

Framework Review Form

Date: 5/16/24

Working Group: Arts, Culture, & Creativity

Working Group Members: Kris R, Yensi J, Lizzie W

Framework Title: Arts, Culture, & Creativity

In light of the **Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles** prepared by the GPAC and adopted by the City Council (<https://www.planpetaluma.org/documents#gpuvision>):

What are the most important policies in this framework? We recommend identifying the top 5 (or fewer) policies and ranking them in order of importance.

| Policy | Explanation |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.1 Integrate arts into city projects. | Chosen because it's an overarching policy that would promote the inclusion of arts across the city. Add a city staff person who would be a culture & art facilitator to provide continuity across sectors and projects. |
| 2.2 Establish public and private funding options. | Chosen because it's a method to ensure that art will be financially sustained. |
| 4.1 Create relevant and accessible public art | Chosen because it's overarching and includes other policies under this goal. Of particular interest is supporting multicultural arts and using art to connect east and west Petaluma; creation of multicultural center Explicitly name disadvantaged neighborhoods to be prioritized |
| 5.1 Expand the art, cultural and creative sectors | If we expand art/cultural/creative sectors, would also expand creative business: combine with 5.2 |
| 6.1 Incorporate creativity into city brand identity | Can be the north star to guide decision making and open door for more opportunities for creativity, can encourage new businesses |

What concerns do you have about the policies in this framework? For example, are they unclear? Should they be softened or strengthened? Do you disagree with the policy direction?

| Policy | Explanation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.1 Integrate arts into city projects. | Discussed having an arts facilitator / advocate, we don't have feasible it is but we think it is essential to have if city is to be successful in this endeavor |
| 2.2 Establish public and private funding options. | Comments from Public Arts Center that they were not included in any of this |
| 3.1.1 Conduct public art master plan building on the previous master plan | Clarify what the previous master plan entails and progress made thus far |
| 4.1 Create relevant and accessible public art | Action items mention youth, and should include older adults (activate senior center for that purpose) |

Members of the committee were not able to agree on direction for the following policies:

| Goal Policy, Action # | What were the areas on which there was no consensus |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Please submit this as a word document via email to cpaul@cityofpetaluma.org by **June 7, 2024**

Economic Development Framework

Working Group: Mary Dooley, Ali Gaylord, Sharon Kirk

1) Top 5 policies in order of importance:

Policy ED-4.5: Invest in Downtown

Firstly, if land owners leave vacant parcels and buildings with fences surrounding them for years, what is their incentive to become a contributing member? Create policy such as a vacancy tax to impose fines (the *stick*) on non-contributing properties. The monies raised would go into street beautification, street trees, etc.

There are many blighted properties downtown. These are just 3 examples.

This is what visitors to our downtown see when they enter from the south.



As they drive through on Washington, heading to the beach.



Implement an amnesty program, that allows blighted properties to be turned into temporary pop-up hubs for start-up businesses (the *carrot*). (See also policy ED-4.2: Encourage Retail & Businesses Near Residents). Temporary “buildings” might be buses, sidewalk kiosks (<https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2013/10/15/sidtv-episode-49-sidewalk-business-incubator.html>), container storefronts, etc.

Examples of quasi-temporary pop-ups in square in Portugal



With an existing downtown fully occupied with restaurants, shops, coffee houses, offices and creatives/makers, this encourages downtown expansion east of the river. Incentivize development of the land to the train station.

Review the mix of businesses downtown and create policy to maintain a functioning downtown serving residents as well as visitors. Rather than unlimited beauty salons, antique and thrift stores, encourage functional retail and incentivize or streamline approvals for food establishments.

Policy ED-2.6: Support Living Wage Job Growth

Goal is to reduce incoming commuter traffic. Enable people who work in Petaluma to live in Petaluma. Provide tax breaks to businesses that pay a living wage or are located near major transit. This policy complements efforts to bring more Affordable Housing to Petaluma.

Policy ED-4.1: Grow Hotel Stays and Tourism

Hotel stays in the heart of downtown will reduce visitor car trips and parking needs.

Brand Petaluma – “Made in Petaluma” - as a Food Hub from outside in (from the surrounding regional agriculture to shops and tables) and inside out (with products exported out of town for larger recognition). The center of culinary learning could start at the Petaluma Culinary Institute at the Fairgrounds– where ag comes to town. And expand on sources that come from our greenbelt into our best restaurants. Allow start up pop ups in high pedestrian traffic spaces to build our brand. Encourage ag centered maker spaces, food innovation hubs with incentives.

We have a track record of spawning great food and beverage brands (Three Twins Ice Cream, Cow Girl Creamery, Lagunitas, McEvoy Olive Oil, Hen House Brewing, Griffo Distillery). Let's make this our brand for economic development. We have a wealth of entrepreneurs who know what works, what doesn't. They can help us build the policies to make this happen.

Policy ED-4.2: Encourage Retail & Businesses Near Residents

Change the zoning to allow pop ups for startups and wealth building in retail deserts in certain residential zones. Align zoning and land use regulations to provide opportunities to add limited neighborhood-serving commercial space in or within close proximity to existing residential neighborhoods.

Highly-useful businesses offer in-person goods and services that the customers use at least once a month. For example - restaurants, grocery stores, drug stores, nail salons, and gyms.

See *Invest in Downtown*: Implement pilot program for small business on vacant lots and/or city owned properties. What about small groceries at the corner of neighborhood parks? Entrepreneurs willing to pilot the program could pay a nominal rent in exchange for robust (defined) reporting on outcomes of the pilot.

2) What concerns do you have about the policies in this framework? For example, are they unclear? Should they be softened or strengthened? Do you disagree with the policy direction?

A. Policy ED-1.3: Ensure Water and Sewer Capacity

Concerned not because it isn't of utmost importance for a growing functioning city, but because it is so obvious that we have it. Why is this included in EDF as a policy? Is it not a thing that exists that requires meeting the growth needs of the town. Is the maximum growth potential calculated within vertical limits and within the limits by the UGB horizontally?

B. "Based on land use policies of the General Plan..."

Please omit in general as a preamble to policy. The policy goals should be driving land use policies. These reads like it's the other way around...as though we can adopt/implement the policies only if the GP allows.

C. Trim the policies overall.

There is a lot of overlap and redundancy. There is far more on the list that can possibly accomplished by staff. Create a coherent limited set of policies and related actions that we have a hope of achieving in the next 20 years.

D. Most of our concerns are about the action items.

Many seem to be hard to implement. Two examples follow:

Policy ED-1.7: Support Just Transition Efforts to support workers as industries change over time.
How does this get implemented?

Action ED-1.7.1: Participate in current or future regional collaborations to develop an inclusive and just transition strategy to shift towards regenerating industries while maintaining jobs for existing industry workers.

This has no teeth. Isn't this at its core, an issue of education? This is best left to the area schools (SRJC, SSU)?

Some policies are missing obvious actions that might actually make a difference. One example follows:

Policy ED-5.1: Concentrate Development Near SMART Stations

Additional actions for this policy:

- Implement reduction in fees, taxes for some number of jobs housed near station.
- Update zoning so that single-family homes are not allowed in new development within X miles of a SMART station. (We should reward people who are willing to forgo car ownership with transportation options near their homes. We must not squander land near stations to

build single-family homes. This is so contrary to any consideration of the greater good and must be reflected in our zoning ordinances.)

3) Least Favorite Policies

Policy ED-1.2: Maintain Industrial Land Inventory Action

ED-1.2.3: Consider expanding the Urban Growth Boundary to create more available land for employment and light industrial uses.”

Vehemently disagree with this policy of expanding the Urban Growth Boundary and cannot believe it is a suggestion after two years of input from GPAC and public.

Policy ED-4.3: Support Shopping Centers as Community Hubs

Disagree with this policy. No new shopping centers. Decentralize and infiltrate neighborhoods. Eliminate oceans of asphalt.

Shopping centers as community hubs seems to be a bit of red herring in the pursuit of 15-minute neighborhoods. As currently realized, shopping centers are not conducive to access on foot or bike. They are all parking lots forward. Oceans of asphalt.

Transit analysis (Jarrett Walker et al) shows that parking lot forward “destinations” are never a destination for bus riders, for example. Retail must be on the street and parking lots behind to encourage active and public transit.

If we want to build community wealth, intergenerational wealth we need to enable storefront businesses in neighborhoods. It is too expensive to rent commercial space in Petaluma for most small start-ups.

Any additional uses of shopping centers MUST be tied to multi-modal improvements; all new development on the street frontage? All new uses must encourage leaving the car at home. (We need to stop being fearful of the MUST word!)

Why would a property owner change anything in a successful mall?

Policy ED-5.3: Develop Industrial Sites Near Highway 101

Disagree with this policy unless industry can prove annually to be a clean industry and a carbon neutral industry.

Economic Development Policy Framework

Draft for Public Review

March 2024

Type text here

NOTE:

Comments from Bill Rinehart are included in boxes on the following pages. Only pages with comments are included

We are creative. We build an environment that promotes beauty, resilient architecture, and inventive design citywide, where art, crafts, design, and economic innovation thrive.

We are forward-thinking leaders. By achieving carbon neutrality in 2030, we demonstrate that equitable, carbon-neutral, regenerative communities and economies are possible through action and collaboration with other cities, communities, and our region.

Pillars

Equity, Justice, and Demographic Changes. Current demographic trends indicate that Petaluma will have an older, more diverse population well into the future. Petaluma commits to advancing social and economic justice to create an inclusive and equitable city in which all can thrive.

Guiding Principles

There are a total of sixteen Guiding Principles, each with multiple, lettered Supporting Concepts. The following Guiding Principles and Supporting Concepts informed this policy framework:

15. Advance a forward-looking economic development strategy that focuses on diversity, opportunity, innovation, and resilience.

- a. Recognize that economic development, self-sufficiency, and resilience are vital to the City's overall prosperity and fiscal health – and critical for accomplishing other City goals and programs.
- b. Pursue “green” jobs and industries that help address the climate emergency and advance a closed-loop, circular local economy.
- c. Support small, local, and BIPOC-owned¹¹ businesses through a variety of strategies including the potential for incubation spaces and mentorship.
- d. Support the creative reuse of vacant and underutilized spaces to build the local economy and support other city goals and initiatives.
- e. Achieve a jobs-housing balance in the city by expanding job opportunities that match the skills of residents, providing living-wage jobs and affordable housing, and encouraging new work models such as working from home or coworking.
- f. Incentivize employing local residents, contractors, and service providers.

Other Relevant Guiding Principles

15.g. protect and capitalize on the asset that is the historic integrity of our downtown and neighborhoods

3. c. Celebrate the role of the Petaluma River in the city's history, economy, recreation, and development patterns.
3. d. Recognize that the future economic, social, cultural, and environment of Petaluma is intertwined with the river.
4. Promote social and economic justice to address structural social and economic inequities and racism.
5. b. Guarantee individual and community food security, including equitable access to healthy, local food.
5. c. Support local farmers and food businesses.
10. j. Encourage and facilitate outdoor opportunities for dining, retail, and other uses by downtown business.

Action ED-1.1.1: Conduct regular collaboration with and outreach to brokers and industry representatives from these targeted industry clusters to identify shared challenges and opportunities at the local and regional levels.

Action ED-1.1.2: Regularly analyze resident occupations and industries of employment to align business growth and retention efforts with creating job opportunities within Petaluma for residents.

Action ED-1.1.3: Update the City's Economic Development Strategic Plan every five years to assess changing conditions and opportunities, adjust the City's approach to economic development activities, examine the relationship between economic development and fiscal health, and adjust business and industry targets for growth and retention.

Policy ED-1.2: Maintain Industrial Land Inventory

Maintain and expand inventory of land available for industrial and flex space suitable for the needs of local businesses.

Action ED-1.2.1: Monitor the remaining inventory of vacant and underutilized land zoned for industrial uses.

Action ED-1.2.2: Examine options for expanding and redeveloping the inventory of land zoned for industrial uses if few remaining well-positioned opportunity sites exist for development and reinvestment.

Action ED-1.2.3: Consider expanding the Urban Growth Boundary to create more available land for employment and light industrial uses.

Policy ED-1.3: Ensure Water and Sewer Capacity

Ensure adequate water supply and sewer capacity exists to support businesses.

Action ED-1.3.1: Maintain adequate water and wastewater facilities and capacity planning and funding.

Policy ED-1.4: Foster Office Development

Foster office development and investment in Downtown Petaluma.

Action ED-1.4.1: Establish policies and programs that incentivize the development of office space in Downtown Petaluma via new construction and conversion of existing buildings.

Policy ED-1.5: Streamline Business Permitting

Streamline and/or expedite permitting for local businesses contributing to the local tax base and/or providing jobs.

Action ED-1.5.1: Adopt and implement a streamlined permit process, including definitions of applicable permit types and criteria for qualification.

ED-1.5.2: prioritize or subsidize application processing for re-purposing historic resources and downtown buildings

ED-1.6.4: encourage and facilitate adaptive re-use of existing buildings, especially historic resources

Policy ED-1.6: Grow Ecologically Sustainable Businesses

Focus resources to encourage business growth and entrepreneurship in industries aligned with Petaluma's industry strengths and opportunities for ecologically sustainable businesses, such as agriculture, green building, renewable energy, and green manufacturing.

Action ED-1.6.1: Maintain or expand business, broker, and developer contacts to monitor and address potential constraints to the ongoing growth of these industries, including zoning, land supply, transportation, and infrastructure.

Action ED-1.6.2: Identify growth opportunities through one-on-one contacts with business owners, brokers, and industry representatives, and participation in industry organizations and convenings.

Action ED-1.6.3: Focus business recruitment and support resources on green industry businesses that are providing good-paying jobs and support diverse levels of educational attainment among their workforce.

Action ED-1.6.4: Explore opportunities to partner with other organizations to create an incubation center for the "circular economy," providing affordable spaces and creative opportunities for businesses focused on repair, mending, skill-sharing, and closed-loop manufacturing.

Policy ED-1.7: Support Just Transition Efforts

Support "just transition" efforts to support workers as industries change over time.

Action ED-1.7.1: Participate in current or future regional collaborations to develop an inclusive and just transition strategy to shift towards regenerating industries while maintaining jobs for existing industry workers.

Policy ED-1.8: Strengthen Innovations to Shorten Supply Chains

Strengthen process innovations among regional businesses to shorten supply chains.

Action ED-1.8.1: Explore the possibility of integrating supply chain considerations into a Made in Petaluma and/or Made in Sonoma County certification program, and/or partner with organizations promoting locally made goods.

Action ED-1.8.2: Establish or maintain partnerships with regional industry groups, including industry-specific groups sponsored by the Sonoma County Economic Development Board such as the Outdoor Recreation Group and Technology Industry Group.

Policy ED-1.9: Encourage Food Industry Business Collaboration

Encourage collaboration between food industry businesses.

Action ED-1.9.1: Regularly participate in and partner with Naturally North Bay and other efforts to convene businesses in the food cluster to identify common supply chain issues or other needs that could be addressed through public or collective action.

Action ED-1.9.2: Participate in regional certification programs for locally produced goods to market and drive consumption towards locally supplied and created food and artisan goods.

Policy ED-3.3: Prepare Fiscal Impact Studies

Prepare citywide and project-specific fiscal impact studies as needed to provide information on progress in sustaining net positive City revenues.

Action ED-3.3.1: Develop and implement requirements for citywide and project-specific fiscal impact studies.

Goal ED-4: Destination City

General comment: leverage and protect the asset which is the historic integrity of our downtown and neighborhoods

Ensure that Petaluma is a preeminent destination for local residents and regional, state, and national visitors by providing desirable retail offerings and unique experiences.

Policy ED-4.1: Grow Hotel Stays and Tourism

Support the continued growth of hotel stays, hospitality, and tourism in Petaluma to increase external spending in Petaluma's economy.

Action ED-4.1.1: Initiate a focused process to identify and leverage opportunities to amplify the role of the Petaluma River in attracting visitors and retail uses.

Action ED-4.1.2: Closely collaborate with local tourism organizations such as Visit Petaluma and Sonoma County Tourism to promote Petaluma's tourism assets and hotels.

Action ED-4.1.3: Invest City resources to beautify and promote Petaluma's historic downtown and other business areas.

Action ED-4.1.4: Create and maintain attractive gateways and excellent wayfinding signage for visitors arriving via Highway 101.

Action ED-4.1.5: Study the adequacy of Petaluma's hotel supply during updates to the Economic Development Strategic Plan, including consideration of whether the market is oversupplied, or whether particular hotels require reinvestment/repositioning.

Policy ED-4.2: Encourage Retail & Businesses Near Residents

Encourage the creation of retail and business spaces for a variety of businesses throughout neighborhoods such that day-to-day needs are accessible to residents without driving.

Action ED-4.2.1: Perform evaluations of Petaluma's opportunities to expand/enhance "15-minute neighborhoods" every three years, identifying development opportunities and transportation improvements to increase accessibility for all Petaluma residents.

Action ED-4.2.2: Based on land use policies of the General Plan, align zoning and land use regulations to provide opportunities to add limited neighborhood-serving commercial space in or within close proximity to existing residential neighborhoods.

Action ED-4.2.3: Conduct retail studies to develop area-specific analyses of retail markets in sub-areas of the City to identify which NAICS code uses are most appropriate or most needed in each location, including Petaluma Boulevard North, Petaluma Blvd South, and North McDowell (north of

Corona) where retail is desired. Explore incentives, and opportunities, forecast demand, and identify barriers to attracting small businesses and tenants to retail spaces.

Policy ED-4.3: Support Shopping Centers as Community Hubs

Support reinvestment in shopping centers as pedestrian-friendly community gathering spaces and as mixed-use retail and housing communities.

Action ED-4.3.1: Review and update, if necessary, the zoning of these shopping centers to encourage development flexibility and enhance options for incorporating a broader mix of uses.

Action ED-4.3.2: Regularly update development and design standards to require pedestrian-friendly design and amenities in shopping centers.

Action ED-4.3.3: Monitor the sales tax performance and vacancy rates in shopping centers for performance concerns; conduct outreach to owners regarding reinvestment and reuse options and provide supportive City services for property owners pursuing reinvestment in centers.

Action ED-4.3.4: Clarify the City's zoning and permitted use intentions for these shopping centers to increase certainty for private developers while recognizing that private lease agreements or land covenants may restrict adaptive uses.

Action ED-4.3.5: Ensure design and building standards for ground-floor commercial space in new mixed-use development projects that promote spaces that are sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of multiple kinds of tenants, including consideration of restaurant needs.

Action ED-4.3.6: Retain retail-centric economist services to advise on retail as initiatives are undertaken and development applications are received and evaluated.

Policy ED-4.4: Prioritize Investment in Unique Local Retail

Prioritize investment in local retail spaces to cultivate unique experiences that distinguish themselves from the online shopping experience.

Action ED-4.4.1: Undertake a community planning and policy effort to define and cultivate the role of the Petaluma River in the commercial district and place-making efforts—providing a unique experience for Petaluma shoppers and visitors.

Action ED-4.4.2: Consider the creation of a local retail business assistance low-interest loan program.

Action ED-4.4.3: Review land use definitions and other City regulations to ensure small business owners can readily undertake a variety of activities in a single storefront space, such as combined sales, artisanal production, exhibitions/performance, and/or shipping.

Policy ED-4.5: Invest in Downtown

Invest in Downtown Petaluma so that it is a safe, inviting community and regional destination for retail, nightlife, tourism, and creative businesses.

1. Facade improvement program
2. Encourage adaptive re-use of historic structures
3. subsidize processing of historic resources

Action ED-4.5.1: Improve and maintain Downtown Petaluma as a clean, well-lighted place by investing in creating and maintaining high-quality public spaces and sidewalks, and ensuring private properties are safe and well-lit.

Action ED-4.5.2: Emphasize well-designed ground floor commercial space in downtown areas, via the use of development incentives such as density bonuses or height bonuses.

Action ED-4.5.3: Encourage developers and property owners to build/maintain small square-footage retail spaces to maximize occupancy in the Downtown Petaluma commercial area.

Action ED-4.5.4: Explore the adoption of “formula” or “chain” retail controls in Downtown Petaluma and other selected areas of the city.

Action ED-4.5.5: Maintain close collaboration and coordination with the Petaluma Downtown Association and area businesses to identify opportunities for business support, promotion, maintenance, service, and code enforcement needs.

Action ED-4.5.6: Maintain and invest in the public realm of Downtown Petaluma and adjacent districts to encourage pedestrian circulation and storefront visibility/access.

Action ED-4.5.7: Implement Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) program and appropriate technology solutions to enhance community safety and support economic development in Downtown Petaluma.

Action ED-4.5.8: Design and implement creative programs to address safety issues related to Downtown alcohol establishments.

Policy ED-4.6: Attract Visitors to Downtown

Direct marketing resources towards attracting visitors to Downtown Petaluma, and promoting its retail, nightlife, and tourism businesses.

Action ED-4.6.1: Consider partnering with other organizations to complete a Downtown Petaluma branding study and marketing strategy.

Action ED-4.6.2: Collaborate with the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Petaluma Association, Sonoma County Tourism, and other regional partners to amplify the reach of tourism marketing efforts.

Action ED-4.6.3: Incorporate Downtown Petaluma in all local and collaborative marketing and promotion efforts.

Action ED-4.6.4: Explore working with the State California Cultural Districts program to establish downtown and adjacent areas as arts district(s), cultural district(s), or similar designations; consider the promotion of arts uses along the Petaluma River.

ED-4.6.5 Promote/leverage and protect the historic integrity of our downtown and historic neighborhoods

Framework Review Form

Date:

Working Group: Health, Equity, and Environmental Justice

Working Group Members: Iliana, Kris, Josh

Framework Title: [Health, Equity, and Environmental Justice Policy Framework

In light of the **Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles** prepared by the GPAC and adopted by the City Council (<https://www.planpetaluma.org/documents#gpuvision>):

What are the most important policies in this framework? We recommend identifying the top 5 (or fewer) policies and ranking them in order of importance.

| Policy | Explanation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| HEE J-2 Leader in equity. In particular Community Engagement. The city needs a Community Engagement Director/Manager. City needs a Community Engagement Manual | We agreed that robust community engagement and leadership development should be immediate priorities because they enable everything else. Without community engagement and leadership we go nowhere. Building it (via trusted relationships with valued non-profits) and sustaining it is the only way forward. For example: If we are to expand access to transit, we need to talk to the people who need more transit. If we want to address the needs of disadvantaged neighborhoods, we need to people who live in them. We need regular/ongoing engagement: “We need to be willing to fail until we succeed” |
| Advance health in all policies | Don’t forget the LGBTQ community. Don’t forget older adults. |
| Housing as a matter of health, equity and environmental justice | Safe and Sanitary Housing 6.1 Improve Housing Quality 6.2 Reduce Homelessness 6.3 Increase housing resilience |

What concerns do you have about the policies in this framework? For example, are they unclear? Should they be softened or strengthened? Do you disagree with the policy direction?

| Policy | Explanation |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Concern that there is no language that describes success. What’s the metric? How will we know we’re successful? | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>3.1 Minimize air pollution Josh Look at indoor air quality – Covid and flu – especially in schools</p> | <p>Doesn't mention anything about indoor air quality, especially in the schools. Critical for health in light of the COVID crisis.</p> |
| <p>No mention of mental health as a focus No specific call out of disadvantaged neighborhoods, will the GP highlight actions on their behalf?</p> | |

Members of the committee were not able to agree on direction for the following policies:

| <p>Goal Policy, Action #</p> | <p>What were the areas on which there was no consensus</p> |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>We think they are all important</p> | |
| | |
| | |

Please submit this as a word document via email to cpaul@cityofpetaluma.org by **June 7, 2024**.

Framework Review Form

Date: 5/16/24 **Working Group:** Historic Resources **Working Group Members:** Kris R, Yensi J, Lizzie W
Framework Title: Historic Resources

In light of the **Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles** prepared by the GPAC and adopted by the City Council (<https://www.planpetaluma.org/documents#gpuvision>):

What are the most important policies in this framework? We recommend identifying the top 5 (or fewer) policies and ranking them in order of importance.

| Policy | Explanation |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Goal HR 1 | All of policies are essential and in order for them to be realized, we support Bill Reinhart's suggestion that a historic resources program should be established and funded to be proactive (v reactive) to appreciating and supporting historic preservation in our city. |
| 2.1 Identify and designate historical resources | Be more explicit in inclusion of all things about the river; prioritize rehabilitating the trestle should be named in the general plan |
| 3.1 Encourage retrofit and rehabilitation | We are assuming this would also encourage compatible adaptive reuse |
| 4.1 Protect archaeological resources | It's the right thing to do |
| 5.2 Celebrate all of Petaluma's history | Yes, making everyone's contributions are recognized and celebrated Reference recommendations from City of Petaluma Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging AD HOC COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE |

What concerns do you have about the policies in this framework? For example, are they unclear? Should they be softened or strengthened? Do you disagree with the policy direction?

| Policy | Explanation |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.3 Promote heritage tourism | Unsure of the extent to which our history is known; enough to create a robust experience? |
| | |
| | |

Members of the committee were not able to agree on direction for the following policies:

| Goal Policy, Action # | What were the areas on which there was no consensus |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| | |

Please submit this as a word document via email to cpaul@cityofpetaluma.org by **June 7, 2024**

June 6, 2024

Petaluma General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

Parks and Open Space Workgroup

Summary Recommendations and comments provided on the “Natural Environment” and “Parks and Recreation” draft policy frameworks

A. Introduction

- a. This document includes a compilation of comments, suggestions, recommendations made by participants in the work-group (42 people).
- b. Many of the comments are general in nature, relating more to the organization of the framework than specific Goals/Policies/Actions.
- c. An attempt has been made to assign them to specific Goals/Policies/Actions, but several remain in the General category for the team to best assign.
- d. There is also a section of “What’s Missing”, things that the work group feels should be added.
- e. The document is split into 3 sections: for each of the subject policy frameworks
 - i. General Comments (both frameworks)
 - ii. What’s Missing? (sub-section in each framework)
 - iii. Notes on specific Goals, Policies, and Actions included in the draft frameworks (sub-section in each framework)

B. General recommendations on both frameworks:

- a. There is general agreement and disappointment it seems the recommendations provided by this workgroup in the Fall of 2022 were not reviewed or considered in the development of these policy frameworks
 - i. The summary of the 2022 recommendations will be attached to this document. While out-of-date, the content and sentiment still represent the consensus of the work group
- b. Re-name these two elements. Re-arrange and re-categorize Goals so that:
 - i. “Parks and recreation” should be about providing and maintaining facilities and services on public and quasi-public lands
 - ii. Change “Natural Environment” to “Natural Features, Systems and Resources” this is about the physical environment, wildlife, natural features, and systems throughout the city, on all Public and Private lands. See definition of “Natural Resources” below
 1. No reason to have an element titled “natural environment” when 95% of natural features occur in un-natural (altered or disturbed) landscapes, or on private lands out of city’s control
- c. Goals are not specific or directive enough. Too general and high level.

- d. Several actions and policies are miss-matched and do not align with their goals (should be moved or re-arranged), some need to be separated (too many unrelated ideas in single action or policy), many need clarification to be useful, some are just nonsense and fluff
- e. Definitions of Open Space and Natural Resources should be revised, closer to what was provided in original workgroup recommendations:
 - i. Open Space: In general, “Open Space” in Petaluma includes all outdoor areas, whether public or private, natural or developed, urban or rural. These are the places where ecological systems, wildlife, and people interact. They include intact riparian corridors, ball fields, urban plazas, parking lots, and everything in between.
 - ii. “Natural Resources” are all living and organic materials, organisms, and systems that contribute to the local and global environment and ecological systems. They may be naturally occurring, installed, or have migrated from outside the region. These include, but are not limited to the flora, fauna, soils, waters, and people of Petaluma.
 - 1. Some believe “Resource” is only an “extractive” term.
 - 2. Others believe there are multiple definitions of “Resource” and it is the best word to encompass the subject
- f. There are too many action items to “develop a plan... Identify, explore...” No specific actions or recommendations provided.
 - i. When will all of this take place? who will do it? and how will it be funded?
 - ii. When possible, also identify potential nexus for funding and opportunities to conduct the “studies”
 - 1. As part of development agreements?
 - 2. General plan update EIR? or zoning update
- g. There is too much “Promotion, Encouragement, consideration” but no “Requirements”
- h. Similar with “Monitor, collaborate, engage” Who does all of this? Need to assign this role, or acknowledge that there is no one and make it a goal to establish a city officer
- i. In general, these frameworks lack any teeth and are too soft. The policies need to be objective and stand up in court

C. Comments on “Natural Environment” framework

- a. What is Missing?
 - i. This Framework needs to be representative of how we honor our environment and communicate our relationship to the natural environment, and be Inspiring!

- ii. Petaluma's context as a "Watershed Valley" needs to be more evident
- iii. Special Status Species are not adequately addressed
- iv. Need a goal to consider an integration of Parks, Urban Forestry, Public Works & Utilities so that we can have a common mission that includes natural features as infrastructure, equal in value to utilities
- v. No Tables or Figures (needs to be coordinated with "Land Use" framework)
 - 1. If this is about "Natural Environments, features, systems..." need supporting graphics and maps
 - 2. All open space opportunities, corridors, connections, need to be shown on General Plan Land Use (GPLU) Map
 - 3. Should natural systems and features be inventoried by political boundaries (voting districts)? Or should these analyses be conducted in a bio-regional context (apart from political boundaries)?
 - 4. Wildlife corridors must be mapped and included in all land-use and development considerations
 - 5. Need to Identify "Priority Open Spaces" and include on maps. These can be for recreational opportunity or ecological value
- vi. The word "Tree" occurs 1 time in the entire document, as a footnote...
 - 1. Incorporate "Urban Forest" G/P/A's in this element
 - 2. There has been more input on trees than any other feature
 - 3. Trees relate to so many of the other GP elements, should perhaps be a stand-alone element (definitely mentioned in many others)
 - 4. Strengthen policies and actions relating to Urban Forestry (see specifics in "Parks" notes)
- vii. Add Definitions and in some cases add sub-classifications for:
 - 1. Open Space
 - 2. Natural Resources
 - 3. Wildlife corridor
 - 4. Waterway
 - 5. Urban Forest
 - 6. Heritage tree
 - 7. Street Tree
 - 8. Protected Tree
 - 9. Rewilding
- viii. Create land use overlays/easement categories for ecologically beneficial portions of private land that can be applied to new developments or title transfers
 - a. Need to identify and map these lands

- b. Include strong language/policies that discourage or prohibit destruction of valuable natural resources
 - ix. New Policy that new Urban developments must include or contribute to public open space/plazas and natural systems (trees)
 - 1. Identify opportunities to add micro-parks in existing urban environments
 - x. Policy to find opportunities to establish ecologically beneficial and climate mitigating landscapes
 - 1. plant trees where appropriate on otherwise un-useful lands
 - 2. re-plant/replace un-sustainable landscapes
 - 3. Nothing about “Re-Wilding” under-utilized lands
 - xi. Many of the policies and actions are simple regurgitations of law (occasionally inconsistent with actual law)
 - xii. Add a G/P/A to “Reduce the urban heat island”
 - xiii. Establish a land use overlay for “Ecological Benefit Zones”
- b. Specific G/P/A's in the draft:
 - i. ENV-1 Community integrated with nature
 - 1. Need policy that city staff is well informed and empowered to be creative in finding ways to support natural resources and systems.
 - 2. There needs to be an action to create a Natural Resources Commission, this will enable us to find a way to better manage and coordinate open space and natural systems related issues
 - a. Commission approves which consultants conduct environmental review of development applications
 - 3. Consider a “Right of other species” policy
 - 4. A lot of opportunity here, but nothing provided
 - 5. Needs policies and actions that require development to integrate ecological systems and natural features
 - 6. Env-1.1 sys nothing. What are the metrics that “demonstrate stewardship” how does this guide action?
 - ii. ENV-2 Healthy protected, productive natural lands
 - 1. Our waterways need to be considered as living corridors which extend beyond the water’s edge and often beyond the banks, consider the entire habitat of the riparian corridor and define the margins on a map
 - 2. The upper reach of Petaluma River includes some of the most valuable and ecologically “natural” landscape yet it is not mentioned here.
 - 3. We have very little “natural” land, change this title and think about what is the real purpose of the goal

4. Add Policies to place zoning overlay over portions of development to create “Ecological Benefit Easements” so that new development contributes to this “network”
5. Need to identify ecologically valuable landscapes and features and designate on maps
6. Env-2.1.3: how? what is the nexus / mechanism for this engagement? What department?
7. ENV-2.2 If this is not done during GPU land use analysis, when is it done, and who does it?
8. Add policy to “down-zone” and/or acquire lands with significant natural features, habitat, native ecology...

iii. ENV-3 Water Resources

1. This needs to reflect that we are “Stewards of a non-polluted watershed”
2. Need stronger policy to protect our wells and groundwater
3. Acknowledge the danger of Forever Chemicals and PFAS
4. 3.1. Many of these actions are simple regurgitation of laws
5. 3.2 Protecting the River and Creeks needs to be elevated to a goal, with many policies and actions
 - a. River and creeks represent our best opportunity for GHG reduction in recreation, and also connectors between East and West Petaluma
 - b. add setbacks, buffers,
 - c. Define entire riparian corridor for all waterways
 - d. Add/develop classifications of river frontage (urban, intact ecology, restoration zone...) with related policies and actions for specific uses
 - i. Where access should occur (or not)
 - e. 3.2.1 Update River Access and Enhancement Plan? Is this enough? Does it need to also include strategies for general development/land-use along all waterways?
 - i. A riverfront development moratorium was proposed so this could be analyzed, but it was deferred to the GPU process. Why is it not happening now?
 - ii. When the REAP was originally developed, scientific analysis was limited to the water’s edge, needs to go beyond

- f. 3.2.4 “Bolster Signage” to protect the creek? Think about what we really need? Interpretive/Informational exhibits? A lot of clutter?
 - g. 3.2.6 develop a palette of plants appropriate for use in Petaluma’s riparian corridors (considering bank stabilization, habitat)
 - 6. 3.3 ...Follow the law...
 - 7. Action 3.4.1 should be a policy and should be expanded with additional actions
 - a. There are already decent guidebooks (Start at The Source, Bay Friendly, Sonoma County/Santa Rosa SUSMP) Since we are in BAASMA jurisdiction we don’t use these, but they are useful. we don’t need to reinvent
 - b. Develop and adopt landscape-based Stormwater Management BMP’s that are more ecologically beneficial than BAASMA’s
 - i. For use on public and private projects
 - c. Stormwater management facilities should not get in the way of actual landscapes (tree plantings and micro-climate or ecologically beneficial landscapes). They need to serve more than engineering purposes
 - 8. This Goal needs to be supported by additional policies and actions regarding:
 - a. Recycled water
 - b. IPM
 - c. Appropriate plant selection(see original recommendations)
 - d. Rainwater harvesting and storage
 - e. Groundwater
- iv. ENV-4 Green infrastructure add “to create healthy, livable and comfortable micro-climates throughout”
 - 1. Env-4.1 All C.I.P.s should integrate green principals
 - 2. 4.1.2 How about trees? Green walls, roofs, etc. are expensive, high maintenance, not really appropriate for public facilities
 - 3. 4.1.3 fee reductions for following existing laws?
 - 4. 4.1.5 the word “Native” is not useful here it is far too limiting in Petaluma
 - a. A policy on “appropriate plant selection” would be good. See original recommendations
 - 5. Env 4.1.6 Again overlooking the value of Trees
 - 6. 4.1.7 WTF does this mean?

- v. Goal ENV-5 What opportunities are there? Identify the nexus
 - 1. We need to ensure we are responsible, as a way to honor indigenous people, not just acknowledge the heritage of the lands

D. Parks

- a. General Comments on Parks/Rec framework:
 - i. This really needs to be about the providing and managing the facilities and services for publicly accessible open spaces and recreational lands (active and passive)
 - ii. Goals/policies/actions related to natural features and systems should be moved to “Natural Systems and Resources”
 - iii. There is not enough to support facilities and accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities. Key issues:
 - 1. Accessibility
 - 2. Facilities
 - 3. Public restrooms
 - iv. The definitions provided are incomplete, badly worded and not useful. It doesn’t matter that they are from official government sources, they do not reflect the meaning of parks to Petaluma
- b. What is missing
 - i. Little to no mention of
 - 1. Health and livability
 - 2. Micro-climate control and management
 - 3. Habitat and wildlife mobility
 - 4. Carbon sequestration
 - 5. Heat island reduction
 - 6. Connections to nature
 - 7. Outdoor education
 - 8. Management/maintenance
 - 9. Dog Parks
 - 10. Wildlife viewing
 - 11. Micro-farming/community gardening
 - 12. Exercise courses (all ages)
 - 13. Restrooms
 - 14. Ecological systems
 - ii. Parks classifications
 - 1. Add “Urban parks and plazas”
 - 2. Add a classification for “un-developed accessible open space”
 - 3. Dog Park
 - 4. Community Garden

5. Mention Streets as the primary public realm, should be designed and maintained like parks
 6. Habitat and wildlife mobility corridors (need zoning overlay)
 7. Acknowledge the value of natural features on private lands (significant trees, drainages, corridors, native ecologies)
- iii. Need a Goal to analyze overall management and the relationship between Parks and Public Works/Utilities so that we can have a common mission
 - iv. Need a Goal about “Water sources and use” (see original recommendations)
 1. Irrigation \efficiency
 - a. Prioritize trees in drought conditions
 2. Reclaimed water
 3. Rainwater harvesting and storage
 4. Water conserving infrastructure
 5. Groundwater recharge
 6. Stormwater management (treatment and detention)

c. Notes on Specific Parks Goals

- i. P-1 and P-2 should be re-arranged so one is clearly about “Improving and Maintain Parks, Rec Facilities and services”, and one is clearly about “acquiring lands, expanding the system and services”
 1. P1.1 Parks master plan also needs to be about maintenance and management, with standards for equipment, furnishings, irrigation, a plant palette to facilitate, design and maintenance (maybe a separate “Master Plan”)
 - a. Maintenance of existing facilities and providing accessible, safe facilities needs to be top priority over “expansion of system”
 2. Several actions and policies, are miss-matched, need to be separated and clarified, some are just nonsense and fluff
 3. “Proposed Parks” table and map are missing key lands
 - a. Stuart St. Pocket Park purchase from Caltrans
 - b. Adobe Golf Course and parcel next to PGE substation?
 - c. Fairgrounds
 - d. Strips of undeveloped land adjacent to Eastside walkway
 - e. Parcels on Adobe Creek
 - f. 18-acre Parcel next to Casa Grande High School
 4. Need a G/P/A mechanism for down-zoning and acquiring ecologically valuable lands and resources for park land
- ii. P-3 River Recreation

1. Include the value/opportunities of the upper reaches and tributaries
 2. This should be about all waterways
 3. Provide a classification system for waterways
 4. Restore the trestle as the major urban interface between downtown and the river
 5. Provide continuous riverside trails where appropriate and establish zones where they are not
 6. Require Public Access Easements for all riverside development
 7. Restore riparian ecologies and wildlife corridors
 8. Maintain barrier free waterfront
- iii. P-4 Interconnected Parks and Facilities
1. P-4.1 is 10 policies in one, need to break down and add actions
 2. P-4.3 include the river corridor and other waterways
 - a. Also require wildlife mobility corridors
- iv. P-5 should also include “Sustainable and Efficient” with policies about BMP’s, construction and maintenance standards
1. Several actions need re-thinking and expanding
- v. P-6 Urban Forest Goal should be moved to Natural systems...(or be made stand-alone element)
1. Urban forest is not limited to Parks,
 2. it should also be mentioned in Infrastructure, Transportation, Land Use/Community Character, Public Facilities, and Health/Equity/Env. Justice, or may be an Element of its own
 3. Street trees need to be considered Infrastructure and managed/maintained by city personnel
 - a. Replacement program (fines and incentives)
 - b. Parking lot shading ordinance
 - c. Coordinate with utilities, etc.
 4. Minor edits throughout
 5. More on the Urban Forestry program
- vi. P-7 Equity
1. Parks and Rec are too “Youth focused”
 2. Need to prioritize facilities for seniors
- vii. P-8 Sustainability
1. Add policies and actions about:
 - a. Recycled water
 - b. Green waste management
 - c. IPM
 - d. Appropriate plant selection(see original recommendations)

- e. Rainwater harvesting and storage
 - f. Stormwater management
 - g. Micro-mobility access
 - h. micro-climate control, health and comfort
 - 2. Standards for construction, maintenance, and management
- viii. P-9 High Quality recreation
 - 1. need a policy to establish a “community engagement coordinator”
 - 2. Encourage Innovation and develop standard agreement/policy for enabling private enterprise to provide specialized recreation facilities on public land (sim to fairgrounds, but short-term leases)

Framework Review Form

Date: May 6, 2024

Working Group: Hazard Mitigation, Climate Change, and Adaptation

Working Group Members: Bill Wolpert, Roger Levinthal, Brent Newell

Framework Title: Public Facilities

In light of the **Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles** prepared by the GPAC and adopted by the City Council (<https://www.planpetaluma.org/documents#gpuvision>):

What are the most important policies in this framework? We recommend identifying the top 5 (or fewer) policies and ranking them in order of importance.

| Policy | Explanation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FAC-1.1: Update, expand, relocate, or replace public facilities | Considering pending effects of Climate Change, especially Sea Level Rise, facilities must be established where their continued functionality can be assured |
| FAC-1.6.1: Design and maintain carbon neutral public facilities. | Reducing atmospheric carbon must remain a priority along with adapting to the consequences of Climate Change. |
| | |

What concerns do you have about the policies in this framework? For example, are they unclear? Should they be softened or strengthened? Do you disagree with the policy direction?

| Policy | Explanation |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| All policies | Definition of "Public Facility" is unclear. Fire Stations are equivalent to parks. |
| FAC-1.5: Outdoor public spaces at public facilities | New play fields should be located within the river flood way. Permanent structures need to incorporate the latest BMPs for energy efficiency, incorporate natural light, and be supported by exterior walls to make the interior more flexible for changing use. |
| FAC-1.5: Enhance and support the Petaluma Marina | Without dredging, can the Marina remain viable? Dredging seems to be counter to BMP for SLR. |

Members of the committee were not able to agree on direction for the following policies:

| Goal Policy, Action # | What were the areas on which there was no consensus |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| | |

Framework Review Form

Date: June 5, 2024

Working Group: Hazard Mitigation, Climate Change, and Adaptation

Working Group Members: Bill Wolpert, Roger Levinthal, Brent Newell

Framework Title: Flood Resilience

In light of the **Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles** prepared by the GPAC and adopted by the City Council (<https://www.planpetaluma.org/documents#gpuvision>):

Comments

1. Needs to acknowledge the BCD RSAP process and SB 272 requirement for an adaptation plan. Missing from the draft framework and this would be key to add into a report being released in 2024.
2. CA OPC has a draft 2024 update – even if too late to use for modeling, at least acknowledge it and that the numbers haven't really changed (and may in fact have gone down a little) for this report being released in 2024
3. Page 8 – “other climatic changes” is vague, does this mean future rainfall changes and if so, may be good to detail. I Assume you aren't considering all climatic changes such as fire.
4. Not really the real definition for a King tide. Its an astronomical term for the perigeon spring tide. Now if you want to set an arbitrary limit of 1.27 then state it that way thats fine but not as the actual definition. Rewrite something like “*for purposes of this report, we have defined King Tide as equal to 1.27...*” that works but not as a standard definition.
5. Zero Net Fill is a term, but the definition is for an area. Should it say “zero net fill area” or how is it actually written in the City code? I am somewhat unclear. And out fo curiosity, why could someone lower the elevation and create more floodplain storage? Reads like it cant be higher or lower.
6. Recommend adding a new Pillar to the list something like “ *Plan needs to recognize that the forces of nature especially flooding are the most critical to design against and therefore plan for the space needed to build and maintain structures that are intended to oppose these forces now and prevent building in these areas that may be needed in the future.*”
7. Page 13 – Adaptation Pathways as an adaptation approach has a potential major flaw in that once an area is built upon it us much more difficult and costly to remove. Identifying the area needs for space upfront saves having to use expensive and coercive measures later to build adaptation measures. It reads easy in principle but in reality, once an area is built-up, it is very difficult and expensive to modify.
8. Page 14 – FR 1.2.1 and FR 1.2.2 – Required freeboard for new development should be based on a reasonable SLR WSE plus a safety freeboard based on the typical lifespan of the structure and how critical it is. Two feet above the current 100-year WSE at MHHW boundary condition may not be protective if SLR increases by 2 feet so perhaps future SLR should be used to set finished flood elevations for structures now. This does add cost but if we believe sea levels are rising, then building now for that makes more sense.

9. FR 1.3.2 – No repair or replacement following a one time 50% damage? This seems rather harsh, is that the intent? Require loss of someones property for a one time damage (not repetitive?). What if the loss is due to failure of the City or some other event? Not sure I am understanding this one correctly.
10. Fr 1.3.3 – A “funded” program. That’s a big ask of the City, who is going to fund and how much. Is the City ok with this?
11. Flood figures are hard to read, are they available at a larger scale and if so, provide the url. Are they overlain on property maps so the public can see where their specific parcels are located on these maps? Of course, the channels and river show the deeper depths but where does the 2 foot cutoff occur on the land in parcels? That might be a good figure to make.
12. The 2 feet of modeled flooding above existing ground, where did this come from? That is a very tight standard, lots of 100 year floods exceed 2 feet. How many properties are impacted and is this current and SLR? Why isnt this exceed FFE? Again, not sure I understand this one correctly but seems like it could be a significant impact.
13. FR-2 No discussion of design hydrology and how the design storm is developed and how long it is in duration. And there are different design storms for different uses. FR 2.1.3 says coordinate with Sonoma Water but a small house development shouldn’t have to do extensive hydrologic modeling. City or SW should provide IDF curves and/or the GP should acknowledge deficiencies with NOAA Atlas 14 and require use of Atlas 15 when its available or First Street hydrology until Atlas 15 is completed. Small development should be able to have standards to design to that are provided by the City, Recommend rewording these measures to require updating of the Sonoma County Hydrology Manual for future rainfall and to differentiate small form major development projects. A Hydrology and Hydraulics Manual should cover how projects are to be modeled so seems like the GP can just reference that document.
14. FFR 2.1.1 – FRYi NOAA is updating all tidal datums for the last epoch (every 19.7 years) so new tidal stats are coming out in 2025 or 2026
15. FR 2.2.1 – Confused, hydrologic models don’t consider SLR at all, do you mean hydraulics model? If so then may be more specific as to the model. This may be limiting and should not be a proprietary model that requires use by select consultants. This item needs more description, use of publicly available models such as HMS or RAS should be preferred for major projects but these models don’t do stormdrains so may not be useful in all conditions. City should be careful not to lock all applications into a single non-competitive consultant model. And for this requirement, who is doing this the City?
16. FR 2.2.2 Do you mean work with FEMA to remap the regulatory flood maps. Why would the Corps do it? Even FEMA doesn’t do it without a reason. Unclear on this one and why the Army Corps would remap floodplains.
17. FR 5.1.15 – unclear on this one. Should excess soils be used to raise vulnerable some areas? Raising is a legitimate approach to address flooding. Unclear if this one prohibits this. We don’t want to fill in floodplains but in areas with low roads or utilities, raising is the maybe the most effective option.
18. FFR 3.1 FAMP – probably good to identify the need for an extensive public process and tie this into the BCDC RSAP process and SB 272. Especially if retreat is an option as this is very controversial.

19. Is there a requirement to map utilities? And identify vulnerable utilities?
20. Structure lifespans seems tricky. Buildings are constantly renewed and like the East Coast, can be around for hundreds of years.
21. No mention of repetitive loss properties. And not allowing rebuilding or requiring raising once a site has flooded 2 or 3 times.
22. FR 4.1 – This should be part of FR 3 prep of FAMP. This is a major and expensive process likely requiring years of public meetings on the order of the GP process. Need to do them both together IMO. This one needs more thought and not just a couple of measures. Retreat may need to be an option for sure but this ties back to the FAMP which would have to have failed for this to happen.
23. Elevated groundwater is not mentioned (I don't believe) but there is a strong likelihood that groundwater issues may be the first impact of SLR assuming no massive levee failures which would be on the City or Corps and not private property owners. Will this be addressed or just up to people to live with it?
24. 4.1.4 – encourage how exactly? TDR is going to require payments and funding I assume, no one is going to leave their homes for free without suing. I think these sections may benefit from City legal review to make sure they are doable and enforceable because they may have legal ramifications.
25. 5.1.1. – most projects have a long lifespan, can this be really quantified? Buildings on the east coast have been there for hundreds of years.
26. 5.1.5 - the current 500 year floodplain is a pretty big. Does this mean no development? Does it make sense to do detention on the small house scale, why not a more comprehensive coherent plan to say use ballfields for winter flood storage and not expect every homeowner to dig a hole. Not sure I understand this one well enough. Again, an overlay would be helpful.
27. 5.1.14 – Does the document acknowledge the difference between flooding due to rainfall which is episodic versus tidal flooding which at some point in the is daily? This one seems more appropriate to fluvial flooding and not direct coastal flooding perhaps?
28. FR 6.1.2 – good but City should be aware of the cost implications. Some critical infrastructure may have a hard time meeting this criteria and could significantly raise costs.
29. FR 6.2.9 – requires City to “build” flood projects?
30. FFR 6.2.12 – Assuming the city doesn't have funds to do all this, they will all other municipalities rely on grant that often depend on CBR calculations that may differ from proposed here. So, is this too proscriptive? Not saying it is but flagging for funding in the real world.
31. FR 6.3 – may add a lot of costs to people looking to build, so let's not ask questions later for why rents and housing costs are so high

RDI Comments top Flood Policy Framework dated April 22, 2024

1. Needs to acknowledge the BCD RSAP process and SB 272 requirement for an adaptation plan. Missing from the draft framework and this would be key to add into a report being released in 2024.
2. CA OPC has a draft 2024 update – even if too late to use for modeling, at least acknowledge it and that the numbers haven't really changed (and may in fact have gone down a little) for this report being released in 2024
3. Page 8 – “other climatic changes” is vague, does this mean future rainfall changes and if so, may be good to detail. I Assume you aren't considering all climatic changes such as fire.
4. Not really the real definition for a King tide. Its an astronomical term for the perigeian spring tide. Now if you want to set an arbitrary limit of 1.27 then state it that way thats fine but not as the actual definition. Rewrite something like “*for purposes of this report, we have defined King Tide as equal to 1.27...*” that works but not as a standard definition.
5. Zero Net Fill is a term, but the definition is for an area. Should it say “zero net fill area” or how is it actually written in the City code? I am somewhat unclear. And out fo curiosity, why could someone lower the elevation and create more floodplain storage? Reads like it cant be higher or lower.
6. Recommend adding a new Pillar to the list something like “ *Plan needs to recognize that the forces of nature especially flooding are the most critical to design against and therefore plan for the space needed to build and maintain structures that are intended to oppose these forces now and prevent building in these areas that may be needed in the future.*”
7. Page 13 – Adaptation Pathways as an adaptation approach has a potential major flaw in that once an area is built upon it us much more difficult and costly to remove. Identifying the area needs for space upfront saves having to use expensive and coercive measures later to build adaptation measures. It reads easy in principle but in reality, once an area is built-up, it is very difficult and expensive to modify.
8. Page 14 – FR 1.2.1 and FR 1.2.2 – Required freeboard for new development should be based on a reasonable SLR WSE plus a safety freeboard based on the typical lifespan of the structure and how critical it is. Two feet above the current 100-year WSE at MHHW boundary condition may not be protective if SLR increases by 2 feet so perhaps future SLR should be used to set finished flood elevations for structures now. This does add cost but if we believe sea levels are rising, then building now for that makes more sense.

9. FR 1.3.2 – No repair or replacement following a one time 50% damage? This seems rather harsh, is that the intent? Require loss of someones property for a one time damage (not repetitive?). What if the loss is due to failure of the City or some other event? Not sure I am understanding this one correctly.
10. Fr 1.3.3 – A “funded” program. That’s a big ask of the City, who is going to fund and how much. Is the City ok with this?
11. Flood figures are hard to read, are they available at a larger scale and if so, provide the url. Are they overlain on property maps so the public can see where their specific parcels are located on these maps? Of course, the channels and river show the deeper depths but where does the 2 foot cutoff occur on the land in parcels? That might be a good figure to make.
12. The 2 feet of modeled flooding above existing ground, where did this come from? That is a very tight standard, lots of 100 year floods exceed 2 feet. How many properties are impacted and is this current and SLR? Why isnt this exceed FFE? Again, not sure I understand this one correctly but seems like it could be a significant impact.
13. FR-2 No discussion of design hydrology and how the design storm is developed and how long it is in duration. And there are different design storms for different uses. FR 2.1.3 says coordinate with Sonoma Water but a small house development shouldn’t have to do extensive hydrologic modeling. City or SW should provide IDF curves and/or the GP should acknowledge deficiencies with NOAA Atlas 14 and require use of Atlas 15 when its available or First Street hydrology until Atlas 15 is completed. Small development should be able to have standards to design to that are provided by the City, Recommend rewording these measures to require updating of the Sonoma County Hydrology Manual for future rainfall and to differentiate small form major development projects. A Hydrology and Hydraulics Manual should cover how projects are to be modeled so seems like the GP can just reference that document.
14. FFR 2.1.1 – FRYi NOAA is updating all tidal datums for the last epoch (every 19.7 years) so new tidal stats are coming out in 2025 or 2026
15. FR 2.2.1 – Confused, hydrologic models don’t consider SLR at all, do you mean hydraulics model? If so then may be more specific as to the model. This may be limiting and should not be a proprietary model that requires use by select consultants. This item needs more description, use of publicly available models such as HMS or RAS should be preferred for major projects but these models don’t do stormdrains so may not be useful in all conditions. City should be careful not to lock all applications into a single non-competitive consultant model. And for this requirement, who is doing this the City?
16. FR 2.2.2 Do you mean work with FEMA to remap the regulatory flood maps. Why would the Corps do it? Even FEMA doesn’t do it without a reason. Unclear on this one and why the

Army Corps would remap floodplains.

17. FR 5.1.15 – unclear on this one. Should excess soils be used to raise vulnerable some areas? Raising is a legitimate approach to address flooding. Unclear if this one prohibits this. We don't want to fill in floodplains but in areas with low roads or utilities, raising is the maybe the most effective option.
18. FFR 3.1 FAMP – probably good to identify the need for an extensive public process and tie this into the BCDC RSAP process and SB 272. Especially if retreat is an option as this is very controversial.
19. Is there a requirement to map utilities? And identify vulnerable utilities?
20. Structure lifespans seems tricky. Building are constantly renewed and like the East Coast, can be around for hundreds of years.
21. No mention of repetitive loss properties. And not allowing rebuilding or requiring raising once a site has flooded 2 or 3 times.
22. FR 4.1 – This should be part of FR 3 prep of FAMP. This is a major and expensive process likely requiring years of public meetings on the order of the GP process. Need to do them both together IMO. This one needs more thought and not just a couple of measures. Retreat may need to be an option for sure but this ties back to the FAMP which would have to have failed for this to happen.
23. Elevated groundwater is not mentioned (I dont believe) but there is a strong likelihood that gw issues may be the first impact of SLR assuming no massive levee failures which would be on the City or Corps and not private property owners. Will this be addressed or just up to people to live with it?
24. 4.1.4 – encourage how exactly? TDR is going to require payments and funding I assume, no one is going to leave their homes for free without suing. I think these sections may benefit from City legal review to make sure they are doable and enforceable because they may have legal ramifications.
25. 5.1.1. – most projects have a long lifespan, can this be really quantified? Buildings on the east coast have been there for hundreds of years.
26. 5.1.5 - the current 500 year floodplain isa pretty big. Does this mean no development? Does it make sense to do detention on the small house scape, why not a more comprehensive coherent plan to say use ballfields for winter flood storage and not expect every homeowner to dig a hole. Not sure I understand this one well enough. Again, an overlay would be helpful.

27. 5.1.14 – Does the document acknowledge the difference between flooding due to rainfall which is episodic versus tidal flooding which at some point in the is daily? This one seems more appropriate to fluvial flooding and not direct coastal flooding perhaps?
28. FR 6.1.2 – good but City should be aware of the cost implications. Some critical infrastructure may have a hard time meeting this criteria and could significantly raise costs.
29. FR 6.2.9 – requires City to “build” flood projects?
30. FFR 6.2.12 – Assuming the city doesn’t have funds to do all this, they will all other municipalities rely on grant that often depend on CBR calculations that may differ form proposed here. So, is this too proscriptive? Not saying it is but flagging for funding in the real world.
31. FR 6.3 – may add a lot of costs to people looking to build, so lets not ask questions later for why rents and housing costs are so high.
- 32.

Framework Review Form

Date: June 5, 2024

Working Group: Hazard Mitigation, Climate Change, and Adaptation

Working Group Members: Bill Wolpert, Roger Levinthal, Brent Newell

Framework Title: **Safety**

In light of the **Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles** prepared by the GPAC and adopted by the City Council (<https://www.planpetaluma.org/documents#gpuvision>):

What are the most important policies in this framework? We recommend identifying the top 5 (or fewer) policies and ranking them in order of importance.

| Policy | Explanation |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SAF-3: Responsive Public Safety Services | Public safety an important element of encouraging public transit, walking, and biking as alternatives to individual cars. |
| SAF-5: Critical Facilities Resiliency | Need to prioritize the protection of existing critical facilities (levees, fire buffer zones, etc.) and the location of new critical facilities taking into account the most conservative SLR and flooding projections. |
| SAF-6.2: Prepare Buildings for Climate Change | Electrification and cooling of buildings important given extreme heat |

What concerns do you have about the policies in this framework? For example, are they unclear? Should they be softened or strengthened? Do you disagree with the policy direction?

| Policy | Explanation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SAF-3: Responsive Public Safety Services | SAF-3 should be strengthened to include a policy and action(s) to fund and implement public safety measures on bike trails and in the 15-minute neighborhood centers to encourage non-vehicular use. |
| SAF-6.2: Prepare Buildings for Climate Change | Should be strengthened to ensure cooling opportunities for existing low-income and elderly residents, or access to community cooling centers |
| SAF-7.2: Increase water efficiency/SAF-6.2 Consider Climate in Development Standards | This can be strengthened by mandating landscape water conservation measures in new development (e.g. no lawns) |
| | |

Friday, June 7, 2024 at 15:01:39 British Summer Time

Subject: Re: GPAC- one more day for comments!
Date: Friday, June 7, 2024 at 1:15:59 AM British Summer Time
From: Dave Alden
To: Christina Paul
Attachments: emailsig_citylogo_d1(2)_8dc70e30-864c-4f5e-895d-2f18a1bef6ab.png,
emailsig_climateready_d1(2)_c6a700cf-0d1b-4933-9004-d4f9809f058e.png,
emailsig_fb_d1(2)_f81c2bb0-676d-4cb4-b1ed-1f349ab83c9a.png, emailsig_insta_d1(2)_afe401e8-
55be-46fd-b371-bb78b0956f12.png

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Christina, thanks for the reminder. I've been exchanging emails today with the Mobility Work Group. The consensus remains what it was at our last Work Group meeting, that there are so many aspects of the mobility framework that we'd be unable to come up with a consolidated response.

Instead, we'll each submit our own comments. I'll finalize mine this evening.

However, we were able to agree that we found there were too many goals, inhibiting effective coordination toward a better future. Therefore, we propose the that the transportation element have only the five goals below, with everything organized under these goals.

1. All transportation infrastructure improvement must be toward a safe, integrated, and seamless mobility network that encourages people of all ages and abilities to conveniently travel throughout Petaluma.
2. There must be coordinated action to reduce dependency on private cars consistent with a carbon neutrality mode shift.
3. There must be coordinated action to increase transit usage consistent with a carbon neutrality mode shift.
4. There must be coordinated action to increase bicycle usage consistent with a carbon neutrality mode shift.
5. There must be coordinated action to increase walking consistent with a carbon neutrality mode shift.

Thanks for your attention. - Dave c: 707-338-8388

On 06/06/2024 7:23 AM PDT Christina Paul <cpaul@cityofpetaluma.org> wrote:

June 6, 2024

Petaluma General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

Parks and Open Space Workgroup

Summary Recommendations and comments provided on the “Natural Environment” and “Parks and Recreation” draft policy frameworks

A. Introduction

- a. This document includes a compilation of comments, suggestions, recommendations made by participants in the work-group (42 people).
- b. Many of the comments are general in nature, relating more to the organization of the framework than specific Goals/Policies/Actions.
- c. An attempt has been made to assign them to specific Goals/Policies/Actions, but several remain in the General category for the team to best assign.
- d. There is also a section of “What’s Missing”, things that the work group feels should be added.
- e. The document is split into 3 sections: for each of the subject policy frameworks
 - i. General Comments (both frameworks)
 - ii. What’s Missing? (sub-section in each framework)
 - iii. Notes on specific Goals, Policies, and Actions included in the draft frameworks (sub-section in each framework)

B. General recommendations on both frameworks:

- a. There is general agreement and disappointment it seems the recommendations provided by this workgroup in the Fall of 2022 were not reviewed or considered in the development of these policy frameworks
 - i. The summary of the 2022 recommendations will be attached to this document. While out-of-date, the content and sentiment still represent the consensus of the work group
- b. Re-name these two elements. Re-arrange and re-categorize Goals so that:
 - i. “Parks and recreation” should be about providing and maintaining facilities and services on public and quasi-public lands
 - ii. Change “Natural Environment” to “Natural Features, Systems and Resources” this is about the physical environment, wildlife, natural features, and systems throughout the city, on all Public and Private lands. See definition of “Natural Resources” below
 1. No reason to have an element titled “natural environment” when 95% of natural features occur in un-natural (altered or disturbed) landscapes, or on private lands out of city’s control
- c. Goals are not specific or directive enough. Too general and high level.

- d. Several actions and policies are miss-matched and do not align with their goals (should be moved or re-arranged), some need to be separated (too many unrelated ideas in single action or policy), many need clarification to be useful, some are just nonsense and fluff
- e. Definitions of Open Space and Natural Resources should be revised, closer to what was provided in original workgroup recommendations:
 - i. Open Space: In general, “Open Space” in Petaluma includes all outdoor areas, whether public or private, natural or developed, urban or rural. These are the places where ecological systems, wildlife, and people interact. They include intact riparian corridors, ball fields, urban plazas, parking lots, and everything in between.
 - ii. “Natural Resources” are all living and organic materials, organisms, and systems that contribute to the local and global environment and ecological systems. They may be naturally occurring, installed, or have migrated from outside the region. These include, but are not limited to the flora, fauna, soils, waters, and people of Petaluma.
 - 1. Some believe “Resource” is only an “extractive” term.
 - 2. Others believe there are multiple definitions of “Resource” and it is the best word to encompass the subject
- f. There are too many action items to “develop a plan... Identify, explore...” No specific actions or recommendations provided.
 - i. When will all of this take place? who will do it? and how will it be funded?
 - ii. When possible, also identify potential nexus for funding and opportunities to conduct the “studies”
 - 1. As part of development agreements?
 - 2. General plan update EIR? or zoning update
- g. There is too much “Promotion, Encouragement, consideration” but no “Requirements”
- h. Similar with “Monitor, collaborate, engage” Who does all of this? Need to assign this role, or acknowledge that there is no one and make it a goal to establish a city officer
- i. In general, these frameworks lack any teeth and are too soft. The policies need to be objective and stand up in court

C. Comments on “Natural Environment” framework

- a. What is Missing?
 - i. This Framework needs to be representative of how we honor our environment and communicate our relationship to the natural environment, and be Inspiring!

- ii. Petaluma's context as a "Watershed Valley" needs to be more evident
- iii. Special Status Species are not adequately addressed
- iv. Need a goal to consider an integration of Parks, Urban Forestry, Public Works & Utilities so that we can have a common mission that includes natural features as infrastructure, equal in value to utilities
- v. No Tables or Figures (needs to be coordinated with "Land Use" framework)
 - 1. If this is about "Natural Environments, features, systems..." need supporting graphics and maps
 - 2. All open space opportunities, corridors, connections, need to be shown on General Plan Land Use (GPLU) Map
 - 3. Should natural systems and features be inventoried by political boundaries (voting districts)? Or should these analyses be conducted in a bio-regional context (apart from political boundaries)?
 - 4. Wildlife corridors must be mapped and included in all land-use and development considerations
 - 5. Need to Identify "Priority Open Spaces" and include on maps. These can be for recreational opportunity or ecological value
- vi. The word "Tree" occurs 1 time in the entire document, as a footnote...
 - 1. Incorporate "Urban Forest" G/P/A's in this element
 - 2. There has been more input on trees than any other feature
 - 3. Trees relate to so many of the other GP elements, should perhaps be a stand-alone element (definitely mentioned in many others)
 - 4. Strengthen policies and actions relating to Urban Forestry (see specifics in "Parks" notes)
- vii. Add Definitions and in some cases add sub-classifications for:
 - 1. Open Space
 - 2. Natural Resources
 - 3. Wildlife corridor
 - 4. Waterway
 - 5. Urban Forest
 - 6. Heritage tree
 - 7. Street Tree
 - 8. Protected Tree
 - 9. Rewilding
- viii. Create land use overlays/easement categories for ecologically beneficial portions of private land that can be applied to new developments or title transfers
 - a. Need to identify and map these lands

- b. Include strong language/policies that discourage or prohibit destruction of valuable natural resources
 - ix. New Policy that new Urban developments must include or contribute to public open space/plazas and natural systems (trees)
 - 1. Identify opportunities to add micro-parks in existing urban environments
 - x. Policy to find opportunities to establish ecologically beneficial and climate mitigating landscapes
 - 1. plant trees where appropriate on otherwise un-useful lands
 - 2. re-plant/replace un-sustainable landscapes
 - 3. Nothing about “Re-Wilding” under-utilized lands
 - xi. Many of the policies and actions are simple regurgitations of law (occasionally inconsistent with actual law)
 - xii. Add a G/P/A to “Reduce the urban heat island”
 - xiii. Establish a land use overlay for “Ecological Benefit Zones”
- b. Specific G/P/A's in the draft:
- i. ENV-1 Community integrated with nature
 - 1. Need policy that city staff is well informed and empowered to be creative in finding ways to support natural resources and systems.
 - 2. There needs to be an action to create a Natural Resources Commission, this will enable us to find a way to better manage and coordinate open space and natural systems related issues
 - a. Commission approves which consultants conduct environmental review of development applications
 - 3. Consider a “Right of other species” policy
 - 4. A lot of opportunity here, but nothing provided
 - 5. Needs policies and actions that require development to integrate ecological systems and natural features
 - 6. Env-1.1 sys nothing. What are the metrics that “demonstrate stewardship” how does this guide action?
 - ii. ENV-2 Healthy protected, productive natural lands
 - 1. Our waterways need to be considered as living corridors which extend beyond the water’s edge and often beyond the banks, consider the entire habitat of the riparian corridor and define the margins on a map
 - 2. The upper reach of Petaluma River includes some of the most valuable and ecologically “natural” landscape yet it is not mentioned here.
 - 3. We have very little “natural” land, change this title and think about what is the real purpose of the goal

4. Add Policies to place zoning overlay over portions of development to create “Ecological Benefit Easements” so that new development contributes to this “network”
5. Need to identify ecologically valuable landscapes and features and designate on maps
6. Env-2.1.3: how? what is the nexus / mechanism for this engagement? What department?
7. ENV-2.2 If this is not done during GPU land use analysis, when is it done, and who does it?
8. Add policy to “down-zone” and/or acquire lands with significant natural features, habitat, native ecology...

iii. ENV-3 Water Resources

1. This needs to reflect that we are “Stewards of a non-polluted watershed”
2. Need stronger policy to protect our wells and groundwater
3. Acknowledge the danger of Forever Chemicals and PFAS
4. 3.1. Many of these actions are simple regurgitation of laws
5. 3.2 Protecting the River and Creeks needs to be elevated to a goal, with many policies and actions
 - a. River and creeks represent our best opportunity for GHG reduction in recreation, and also connectors between East and West Petaluma
 - b. add setbacks, buffers,
 - c. Define entire riparian corridor for all waterways
 - d. Add/develop classifications of river frontage (urban, intact ecology, restoration zone...) with related policies and actions for specific uses
 - i. Where access should occur (or not)
 - e. 3.2.1 Update River Access and Enhancement Plan? Is this enough? Does it need to also include strategies for general development/land-use along all waterways?
 - i. A riverfront development moratorium was proposed so this could be analyzed, but it was deferred to the GPU process. Why is it not happening now?
 - ii. When the REAP was originally developed, scientific analysis was limited to the water’s edge, needs to go beyond

- f. 3.2.4 “Bolster Signage” to protect the creek? Think about what we really need? Interpretive/Informational exhibits? A lot of clutter?
 - g. 3.2.6 develop a palette of plants appropriate for use in Petaluma’s riparian corridors (considering bank stabilization, habitat)
 - 6. 3.3 ...Follow the law...
 - 7. Action 3.4.1 should be a policy and should be expanded with additional actions
 - a. There are already decent guidebooks (Start at The Source, Bay Friendly, Sonoma County/Santa Rosa SUSMP) Since we are in BAASMA jurisdiction we don’t use these, but they are useful. we don’t need to reinvent
 - b. Develop and adopt landscape-based Stormwater Management BMP’s that are more ecologically beneficial than BAASMA’s
 - i. For use on public and private projects
 - c. Stormwater management facilities should not get in the way of actual landscapes (tree plantings and micro-climate or ecologically beneficial landscapes). They need to serve more than engineering purposes
 - 8. This Goal needs to be supported by additional policies and actions regarding:
 - a. Recycled water
 - b. IPM
 - c. Appropriate plant selection(see original recommendations)
 - d. Rainwater harvesting and storage
 - e. Groundwater
- iv. ENV-4 Green infrastructure add “to create healthy, livable and comfortable micro-climates throughout”
 - 1. Env-4.1 All C.I.P.s should integrate green principals
 - 2. 4.1.2 How about trees? Green walls, roofs, etc. are expensive, high maintenance, not really appropriate for public facilities
 - 3. 4.1.3 fee reductions for following existing laws?
 - 4. 4.1.5 the word “Native” is not useful here it is far too limiting in Petaluma
 - a. A policy on “appropriate plant selection” would be good. See original recommendations
 - 5. Env 4.1.6 Again overlooking the value of Trees
 - 6. 4.1.7 WTF does this mean?

- v. Goal ENV-5 What opportunities are there? Identify the nexus
 - 1. We need to ensure we are responsible, as a way to honor indigenous people, not just acknowledge the heritage of the lands

D. Parks

- a. General Comments on Parks/Rec framework:
 - i. This really needs to be about the providing and managing the facilities and services for publicly accessible open spaces and recreational lands (active and passive)
 - ii. Goals/policies/actions related to natural features and systems should be moved to “Natural Systems and Resources”
 - iii. There is not enough to support facilities and accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities. Key issues:
 - 1. Accessibility
 - 2. Facilities
 - 3. Public restrooms
 - iv. The definitions provided are incomplete, badly worded and not useful. It doesn’t matter that they are from official government sources, they do not reflect the meaning of parks to Petaluma
- b. What is missing
 - i. Little to no mention of
 - 1. Health and livability
 - 2. Micro-climate control and management
 - 3. Habitat and wildlife mobility
 - 4. Carbon sequestration
 - 5. Heat island reduction
 - 6. Connections to nature
 - 7. Outdoor education
 - 8. Management/maintenance
 - 9. Dog Parks
 - 10. Wildlife viewing
 - 11. Micro-farming/community gardening
 - 12. Exercise courses (all ages)
 - 13. Restrooms
 - 14. Ecological systems
 - ii. Parks classifications
 - 1. Add “Urban parks and plazas”
 - 2. Add a classification for “un-developed accessible open space”
 - 3. Dog Park
 - 4. Community Garden

5. Mention Streets as the primary public realm, should be designed and maintained like parks
 6. Habitat and wildlife mobility corridors (need zoning overlay)
 7. Acknowledge the value of natural features on private lands (significant trees, drainages, corridors, native ecologies)
- iii. Need a Goal to analyze overall management and the relationship between Parks and Public Works/Utilities so that we can have a common mission
 - iv. Need a Goal about “Water sources and use” (see original recommendations)
 1. Irrigation \efficiency
 - a. Prioritize trees in drought conditions
 2. Reclaimed water
 3. Rainwater harvesting and storage
 4. Water conserving infrastructure
 5. Groundwater recharge
 6. Stormwater management (treatment and detention)

c. Notes on Specific Parks Goals

- i. P-1 and P-2 should be re-arranged so one is clearly about “Improving and Maintain Parks, Rec Facilities and services”, and one is clearly about “acquiring lands, expanding the system and services”
 1. P1.1 Parks master plan also needs to be about maintenance and management, with standards for equipment, furnishings, irrigation, a plant palette to facilitate, design and maintenance (maybe a separate “Master Plan”)
 - a. Maintenance of existing facilities and providing accessible, safe facilities needs to be top priority over “expansion of system”
 2. Several actions and policies, are miss-matched, need to be separated and clarified, some are just nonsense and fluff
 3. “Proposed Parks” table and map are missing key lands
 - a. Stuart St. Pocket Park purchase from Caltrans
 - b. Adobe Golf Course and parcel next to PGE substation?
 - c. Fairgrounds
 - d. Strips of undeveloped land adjacent to Eastside walkway
 - e. Parcels on Adobe Creek
 - f. 18-acre Parcel next to Casa Grande High School
 4. Need a G/P/A mechanism for down-zoning and acquiring ecologically valuable lands and resources for park land
- ii. P-3 River Recreation

1. Include the value/opportunities of the upper reaches and tributaries
 2. This should be about all waterways
 3. Provide a classification system for waterways
 4. Restore the trestle as the major urban interface between downtown and the river
 5. Provide continuous riverside trails where appropriate and establish zones where they are not
 6. Require Public Access Easements for all riverside development
 7. Restore riparian ecologies and wildlife corridors
 8. Maintain barrier free waterfront
- iii. P-4 Interconnected Parks and Facilities
1. P-4.1 is 10 policies in one, need to break down and add actions
 2. P-4.3 include the river corridor and other waterways
 - a. Also require wildlife mobility corridors
- iv. P-5 should also include “Sustainable and Efficient” with policies about BMP’s, construction and maintenance standards
1. Several actions need re-thinking and expanding
- v. P-6 Urban Forest Goal should be moved to Natural systems...(or be made stand-alone element)
1. Urban forest is not limited to Parks,
 2. it should also be mentioned in Infrastructure, Transportation, Land Use/Community Character, Public Facilities, and Health/Equity/Env. Justice, or may be an Element of its own
 3. Street trees need to be considered Infrastructure and managed/maintained by city personnel
 - a. Replacement program (fines and incentives)
 - b. Parking lot shading ordinance
 - c. Coordinate with utilities, etc.
 4. Minor edits throughout
 5. More on the Urban Forestry program
- vi. P-7 Equity
1. Parks and Rec are too “Youth focused”
 2. Need to prioritize facilities for seniors
- vii. P-8 Sustainability
1. Add policies and actions about:
 - a. Recycled water
 - b. Green waste management
 - c. IPM
 - d. Appropriate plant selection(see original recommendations)

- e. Rainwater harvesting and storage
 - f. Stormwater management
 - g. Micro-mobility access
 - h. micro-climate control, health and comfort
 - 2. Standards for construction, maintenance, and management
- viii. P-9 High Quality recreation
 - 1. need a policy to establish a “community engagement coordinator”
 - 2. Encourage Innovation and develop standard agreement/policy for enabling private enterprise to provide specialized recreation facilities on public land (sim to fairgrounds, but short-term leases)

Summary of Recommendations from GPAC Working Group on Open Space and Natural Resources, Fall 2022

Defining Open Space

In general, “Open Space” in Petaluma includes all outdoor areas, whether public or private, natural or developed, urban or rural. These are the places where ecological systems, wildlife, and people interact. They include intact riparian corridors, ball fields, urban plazas, parking lots, and everything in between. For the purposes of the General Plan, various categories of open space have been defined and are described later in this document.

Open space also plays an important role as developed land allows light, sun and air to create healthier places to work, play and live. The focus of this workgroup is on the undeveloped land, land to be re-developed, and existing public open space to identify places, find linkages, and to create a climate responsive balance for a growing population and developing city. The focus is on well-being that is holistic which means biodiversity, access, preservation, remediation, habitat health, activities and stronger connections between people and nature.

Previous general plans offer a single Land Use Designation for Open Space and have limited goals and objectives. Our new general plan should have expanded land use definitions and include goals, objectives, and policies to provide a broader range of public and ecological benefits.

Defining Natural Resources

“Natural Resources” are all living and organic materials and organisms that contribute to local and global environment and ecological systems. They may be naturally occurring, installed, or have migrated from outside the region. These include, but are not limited to the flora, fauna, soils, waters, and people of Petaluma.

We live in a valley defined by two different mountain ranges and we need to embrace our geolocation and natural system with a long term strategy like the Indigenous People did for over 10,000 years.

The Workinggroup recommends the City also preserve, protect, and manage our natural resources besides natural landscapes. These include:

- River and tributaries including water, habitat, wildlife
- Petaluma Marsh and Wetlands
- Groundwater
- Water Supply
- Flood Management
- Sea Level Rise protections
- Our Urban Forest including both public and private land
- Street Trees

- Urban Ecosystem including air, water, land, biota, people, transport systems, buildings
- Reduced night lights to lessen disturbance of night wildlife
- Clean air, esp. protection from wildfire smoke
- Quiet air, esp. transportation noise from freeway and acoustic and raceway noise from fairgrounds
- Green Energy production and access (wind and solar energy in open spaces)
- Agricultural businesses and local food production (esp. Bounty Farm, local coops)

Recommendations and Priorities

Preserve, Restore, Plant and Connect open spaces and the urban forest within the city to the greatest extent possible across public, private, natural, developed, and agricultural lands by following objectives set down by Sonoma County “Resiliency Lands Strategy ” (recent draft published for public review)

- Focus early actions on areas with the greatest potential for carbon sequestration, climate risk reduction, and biodiversity enhancement.
- Participate in forum(s) for coordinated action on climate resilience in Sonoma County.
 - Advocate more for County attention, esp. for the Petaluma River, its tributaries and watershed zones, and Petaluma Marsh and connected Wildlands.
- Reduce fragmentation of the natural lands system by adding to conserved spaces, increasing connections and corridors, and working with private landowners to develop shared management strategies.
- Partner with Native American tribes within Sonoma County to advance traditional ecological knowledge and preserve tribal cultural resources and tribal cultural properties.
- Identify funding and financing strategies from the county, state, and federal governments, as well as private funding sources, to advance this innovative and bold plan. Identify new concepts for funding and financing sources as well.
- Prioritize equity and climate justice approaches that are measurable and clear.

Create Dedicated Chapter/Section in new General Plan for Open Space and Natural Resources

- We encourage GP policy to express value for environmental and ecological categories and benefits by creating a separate section that supports the shift to using environmental resources and hazards as our base map and reframes human centric development to integrate it into natural systems.
- Create enforceable, objective standards and policies to implement ideas contained here-in
- Recreation, Music and Art are overlapping but separate sections from Open Space and Natural Resources so think about creating separate sections. Keep Parks in Open Space.

- Our new general plan should have expanded land use definitions and include goals, objectives, and policies to provide a broader range of public and ecological benefits.
- Multiple categories of Open Space ranging from “Sportsfield” to “Wildlife Mobility Corridor”. Some or all of which can be applied to parcels in order to create a hierarchy of use intensity, and to allow or restrict development to meet the needs of the community and improve urban ecology.
- Recognize the role of natural resources, open spaces and the urban forest in creating a healthy and liveable environment, and reversing climate change.
- Elevate the importance of open space and natural resources so they are considered at every level of planning and policy
- Identify and promote development strategies which are beneficial to urban ecology while prohibiting or discouraging those which are not.
- Growth, development, and urbanization must not be exclusive of ecologically beneficial resources (trees, useful landscapes, wildlife corridors, etc.)
- Use land use designation/overlays to Establish corridors that can be connected over time, as parcels are re-developed
- Do not over-regulate landscapes. Create goals, guidelines, standards, but allow for creativity and experimentation

Elevate Parks/Natural Resources Department to have equal footing with Public Works/Utilities

- Open Spaces and Natural Resources become “infrastructure” equal to streets and utilities.
- Allow them to share resources, personnel, and have common, equal priorities
- PW/U and Parks Dept do not have to compete for budget, can have common goals and take responsibility for maintenance, and monitoring and management of trees and natural resources
- An Open Spaces and Natural Resources Department in the City organization would provide more consistent long range implementation of policies recommended by this workgroup due to overlap and integration with many other General Plan topics
- Street trees are maintained by well trained city staff and not left to homeowners
- Establish an Urban Forestry Officer and staff
 - Conduct a City wide tree inventory
 - Develop new standards and strategies for weed abatement
 - Develop and publish a palette of successful, wildlife supporting plant species, with specific landscape purposes
 - Full time staff for Gator-bag filling / street tree irrigation and maintenance
 - Heritage tree survey, mapping and designation
 - Invasive species control / eradication
 - Integrated Pest Management Plan for city parcels and publish BMP’s for private landowners
 - Education and outreach for residents to promote healthy urban ecology
 - Manage urban Forestry Web page interface with public

- Shift city policy to using environmental resource and hazard policy throughout all departments as basis of decision making. Planning and Land Use Policies need to be reframed with natural systems approach
- Tree Ordinances Update to require arborist advice before removal of all large trees on both public and private lands (city council priority 2022-23)
- Tree ordinance to require mitigation (replacement trees or fees) for removal of all trees greater than 4" caliper d.b.h. (similar to Santa Rosa and many other communities)
- Urban Forest Management Plan (in development)
- Parks Plan (In development)
- Require plans for future construction of both buildings and transport systems to include open space and trees/vegetation that tie in with Natural Systems Approach
- Provide city staff to coordinate and manage a corps of volunteers to work with local nonprofits for both maintenance and construction programs and initiatives
 - local nonprofits such as Daily Acts, Friends of Petaluma River, Petaluma Wetlands Alliance, ReLeaf Petaluma, Rebuild Together Petaluma, River Park Foundation, Petaluma People's Services, Rotary, Kiwana, Bicycle Clubs, Sierra Chapter
 - place based groups like Sunrise Community Garden, La Tercera Community Garden, Petaluma Bounty, church gardens
 - Function based groups for cleaning up graffiti, trash and litter pickup, and restoring benches
 - school programs working with students such as Interact and Environmental clubs

Use Climate Change Actions/Strategies in all policy decisions for Open Space and Natural Resources

Climate Change is happening sooner than expected with greater impact locally so we need to put more effort into being prepared and take adaptive actions as well as corrective actions. We need to recognize the city is part of a larger ecosystem as well as larger civilization and our human centered systems need to be in balance and be part of the larger natural system.

Acknowledge Prior Inhabitants of our Land and Follow Their Long Perspective

We need to acknowledge that our Industrial lifestyle and values have dramatically changed the landscape that was nurtured by Indigineous Peoples and other species who lived here for many thousands of years before Eurpeans arrived 150 years ago. A key element of decision by consensus amongst leaders was the question: "Is it good for 7 generations from now?" Think long term, not just 20 years. We should do what we can to restore sustainable ecology.

Incorporate Natural Systems Approach in All Future Planning

- Our natural resources and environment form the base map for city planning
- Look at Long Term Strategies (see addendum article) to protect entire watershed and cooperate with county, bay area, state, and federal government agencies and environmental nonprofits to improve city life as well as our natural systems
- Air, water, land, biota (all living organisms) need to be considered for all projects and initiatives so human centered interests do not conflict or cause harm considering the numerous benefits:

social, physical and mental wellbeing, ecology, biodiversity, protection from fire and flooding, personal and city-wide economics

- Stormwater management BMP's must not supplant or displace real tree plantings
- Buildings and businesses along the river and open spaces should face the river and open spaces to emphasize our relationship to the river and natural world/ecosystem
- Develop landscape GUIDELINES with a palette of appropriate plants with associated bioregions
- Petaluma UGB puts us in the middle of a defined watershed so movement of water and wildlife needs to be considered before any development occurs
 - Create ecologically beneficial landscapes such as vernal pools or dense stands of trees in otherwise inaccessible open space (Highway interchanges, Fallow farmlands)
 - Ensure livestock fencing does not prohibit mobility of wildlife species
 - Ensure livestock waste does not directly drain into watershed or river
 - Remove all barriers to terrestrial and aquatic migration
 - Map existing wildlife corridors and identify gaps. Develop strategies to connect/bridge corridors across private lands
- Increase Tree Canopies throughout town. Trees provide multiple benefits including heat island reduction, safer roads, added economic values, and improved health and need to be included in parks, transport corridors, wildlife corridors, parks, and private land
- Protection from natural hazards such as polluted land, water, and air
 - Further develop and implement pollution prevention policies and strategies at all levels (litter, sedimentation, sanitation, chemical/hazmat, groundwater...)
 - Identify and eliminate all sources of river and riparian corridor pollution
- Evaluate BAASMA (Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association) BMPs (Best Management Practices). Prioritize strategies that use biological treatment controls over mechanical systems, develop additional BMP's, and allow for site-specific custom solutions.

Rethink Water Sources and Use

- Undertake large-scale water retention systems during flood years to store water for drought years.
- Ensure we meet future water needs given required housing by state, supporting new and old businesses, expanding population, limited water supply from SCWA, variable groundwater systems, regulated water rates and fees, competition from other growing cities
- Consider consolidating management of all Water resources (potable, storm, river...)
- Promote rainwater harvesting from rooftops and impervious surfaces
- Encourage installation and maintenance of rain gardens, bioswales and permeable paving
- Promote use of greywater irrigation systems, provide standard details and instructions
- Encourage agriculture in watershed to construct or improve water catchment ponds and use land management BMPs for increasing infiltration to groundwater
- Plan for drought and flooding since both will be more intense and duration in future.
- Improve flood water sewer system (with trash collection)
- Study (in progress) using winter excess Russian River water in winter months to recharge local groundwater supplies by pumping down with current city well system and retrieve in summer when needed using same pumps
- Construct more water tanks or reservoirs for storage

- Dig new wells for direct water sourcing
- Prioritize irrigation of trees during drought
- Restrict planting and irrigation of turfgrass lawns to public or quasi-public accessible landscapes. Prohibit use of turf for ornamental landscape purposes
- Provide recycled water to all neighborhoods and parks.
- Provide recycled water filling stations for all citizens to use for irrigation in small open spaces and tree watering during drought on both public and private properties.
- Conserve water use and irrigation during drought - increased education, incentive programs and regulations/fees (Water-wise House Calls, Mulch Madness, etc.)
 - New neighborhoods to be dual-plumbed and provided for efficient for street tree irrigation
 - Allow for landscape metering or sub-metering to deduct wastewater fees for irrigation
 - Increase capacity for water recycling and distribution
 - Identify alternative water sources, recharge strategies
 - Consider additional water storage infrastructure
 - Develop city standards for rainwater harvesting
 - Develop city standards for private use of greywater and black water
 - Develop standards for residential stormwater management BMPs
 - Prioritize stormwater management BMP's that facilitate groundwater recharge

Create More Open Spaces and Improve Existing Open Spaces

- Identify existing Open Spaces and natural resources on private lands that significantly contribute to the health of our Urban forest. Develop planning tools to protect these
- Develop overlay zones for various social and ecological benefits that can be applied to private parcels to allow development while providing wildlife corridors and trees
- Evaluate our more urban parks and plazas for ways to improve environmental quality with natural resources (adding trees, replacing un-sustainable landscapes)
- Develop River Park (McNear Peninsula) and improve Steamer Landing Park
- Develop Lafferty Ranch into improved watershed and accessible park
- Protect La Cresta Ridge and Ravine in west Petaluma area for people and wildlife and prevent development
- Improve Paula Lane open space area in west Petaluma
- Improve all parks with local community input (e.g. see suggestions in S. Kirks letter of 8-5 and M. Sullivan letter on Fairgrounds)
- Create teams of park and trail stewards from local neighborhoods and increase neighbor participation in upkeep such as workdays
- Identify and designate opportunities to add micro-parks and plazas downtown and within shopping centers or parking lots and spaces, such as parklets, to provide usable outdoor space, accessible to anyone. May need a new classification for this scale of open space.
- Create more seating, signage, interpretation with help from NParks/Trails Stewards
- Identify neighborhoods lacking open space, and parcels within which can be "Converted", to include pocket parks and street parklets and/or neighborhood services and retail (with outdoor gathering space and trees)

- identify a list of low-water-use, durable, weed suppressing, wildlife friendly groundcover plants, and plant these in unmanageable weed-patches within existing parks and plazas
- replace un-sustainable, thirsty landscapes with sustainable plants as described above.
- Identify parcels for potential 30x30 acquisition
 - Parcels in upper river area N and S of Outlet Mall
 - Kelly Creek Extension for Helen Putnam Park in cooperation with County
 - 10 acre parcel next to Arroyo Park
 - Stuart St. Pocket Park purchase from Caltrans
 - Adobe Golf Course and parcel next to PGE substation
 - Fairgrounds
 - Strips of undeveloped land adjacent to Eastside walkway
 - Parcels on Adobe Creek
 - 18 acre Parcel next to Casa Grande High School
- Reimagine Adobe Golf Course and Open Space between it and PGE substation and ensure whatever redevelopment occurs includes open space and possibly neighborhood services which will enable adjacent residents to not use their cars Consider possibilities outside the box, for example:
 - reset zoning and density and policy
 - as a new food forest
 - multi use area for recreation, park, neighborhood services, affordable housing, energy production and storage
 - maybe start a new development integrating the 15 minute neighborhood concepts with habitat for biodiversity or
 - develop large green energy production and storage in cooperation with PGE
- Allow/support neighborhoods to create community spaces and gardens
- Create pocket park and street parklet system so neighborhoods can create shared space
 - eg. Caltrans removed 2 houses on Stuart Dr. which neighbors want to turn into a pocket park/playground/solar array
 - eg. remove one car park space, dig out asphalt, add trees for shade and benches for people
- Reinvent Fairgrounds into a plan that maintains and promotes local agriculture including small farms, nurseries, and ranchettes. Create a city park. Reduce noise pollution by:
 - a central food forest and community vegetable garden
 - Build enclosed auditorium for music venues that can also house many other events including vehicle races and sports events
 - Create a year round agricultural unit with 4-H and PHS Ag Dept. with an active farm and dairy that students can see, touch, and learn agriculture.
 - I support something similar to this, but not as stated. suggest removing or discussing an alternate recommendation

Create more Wetlands and Improve Waterways

- Improve floodplain near Outlet Mall and restore with wetland vegetation and using BMPs for wetland restoration

- Construct rainwater catchment basins in upper river and tributaries
- Work with RCD, County, landowners, and other agencies for reducing erosion, sediment, and trash in creeks and watershed
- Increase effort to clean out trash, debris, large objects along river and creeks, e.g. Corona Creek has several abandoned vehicles and highly eroding near school grounds
- Increase setbacks for construction on properties along river and creek corridors
- Improve downtown river with Boat House in development, maintained docks, and restored river banks with wetland vegetation for erosion control and wildlife habitat
- Sea Level Rise adaptations, esp. in downtown area
- Create regional solution to dredging and dike management for sea level rise
- Build flood protections using nature based systems and flood walls if needed
- Prohibit development in the upper reach area - create North River Park and Open Space between north river and freeway, use for water catchment and infiltration
- Prevent the construction of an asphalt plant opposite Shollenberger Park
- Apply stormwater management BMP's and pollution prevention measures to existing storm drain inlets

Improve our Urban Canopy and Ecology and Heat Island Reduction

- See recommendations listed under “Merge Parks and PW/U departments” listed above
- Inventory trees in city (part of Urban Forestry Management Plan grant)
- Create UFMP
- Identify and protect heritage trees and significant stands of established or naturally occurring trees
- Support 10,000 Tree Initiative stated by ReLeaf Petaluma to provide multiple benefits
- Add trees along existing streets and corridors
- Partner with shopping centers and large parking lot owners to add shade trees and irrigation in parking lots
- Trees should be considered “infrastructure” equal to sidewalks, streetlights, signs, signals, benches, etc.
- Support Food Coops, Community Gardens and front yard neighborhood food gardens
 - support Bounty Farms
 - support Daily Acts effort to transform front lawns into sustainable landscapes
 - support local farm to table restaurants
- Prohibit “Filterra” or other types of stormwater management devices type stormwater management devices that displace real street trees
- Create more under road space for tree roots using modern techniques
- Identify areas of expansive pavements
- Work with property owners to add trees on private parcels
- Add/replace street trees where they do not exist or have been removed
- place utilities under roads and trails so they do not interfere with street trees
- All transportation, road and development projects maximize inclusion of trees
- Monitor establishment and maintenance of new trees
- Develop a list of recommended trees for uses (not just street trees)

- Have a webpage on the City's website dedicated to trees and the urban forest, with management practices, lists of recommended trees, featured heritage trees, permit requirements and info...
- All new pavements are required to include trees. Develop standards and allow for off-site mitigation, or in-lieu fee
- Establish mitigation standards and in-lieu fees for tree removals which go into a city account dedicated to planting and maintaining trees (similar to Santa Rosa)

Select and use appropriate plant materials

- Select and install plant species to maximize potential environmental, ecological, social and aesthetic benefits, such as: carbon sequestration, micro-climate control (wind, shade, glare), habitat creation, biodiversity support, heat island reduction, traffic calming, pedestrian protection, visual mitigation, etc.
- Plants should be chosen which are best suited to the specific conditions in which they are to be installed (soils, exposure, available space, surrounding conditions)
- Petaluma has a variety of soil types and ecologies. Plants “native” to certain areas of our bioregion are not necessarily appropriate in all areas, or for all situations.
- Prioritize “native” plants when appropriate and when considering characteristics of the specific location
- There are also many acceptable non-native species and cultivars that are well suited to Petaluma, are adaptable to harsh urban conditions that don't support some sonoma county natives, and have the capability to provide great ecological benefit.
- Domestic landscapes must be symbiotic with natural landscapes
- Invasive species must not be used (refer to Cal IPC)
- Be conscious of management/maintenance strategies when selecting plants (water, pest management, ultimate growth habit)

Perform Wildlife Surveys and Education, Maintain and establish wildlife corridors

- Inventory our wildlife corridors by species and update maps, use this information to develop base map
- Create Habitat Map to illustrate locations, corridors, and pockets where wildlife occurs
- Over 230 species of birds have been surveyed at Shollenberger Park and ECWRF and we need to create a similar list for our urban forest
- More education is needed to illustrate the diversity of species in our urban ecosystem including natural environment web pages on city website
- Create zoning overlays, land-use designations, other tools to establish, protect, and maintain wildlife corridors on public and private lands.
- remove unnecessary barriers to wildlife mobility
- Tree canopy can mitigate barriers in some instances, for some species.
- Use a multi-tiered approach including Trees, shrubs and groundcovers where appropriate.

- Encourage planting of ecologically beneficial plant materials. Develop a “Wildlife Friendly Plant List” and make available to public
- Develop integrated pest management strategies and educate residents to avoid use of harmful pesticides.
- Strengthen pollution prevention measures through education and other reminders (“no dumping, flows to creek” signs, watershed education in schools)

Increase Access to Open Space, Wetlands and Waterways

- Enhance the river habitat, beautify the downtown section, and prepare for sea level rise using natural systems approach
- Create more Open Space with access esp. river and creek corridors, River Park, North River Open Space, Fairgrounds, Helen Putnam Park, Lafferty Park/Watershed
- River Enhancement and Access in Downtown area - revisit prior report and prioritize
- River Access points and path along entire riverfront from Petaluma Marsh to Cotati including bike path entire length of Petaluma River
- Develop our transport system away from car centric roads toward ped, bike, and micro-mobility including trails and paths in natural settings and especially use Rainier underpass and trail system to connect Lynch Creek trail and Petaluma Blvd. and Corona Rd. and Denman Reach area.
- Create city wide Bike and Ped Paths and Trails with WayFinding and with rideshare systems so entire city becomes more ped, bike and micro-mobility centric shifting away from our car centric policies which will not only reduce our carbon footprint but also improve air quality and overall citizen health and also include bench maintenance and addition to all paths so pedestrians can rest and enjoy their surroundings
 - Create a well-connected network of alternative transportation corridors which include trees, veg, and bike/ped routes
 - Identify tree-less corridors and strategies for retro-fitting to add street trees
 - Re-envision existing street network to identify corridors needing transformation
- Allow/Encourage businesses to create parklets where appropriate and include trees and vegetation (must be open to the public when on public land)
- Consider creating a walking mall on Kentucky St. as community space
- Renovate Historic Trestle and improve Water St. to create continuous public open space along the river including walkway, bikeway, restaurant seating, art display