 1.03 |
| College Greens Park | 5.1 |
| Colorado Ballpark | 9.33 |
| Community Center | 4.31 |
| Cresthills Park | 4.21 |
| Davis Park | 0.7 |
| Flagpole Green Space | 0.62 |
| Gardens I Park | 0.75 |
| Gardens III Park | 0.86 |
| Gardens V Basin Park | 15.87 |
| Henry Miller Plaza | 2.63 |
| HG Fawcett Canal Trail | 19 |
| Jo Lin Basin Park | 4.16 |
| Lindemann Trail | 4.5 |
| Little Page Park | 0.18 |
| Meadowlands Basin Park | 24.4 |
| Meadowlans Courtyard | 1.01 |
| Meadowlands I Park | 0.61 |
| Meadowlands II Park | 4.38 |
| Meadowlands III Park | 3.44 |
| Miller and Lux Building | 0.15 |
| Oliveira Park & Courtyard | 8.72 |
| Neighborhood Park | 0.54 |
| Orchard Terrace Park | 1.17 |
| Pacheco Park | 6.02 |
| Page Extension Trail | 0.84 |
| Presidential Park | 0.43 |
| Rail Trail | 6.91 |
| Rail Trail Extensions | 6.66 |

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Rancho Dos Amigos Park | 0.62 |
| Ranchwood Park | 4.55 |
| Regency Lot D Park | 4.98 |
| Regency Tot Lot Park | 0.47 |
| Skylark Park & Expansion | 7.42 |
| Elena Talbott Basin Park | 9.19 |
| Verona Basin Park | 6.75 |
| Veterans Memorial Park | 2.16 |
| Village Park | 0.55 |
| Vineyard Basin A Park | 6.27 |
| Vineyard Basin B Park | 8.95 |
| Vineyard Basin C Park | 8.58 |
| Wolfsen Green Space | 2.04 |

