

8 RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides information relevant to recreation and open space impacts under NEPA and CEQA in connection with the Proposed Action and alternatives. This chapter includes: introduction, environmental and regulatory setting, impact analysis methods and assumptions, significance criteria, environmental effects of the action and alternatives, and mitigation measures to address effects that are identified as significant. The value of open space related to biological resources, agriculture, and aesthetics is address in Chapter 4, *Biological Resources*, Chapter 6, *Agricultural and Forestry Resources*, and Chapter 18, *Visual Resources*, respectively.

8.1.1 Data Sources

The following sources of information were reviewed to prepare the recreation and open space chapter.

- ▲ *The Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan* (Yolo County 2009a),
- ▲ *The Background Report for the Yolo County General Plan update* (Yolo County 2005),
- ▲ *The Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan EIR* (Yolo County 2009b),
- ▲ *The Yolo County Park and Open Space Master Plan* (Yolo County 2006),
- ▲ Information available on the Yolo County website, www.yolocounty.org,
- ▲ *City of Davis General Plan* (City of Davis 2007),
- ▲ *City of West Sacramento General Plan 2035 Policy Document* (City of West Sacramento 2016a),
- ▲ *City of Winters General Plan* (City of Winters 1992),
- ▲ *City of Woodland General Plan* (City of Woodland 2017), and
- ▲ *Cache Creek Resources Management Plan (CCRMP)* (Yolo County 2002).

8.1.2 Definitions

Recreation resources within the Plan Area include recreation areas and facilities for active and passive recreation such as parks, trails, campsites, and open space. Passive recreation refers to non-consumptive uses requiring minimal facilities such as wildlife observation, walking, hiking, and biking. An area supporting passive recreation is generally an undeveloped space requiring minimal facilities (e.g., trails, parking spaces) to fulfill its intended purpose. The quality of the environment and *naturalness* of an area is a primary focus of the recreational experience in a passive recreation area.

Active recreation is generally any recreational activity that requires significant infrastructure for the purposes of active sports or organized events. Locations supporting active recreation typically require specialized parkland facilities and management. Examples of active recreational outdoor facilities include sports fields, play grounds, skate parks, golf courses, and amphitheatres.

8.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

8.2.1 Environmental Setting

EXISTING RECREATION AREAS AND OPEN SPACE

Parks and open space within the Plan Area include city and county parks, regional parks, and open space areas managed by federal, State, and local agencies, non-governmental organizations, commercial mitigation banks, and other private interests (Yolo County 2009a). Large properties under public ownership and/or management in Yolo County are discussed in detail on pages CO-10 to CO-12 of the Conservation and Open Space Element of the Yolo County General Plan. The following section provides an overview of existing open space recreation areas in the Plan Area.

Federal Recreation Areas and Open Space

Approximately 28,580 acres (4.4 percent) of the Plan Area is in federal ownership, including the northwest portion of the county within the Blue Ridge Range. This area is primarily owned by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and includes the Cache Creek Natural Area/Camp Haswell Park and lands in the southwest portion of the county near Berryessa Peak, as well as other small properties within the Blue Ridge Range (Yolo County 2009b). The Cache Creek Natural Area is jointly managed by the BLM and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The area is designated as a “primitive area,” where facilities, developed campgrounds, and motorized vehicles are not permitted.

State Recreation Areas and Open Space

The State of California owns approximately 17,460 acres (2.6 percent) of land within the Plan Area, including the Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area (Yolo Bypass) and the Fremont Weir Wildlife Area.

The Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area encompasses approximately 16,600 acres of managed wildlife habitat and agricultural land located within the southern floodway of the Yolo Bypass. The Wildlife Area is a public and private restoration project managed by the CDFW. The Yolo Basin Foundation is responsible for environmental education programs associated with the Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area.

The Fremont Weir Wildlife Area is located primarily in the northeastern part of the county, with a small portion located in Sutter County (DFG 2009). This area is a floodway consisting of approximately 1,500 acres and is typically used for fishing, bird watching, wildlife viewing, and hunting. No facilities are located in the wildlife area.

In addition, the Cache Creek Wild and Scenic River Area was added to the State Wild and Scenic River System in 2005. This Wild and Scenic River Area includes 31 miles of upper Cache Creek in Lake and Yolo counties. Designation of the upper reaches of the Creek as “wild and scenic” supports the creek’s scenic, recreational, wildlife, and fishery values and precludes new dams and water diversions.

County Recreation Areas and Open Space

Yolo County manages almost 1,400 acres of regional and community parks and open space areas. The term “resource” park is used to refer to regional and/or open space parkland, which is typically much larger in size than a community park, and is characterized by passive and/or very low-management uses. “Resource” parks are intended to serve the county population and outside visitors, rather than a singular community. Community parks are generally small in area and are developed for a variety of community uses, gatherings, and events. These parks are intended to provide active recreation areas, such as playgrounds sports fields, sports courts, and picnic areas. A list of county parks and their acreage are shown below in Table 8-1.

Table 8-1 Existing County Parks

Park	Acreage
Dunnigan Community Park	0.5
Esparto Community Park	4
Cache Creek Canyon Regional Park, Trail System, and Campground	685
Cache Creek Conservancy Nature Preserve	130
Capay Open Space Park and Trail System	41
Clarksburg River Access Park	4
Correll-Rodgers Habitat Area	40
Elkhorn Regional Park	55
Gibson House Museum	2
Grasslands Regional Park and Trail System	320
Helvetia Oak Grove	11
Knights Landing River Access Park	4
Nichols Park	21
Otis Ranch Open Space and Trail System	587
Putah Creek Fishing Access	150
Wild Wings Park	17

Source: Yolo County 2015, Yolo County 2017

Within the Cache Creek planning area, the County has designated an Open Space area of about 5,000 acres of primarily privately owned lands that fall under the management guidance and regulation of the CCRMP.

City Recreation Areas and Open Space

Each of the four cities within Yolo County own public open spaces that include parks within their boundaries. The City of Davis Parks and Open Space Division maintains more than 485 acres of parks and greenbelts and 570 acres of open space land throughout the community. The City has also acquired conservation easements on approximately 5,300 acres of agricultural land and habitat surrounding the community through their Open Space Program (City of Davis 2017).

The City of West Sacramento operates 35 parks sites comprising approximately 150 acres. Parks within West Sacramento include mini parks, playfields, neighborhood parks, boat ramps, community parks, regional parks, and linear parks (City of West Sacramento 2016b).

Existing recreation facilities within the City of Winters includes approximately 6 acres of parkland, facilities associated with each of the schools within the city, the Community Center and Rotary Park Complex, and the Winters Scout Cabin (City of Winters 1992).

The City of Woodland has more than 160 acres of parks and recreation areas in 25 identified facilities, which include mini parks, neighborhood parks, special use parks, a swimming pool, community parks, and regional parks (<http://www.cityofwoodland.org/gov/depts/communityserv/parks/default.asp>).

Other Recreation and Open Space Areas

The Blue Ridge Berryessa area consists of 785,000 acres of predominantly open space along the spine of the western Blue Ridge Mountains in the northwestern part of Yolo County, and includes portions of Colusa,

Solano, Napa and Lake Counties. The area remains primarily in private ownership and is not subject to State or federal management.

PLANNED RECREATION AREAS AND OPEN SPACE

Yolo County has several planned recreation and open space areas, as described in the Yolo County General Plan (Yolo County 2009a) and city general plans (City of Davis 2007; City of West Sacramento 2016a; City of Winters 1992; City of Woodland 2002). Planned features include the following:

- ▲ Capay Valley Bicycle Trail;
- ▲ gateway park in the Western Foothills;
- ▲ Blue Ridge Trail;
- ▲ trail linking Putah Creek access sites;
- ▲ trail linkages along Putah Creek between existing access sites in Winters and Davis;
- ▲ extension of existing bicycle trail along Putah Creek corridor;
- ▲ gateway park to Yolo Bypass;
- ▲ trail linkages along the Sacramento River between Knights Landing and Clarksburg;
- ▲ gateway park in the Delta region;
- ▲ new California Indian Heritage Center;
- ▲ expanded Sacramento River access and trail linkage;
- ▲ new community park in Esparto;
- ▲ Dunnigan Hills Area Park;
- ▲ new community park in Knights Landing;
- ▲ new community park in Dunnigan;
- ▲ trail linking Cache Creek access sites;
- ▲ expansion of Cache Creek Regional Park;
- ▲ additional parks and trail linkages along Cache Creek corridor;
- ▲ Cache Creek Parkway Plan;
- ▲ extension of existing bicycle trail west of Davis;
- ▲ new and expansion of existing neighborhood, miniparks, and community parks in Davis; and
- ▲ ongoing acquisitions by City of Davis Open Space and Habitat Commission.

8.2.2 Regulatory Setting

FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Cache Creek Coordinated Resource Management Plan

The *Cache Creek Coordinated Resource Management Plan* was adopted by the BLM in 2004 and provides the framework for the future management direction of BLM lands included within the Cache Creek Natural Area. Other collaborating agencies include CDFW, which manages the Cache Creek Wildlife Area, and Yolo County Parks and Resources Management, which manages Cache Creek Canyon Regional Park.

STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) preserves open space and parkland in urbanizing areas of the state by authorizing local governments to establish ordinances requiring developers of new subdivisions to dedicate land for parks, pay an in-lieu fee, or perform a combination of the two. The Quimby Act provides two standards for the dedication of land for use as parkland. If the existing area of parkland in a community is 3 acres or more per 1,000 persons, then the community may require dedication based on a standard of 5 acres per 1,000 persons residing in the subdivision. If the existing amount of

parkland in a community is less than 3 acres per 1,000 persons, then the community may require dedication based on a standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 persons residing in the subdivision.

Delta Protection Act

The Delta Protection Act of 1992 (California Water Code Section 12220) established the Delta Protection Commission (DPC). The Delta Reform Act of 2009 (SBX7-1) amended the 1992 act in November 2009. The Commission has land use planning jurisdiction over the Delta Primary Zone, which generally consists of lands in the central portion of the Delta that were not within either the urban limit line or sphere of influence of any local government's general plan. The Primary Zone, which comprises 487,625 acres, or approximately 66%, of the Delta, encompasses portions of San Joaquin, Contra Costa, Solano, Yolo, and Sacramento Counties. The Secondary Zone is the area outside the Primary Zone and within the "Legal Delta." The Primary Zone is within the planning area of the DPC but the Secondary Zone is not. Lands in Yolo County that are overlaid by the Primary and Secondary Delta Zones are shown in Figure 5-3, and are comprised of areas in the southeastern corner of the county, which includes lands that are part of the Yolo Bypass (Yolo County 2009a).

The Delta Protection Commission is charged with preparing a regional plan for the Primary Zone to address land uses and resources management, with particular emphasis on agriculture, which was designated by the Delta Protection Act as the primary use of this zone. This plan, the Land Use & Resource Management Plan (LURMP) provides guidance to local governments. The LURMP provides guidance on a variety of resources, including land use, and recreation and access. Specifically, Land Use Policy P-2 and Agriculture Policies P-1 through P-10 address the role of local governments in preserving and protecting long-term agricultural viability and open space values in the Primary Zone through implementation of general plan policies and zoning codes.

Senate Bill 1556

In 2006, Senate Bill 1556 mandated that the Delta Protection Commission adopt a plan and implementation program for a continuous recreational corridor trail network through all five Delta counties, linking the San Francisco Bay Trail system to the planned Sacramento River trails in Yolo and Sacramento Counties, pending funding availability (Public Resources Code Section 5854). The plan for the Great California Delta Trail (Delta Trail) is to include routes for bicycling and hiking, with interconnections to other trails, park and recreational facilities, and public transportation. This plan prioritizes trail connections on existing public lands, and working with willing private landowners for access. The plan also includes water trails to provide trail continuity in places where land trails are not feasible. The Delta Protection Commission serves as a facilitator for this effort, working in partnership with local entities to coordinate planning and implementation across jurisdictional boundaries (Delta Protection Commission 2017).

LOCAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan

The goals and policies of the Conservation and Open Space element of the *Yolo County General Plan* seek to ensure a balanced management of the County's multiple natural and cultural resources. Goals and policies related to recreation and open space and potentially relevant to the HCP/NCCP are:

Goal CO-1 Natural Open Space. Provide a diverse, connected and accessible network of open space, to enhance natural resources and their appropriate use.

- ▲ **Policy CO-1.1.** Expand and enhance an integrated network of open space to support recreation, natural resources, historic and tribal resources, habitat, water management, aesthetics, and other beneficial uses.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.2.** Develop a connected system of recreational trails to link communities and parks throughout the county.

- ▲ **Policy CO-1.3.** Create a network of regional parks and open space corridors that highlight unique resources and recreational opportunities for a variety of users.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.4.** Provision of an appropriate level of public facilities and infrastructure shall be a priority for all County park facilities.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.5.** Establish future resource parks close to population centers, where feasible.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.7.** Support efforts by willing landowners and non-profit groups to provide new opportunities for outdoor recreation.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.9.** Promote the conservation of environmental resources in new and existing park and open space facilities.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.10.** The target threshold for resource parks (regional and open space parks) shall be 20 acres per 1,000 total County population (both unincorporated and incorporated). Larger ratios may be appropriate in Specific Plan areas to accommodate important natural features and/or safety areas.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.11.** Coordinate the development of recreation areas and public open space with regional trail planning.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.13.** Within the Delta Primary Zone, ensure compatibility of permitted land use activities with applicable, natural open space policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.14.** Support the preservation of open space consistent with this General Plan, via acquisition of fee title or easement interest by land trusts, government agencies, and conservancies from willing landowners.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.15.** Support efforts to acquire either fee title or easements on additional open space areas adjoining existing protected natural resource areas to increase the size, connectivity, and buffering of existing habitat.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.16.** Coordinate open space acquisition with habitat acquisition that occurs pursuant to the Yolo Natural Heritage Program.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.23.** Increase public access and recreational uses along waterways wherever feasible, particularly Cache Creek, Lower Putah Creek, the Yolo Bypass, and the Sacramento River.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.24.** Allow for specified areas of resource parks to be preserved, enhanced and/or restored as mitigation sites for public agencies only, consistent with the requirements of appropriate regulatory and funding agencies, provided that adequate compensation, including funding for operations and maintenance of the mitigation, is provided.
- ▲ **Policy CO-1.29.** Require clustering and creative site planning in new development areas to preserve and enhance areas of contiguous open space to the extent feasible.

Yolo County Parks and Open Space Master Plan

The purpose of the *Yolo County Parks and Open Space Master Plan* is to provide information and guidance for the management, use, and future development of Yolo County parks and open space facilities, both individually and system-wide. The Parks and Open Space Master Plan provides baseline inventories and assessments of recreational uses, as well as system-wide classifications and design elements to reinforce an identity and management consistency for county park property. Relevant policies and actions are described on pages VI-1 to VI-4 and VI-8 to VI-22 of the Master Plan (Yolo County 2006).

Cache Creek Resources Management Plan

The CCRMP was developed by Yolo County as part of the *Cache Creek Area Plan* and establishes goals to assist in the overall management of the resources associated with Cache Creek. Goals of the plan include ensuring that the floodway is maintained to allow other beneficial uses of the channel, including groundwater recharge, recreation, and riparian vegetation, without adversely affecting flood capacity (Yolo County 2002).

Yolo County Bicycle Transportation Plan

Yolo County has adopted a Bicycle Transportation Plan that serves as a long-range, comprehensive policy guide for constructing a countywide bike trail network. The plan lists current priorities for bicycle facility development, and sets forth a goal to provide for and encourage the development of an integrated system of bikeway facilities. These facilities would provide for safe and convenient travel for bicyclists throughout the county. The goals and policies of the County relating to bicycle trails are discussed in further detail on pages 2-4 of the *Yolo County Bicycle Transportation Plan* (Yolo County 2013).

Yolo County Oak Woodland Conservation and Enhancement Plan

The *Oak Woodland Conservation and Enhancement Plan* includes a description of the existing oak woodland resources in Yolo County, as well as the goals for protecting and growing these areas. These goals are described on page 5 of the Conservation and Enhancement Plan (Yolo County 2007). Priorities for oak woodland conservation and enhancement projects is described on pages 19 through 41 of the Conservation and Enhancement Plan.

Yolo Land Trust

The Yolo Land Trust helps landowners place conservation easements on their property to permanently preserve farmland, rangeland, stream corridors, wetlands, and oak woodlands to protect farms, open space, and habitat lands. Conservation easements have been placed on almost 11,000 acres in Yolo County through the Yolo Land Trust.

City of Davis General Plan

The *City of Davis General Plan* contains the following goals and policies related to recreation and open space and potentially relevant to the HCP/NCCP:

Goal POS 1. Provide ample, diverse, safe, affordable and accessible parks, open spaces and recreation facilities and programs to meet the current and future needs of Davis' various age and interest groups and to promote a sense of community, pride, family and cross-age interaction.

- ▲ **Policy POS 1.2.** Provide informal areas for people of all ages to interact with natural landscapes, and preserve open space between urban and agricultural uses to provide a physical and visual edge to the City.

Goal POS 3. Identify and develop linkages, corridors and other connectors to provide an aesthetically pleasing and functional network of parks, open space areas, greenbelts and bike paths throughout the City.

- ▲ **Policy POS 3.1.** Require creation of neighborhood greenbelts by project developers in all residential projects, in accordance with Policy LU A.5.
- ▲ **Policy POS 3.2.** Develop a system of greenbelts and accessways in new non-residential development areas.

Goal POS 4. Distribute parks, open spaces and recreation programs and facilities throughout the City.

- ▲ **Policy POS 4.1.** Preserve existing parks, greenbelts, and open space areas.
- ▲ **Policy POS 4.2.** Construct new parks and recreation facilities.

Goal POS 6. Encourage local organizations, the Davis Joint Unified School District, UC Davis, and the private sector to provide, develop and maintain needed parks, open space, recreation facilities, programs, activities and special events to the greatest extent possible.

- ▲ **Policy POS 6.2.** Require dedication of land and/or payment of an in-lieu fee for park and recreational purposes as a condition of approval for subdivisions, as allowed by the Quimby Act (Government Code 66477).

Goal HAB 2. Increase public awareness of habitat, wildlife and sensitive species.

- ▲ **Policy HAB 2.1.** Develop environmental educational programs and public access areas and programs to allow viewing of wildlife and habitat through controlled interactions of people with natural areas.

Goal TRANS 4. Davis will strengthen its status as a premier bicycling community in the nation by continuing to encourage bicycling as a healthy, affordable, efficient, and low-impact mode of transportation accessible to riders of all abilities, and by continuously improving the bicycling infrastructure.

- ▲ **Policy TRANS 4.2.** Develop a continuous trails and bikeway network for both recreation and transportation that serves the Core, neighborhoods, neighborhood shopping centers, employment centers, schools and other institutions; minimize conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists, equestrians, and automobiles; and minimize impacts on wildlife. Greenbelts and separated bike paths on arterials should serve as the backbone of much of this network.
- ▲ **Policy TRANS 4.7.** Develop a system of trails around the edge of the City and within the City for recreational use and to allow pedestrians and bicyclists to reach open space and natural areas.

City of Davis Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

The *City of Davis Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan* (City of Davis 2012) provides an overall framework to guide the provision of parks, recreation, and related quality of life services in the community. The 2012 Plan includes a 10-year plan and funding strategy that prioritizes parks and recreation related capital projects that are needed to maintain existing amenities, respond to community requests for enhanced opportunities, and provide for expanded facilities to accommodate projected population growth.

2014 City of Davis Bicycle Action Plan

The City of Davis adopted the 2014 Bicycle Action Plan to provide a detailed road map for implementing bike programs that will help Davis achieve its long-term emissions reductions and mode share goals. It is the goal of the City of Davis to maintain the current integrated system of bicycle facilities and create future linkages and improvements in the system (City of Davis 2014).

City of West Sacramento General Plan

The City of West Sacramento General Plan contains the following goals and policies that relate to recreation and open space that may be applicable to the analysis of the HCP/NCCP:

Goal PR-1. To establish and maintain a public park system and recreation facilities suited to the needs of West Sacramento residents and visitors.

- ▲ **Policy PR-1.2. New Development.** The City shall require new residential development to help meet the City's park acreage standard as shown in Table PR-1 and established in the adopted Parkland Dedication Ordinance. To this end, the City shall require of all new development the dedication of land, dedication of improvements, payment of in-lieu fees, or any combination of these determined acceptable by the City, to the extent authorized by law. Projects located in an areas subject to a specific plan may employ alternative strategies to achieve recreation goals.

- ▲ **Policy PR-1.3. Urban Parks.** The City shall, for development in urban infill areas where traditional neighborhood and community parks are not feasible or appropriate, work with developers to produce creative and flexible solutions for providing urban parks, such as plazas and rooftop gardens.
- ▲ **Policy PR-1.5. Walking Distance.** The City shall strive to provide park facilities within convenient walking-distance of all residents.
- ▲ **Policy PR-1.7. Non-Automobile Access.** The City shall require that new neighborhood and community parks are accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists, and are connected with transit, to the extent feasible.
- ▲ **Policy PR-1.8. City Park Complex.** The City shall promote the development of one or more large-scale park complexes in West Sacramento
- ▲ **Policy PR-1.10. Joint Use.** The City shall prioritize the joint-use of school facilities over the development of new park and recreational facilities and shall support significant improvement of existing school cafeterias and auditoriums for joint use purposes.
- ▲ **Policy PR-1.14. Buffer Potential Impacts.** The City shall strive to ensure new high-activity level parks and parks intended for night use are designed to buffer existing and planned surrounding residential uses from excessive noise, light, and other potential nuisances.
- ▲ **Policy PR-1.15. Community Activity Areas.** The City shall identify appropriate open spaces, including areas within the Central Business District and along the Sacramento River, for development of safe community activity areas.
- ▲ **Policy PR-1.18. Parks as Buffers.** The City shall encourage the use of parks and recreational corridors as buffers between incompatible land uses.

Goal PR-2. To provide a continual system of parks and open space corridors that connect destination points within and beyond the city of West Sacramento.

- ▲ **Policy PR-2.1 Recreational Corridors along River.** The City shall establish recreational corridors along the full length of the Sacramento River and Deep Water Ship Channel located within city limits.
- ▲ **Policy PR-2.2. Pedestrian/Bicycle System.** The City shall develop and maintain a system of pedestrian and bicycle pathways linking City parks, neighborhood shopping areas, major activity centers, and major open space areas with one another and with nearby residential areas.
- ▲ **Policy PR-2.3. Connecting to Recreational Corridors.** The City shall strive to ensure that pedestrian and bicycle pathways that cross the Sacramento River connect to the city's recreational corridors.
- ▲ **Policy PR-2.5 Regional Coordination.** The City shall coordinate with SACOG and surrounding jurisdictions to ensure that recreational corridors within the city connect with existing and planned facilities outside the city.
- ▲ **Policy PR-2.6. Joint Use of City Levee and Utility Properties.** The City shall establish recreational trails as part of future levee and utility property improvements where feasible.

Goal PR-3. To provide and encourage, to the fullest extent possible, public access to the Sacramento River and Deep Water Ship Channel for recreation purposes.

- ▲ **Policy PR-3.1 River Access.** The City shall establish and maintain continuous public access to the Sacramento River for its full length within West Sacramento for fishing and other uses.

- ▲ **Policy PR-3.2 Ship Channel Access.** The City shall strive to establish and maintain continuous public access to the Deep Water Ship Channel, within the limits imposed by safety considerations.
- ▲ **Policy PR-3.3. Public Access Easements.** The City shall require the dedication of public access easements through all new developments along the Sacramento River and Deep Water Ship Channel.
- ▲ **Policy PR-3.4. Water-Oriented Facilities.** The City shall encourage the development of public and private water-oriented park and recreational facilities along the Sacramento River and the Deep Water Ship Channel.
- ▲ **Policy PR-3.5. River, Ship Channel Linkage.** Linear access to the Sacramento River and Deep Water Ship Channel shall be linked to the city's overall system of parks, recreational pathways, and open space. To this end, the City shall require the dedication of public access easements through new developments along the Sacramento River and Deep Water Ship Channel.
- ▲ **Policy PR-3.6. Marinas and Riparian Vegetation.** The City shall encourage the development of public and private marinas in appropriate locations that avoid, as much as possible, areas of significant existing riparian vegetation.

2013 West Sacramento Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan

The City of West Sacramento has adopted a Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan to encourage the role of bicycling and walking as viable modes of transportation by providing well maintained facilities that promote public use. This plan outlines a vision for connected bikeways, walkways, and trails that link together neighborhoods, places of employment, shopping centers, parks, and schools within West Sacramento (City of West Sacramento 2013).

City of Winters General Plan

The following policies related to recreation and open space, from Section V, Recreational and Cultural Resources, of the *City of Winters General Plan*, are potentially relevant to the HCP/NCCP:

GOAL V.A: To establish and maintain a public park system and recreation facilities suited to the needs of Winters' residents and visitors.

- ▲ **Policy V.A.1.** The City's overall goal shall be seven acres of developed parkland (combined neighborhood and community) per 1,000 residents.
- ▲ **Policy V.A.14.** The City shall encourage the use of open space and recreational uses as buffers between incompatible land uses.
- ▲ **Policy V.A.15.** The City shall pursue the development of a citywide network of pedestrian and bicycle pathways and equestrian trails. The pedestrian and bicycle pathway and trail system should be designed to link parks, schools, civic and major shopping and employment centers. The City's bicycle pathway system should be integrated with the county-wide bikeway system.

City of Winters Bikeway System Master Plan

The purpose of the *City of Winters Bikeway System Master Plan* is to formulate a long-range, comprehensive, and consistent policy guidance for creating a citywide connected bikeway network that tends to the needs of its various users in a convenient, safe and inviting way. This Master Plan provides a list of potential projects that create a network of bicycle routes that will encourage and promote bicycling. The overall goal is to identify conceptual projects that will increase bicycle ridership by enhancing the safety of routes, comfort of users, and convenience of bicycle facilities.

Putah Creek Nature Park Master Plan

The City of Winters developed the 2008 *Putah Creek Nature Park Master Plan* as an update to the *Winters Putah Creek Park Master Plan*. This plan is a conceptual document that discusses opportunities for public access and sustainable fish and wildlife habitat through restoration of natural channel form and function along a 1-mile stretch of Putah Creek between Railroad Avenue and I-505. The goals of the plan are to integrate the park into the community, support the City's economic vitality, provide access to native riparian habitat, and improve the ecological vitality of the creek (City of Winters 2008).

City of Woodland General Plan

The *City of Woodland General Plan* contains the following policies related to recreation and open space that are potentially relevant to the HCP/NCCP:

Goal 2.N: Open Space System. Create a comprehensive and connected system of parks, greenbelts and open space.

- ▲ **Policy 2.N.1:** High-Quality Park System. Provide a high-quality, diversified public park system that provides a variety of recreational opportunities for all City residents.
- ▲ **Policy 2.N.2:** Greenways and Greenbelts. Develop a system of greenways and greenbelts that link existing and future parks and open space where possible and provide the opportunity for linear, multi-use trails. Require a system of greenways and/or greenbelts as a component of new Specific Plan areas.

Goal 5.C: Park System. Establish and maintain a complete system of public parks and community and recreational facilities that provides opportunities for both passive and active recreation and is well suited to the needs of Woodland residents, employees, and visitors.

- ▲ **Policy 5.C.3:** Park Acreage Standard. Ensure that the development of parks and recreation facilities keeps pace with development and growth within the city. Of the total acreage, strive to achieve and maintain a standard of 6.0 acres of parks per 1,000 residents for the development of City-owned park facilities.
- ▲ **Policy 5.C.11:** Park Development Funding. Identify appropriate funding mechanisms to adequately fund the development of new parks and recreational facilities; the renovation of existing parks and recreational facilities; and the ongoing preservation, maintenance and repair of the city's existing open space, parks and recreational resources and facilities.
- ▲ **Policy 5.C.15:** Collaboration with County. Cooperate with Yolo County in the development of a countywide parks, open space, and trail system.

Goal 7.B: Maintain and Protect Biological Resources. Maintain and protect natural habitats throughout the Planning Area, especially types that are considered sensitive by the Yolo HCP/NCCP. Protect sensitive wildlife and plant species.

- ▲ **Policy 7.B.7:** Woodland Regional Park. Protect and maintain Woodland Regional Park as an important wildlife preserve and habitat for special-status plants and allow for public access that is compatible with and promotes public education of the site's habitat value.

City of Woodland Bicycle Transportation Plan

The *City of Woodland Bicycle Transportation Plan* was prepared by the City to improve bicycle transportation and safety within the City of Woodland. The goals of this plan are to provide a network of bikeways between residential areas, employment centers, schools, recreational facilities, and commercial businesses; to provide safe convenient travel for cyclists; to reduce air and noise pollution, traffic, and parking congestion, and excess energy consumption caused from automobiles; and to promote the physical and recreational benefits of cycling (City of Woodland 2002).

8.3 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

8.3.1 Methodology and Significance Criteria

METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The evaluation of potential impacts to recreation is based on a review of existing recreational facilities, anticipated future facilities, and recreation-related plans and policies pertaining to the Plan Area described above in Sections 8.2.1, *Environmental Setting* and 8.2.2, *Regulatory Setting*. The impact analysis considers the potential for increases in demand for recreation resources and potential effects to existing recreation recreational resources and open space within the Plan Area.

As described in Section 3.3, the issuance of ITPs by the Wildlife Agencies for take of 12 covered species associated with five categories of covered activities—together with subsequent adoption and implementation of the Plan by the Applicants consistent with the Permits—is the Proposed Action considered in this EIS/EIR. Issuance of permits by the Wildlife Agencies only provides compliance with the FESA and NCCPA.

All Covered Activities are subject to the approval authority of one or more of the Applicants with jurisdiction over such projects, and HCP/NCCP approval and permit issuance for take of covered species does not confer or imply approval from any entity other than the USFWS or CDFW to implement the Covered Activities. Rather, as part of the standard approval process, individual projects will be considered for further environmental analysis and generally will receive separate, project-level environmental analysis review under CEQA and, in some cases, NEPA for those projects involving federal Agencies.

The assessment of potential effects on recreation in the Plan Area is based on the anticipated changes in land cover and land uses over a 50-year study period, corresponding to the permit term under the Proposed Action Alternative.

Anticipated changes in land cover/land use for each alternative are described in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*. See Chapter 3, *Approach to the Analysis*, for a description of the methodology used across all resource chapters for the analysis of cumulative effects.

As described in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, the Conservancy has proposed a number of changes to the HCP/NCCP since the release of the Draft on June 1, 2017. These changes are described and Characterized in Section 2.3.2, *Alternative B – Proposed Action Alternative (Permit Issuance/Plan Implementation)*, of Chapter 2.

These proposed changes fall into several categories;

- ▲ Copy edits such as correction of spelling errors,
- ▲ Minor text clarifications and corrections such as providing or correcting cross references to other parts of the document,
- ▲ Minor numeric corrections, such as small adjustments to acreages of particular land cover types,
- ▲ Providing updated information since publication of the Draft HCP/NCCP such as including information from the City of Woodland General Plan Update 2035, which was adopted after the Draft HCP/NCCP was published,
- ▲ Clarifications or enhancements to particular plan elements such as new or updated Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs),

- ▲ Increased details on plan implementation such as providing additional information on the content of the Implementation Handbook, and
- ▲ Changes in assumptions regarding costs and funding to reflect updated information.

These proposed changes have been analyzed to determine whether they would result in any changes to the impact analysis or conclusions reached in the Draft EIS/EIR. This analysis is provided in Section 24.2, *Evaluation of Proposed Modifications to the Draft HCP/NCCP*. The analysis substantiates that the proposed changes to the HCP/NCCP do not alter the analysis or impact conclusions provided in the Draft EIS/EIR for recreation and open space. Therefore, no changes to the analysis provided below are merited.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Effects would be significant if an alternative would result in the following:

- ▲ increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, or
- ▲ include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Issues Not Evaluated Further

Under all alternatives there would primarily be a continuation of existing conditions in the expanded Plan Area along the south side of Putah Creek in Solano County. The land is primarily used for agriculture and this land use would continue. There is also valley foothill riparian along Putah Creek that may be considered forest land. Some agricultural land in this area is currently under agricultural or other conservation easements, such as those purchased through the City of Davis Open Space Program, and it is likely that some additional landowners would also place their land under easement in the future, which would increase the amount of protected agricultural lands. In addition, under all the alternatives the riparian forest along Putah Creek would continue to be protected via various laws and regulations (e.g., Section 1600 of the Fish and Game Code, see Chapter 4, *Biological Resources*) and enhanced through activities such as those implemented by the Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee. Because there would be no change to recreation resources or opportunities in the expanded Plan Area, this issue is not discussed further.

8.3.2 Effects of Proposed Action and Alternatives

ALTERNATIVE A—NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE (NO PERMIT/NO PLAN IMPLEMENTATION)

Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

As described previously in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, under the No Action Alternative (Alternative A), take associated with development would occur over the 50-year study period consistent with the local general plans and other applicable planning documents (e.g., community plans, specific plans, recreation plans). As also described in Chapter 2, for purposes of this analysis, development and related activities (e.g., operations and maintenance) under the No Action Alternative are considered using the same organizational categories identified in the Yolo HCP/NCCP; urban projects and activities; rural projects and activities, which includes rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities, agricultural economic development, and open space; and public and private operations and maintenance. Under the No Action Alternative, the Plan would not be approved and implemented and no Endangered Species Act authorizations would be issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or CDFW related to the Plan. Endangered species permitting and mitigation would continue on an individual project-by-project basis. Urban projects and activities would be concentrated within the Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland. Rural projects and activities would primarily occur within and around the existing

communities within the unincorporated county (primarily Elkhorn, Madison, Clarksburg, Dunnigan, Esparto, and Knights Landing). Activities associated with the rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities, agricultural economic development, and open space categories would occur in various locations in the unincorporated county. Public and private operations and maintenance activities would occur both in Yolo County and the cities.

Under the No Action Alternative, developments in rural and urban areas within the Plan Area would occur as planned by the plan participants, and would result in the need for expanded and additional parks and recreational facilities. Large-scale residential or commercial developments that either significantly expand an existing community or create a new community where one did not previously exist could substantially increase the demand for recreational facilities. Existing parks and open space operated by federal, state, and local agencies would continue to be available to recreational users. The development of new or expanded recreational facilities would be expected to continue, in part, in response to increased demand, consistent with current local plans and policies. Recreation-related impacts associated with individual development projects would be addressed on a project-by-project basis. Individual development projects would provide for mitigation, including land dedication for recreational purposes or payment of in-lieu fees for park development consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and plan policies as described above in Section 8.2.2, *Regulatory Setting* (e.g., Quimby Act, local general plan policies).

Activities under the rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities category include construction of additional recreational facilities outside of the incorporated cities and rural communities, including installation of trails and bikeways and expansion of existing and development of new planned park and open space uses and activities that are consistent with local General Plans and plans addressing parks, open space, biking facilities, and trails. Examples of planned new or expanded facilities include parks supporting both active and passive recreation as well as areas for campsites, picnicking, swimming, water skiing, fishing, habitat preservation and educational tours, off-highway vehicle use, and hunting. Infrastructure and amenities would be included with these facilities, such as access roads, utilities, signage, landscaping, parking lots, and trash receptacles. These new facilities would provide additional recreational opportunities and would reduce the demand on existing recreational facilities as new planned residential development proceeds. Other activities under this development category, such as stormwater drainage facilities, levees, and flood control facilities, wastewater treatment, energy generation, solid waste management, and an airport would generally not increase demand on recreational facilities or involve construction of new recreational facilities.

Although activities under the agricultural economic development and open space category could result in relatively large structures being constructed in a rural/agricultural area (e.g., processing plants), these would generally not increase the demand for recreational facilities or require the construction of new recreational facilities. The same would be true for mining operations included in this category. Activities under the open space element of this category would also include planned park and open space uses in the *Yolo County Parks and Open Space Master Plan* and the *Yolo County Cache Creek Area Plan*. The addition of park and open space land uses within the Plan Area would provide additional recreational opportunities and would reduce the demand on existing recreational facilities.

The impact descriptions provided above primarily relate to permanent changes in demand for, and provision of recreational facilities. Construction of new facilities and public and private operations and maintenance activities have the potential to result in temporary disruptions to access to individual recreational facilities, or portions of facilities, if these activities cross, or occur in close proximity to existing facilities. For example, if a new underground utility were to cross a park area and the public was temporarily excluded from the construction corridor. However, access disruptions would cease after construction was complete and full access to the recreation facility would be restored.

As the development and other activities described above are implemented under the No Action Alternative, impacts to threatened and endangered species and other biological resources would occur, requiring mitigation. Mitigation measures are likely to include on-site areas of preservation within a specific project site, and small, non-contiguous areas of preservation lands throughout Yolo County, or nearby sites outside

the county with authorization from the permitting agencies. Generally, these required mitigation actions under the No Action Alternative would either retain lands in their existing condition (i.e., preserve habitat), or convert lands to a more natural state (i.e., habitat restoration or creation), which would not increase the demand for recreational resources, would provide open space values, and could provide passive recreation opportunities if public access were included as part of protected mitigation lands management.

Cumulative Effects

Expansion of development in urban and rural areas (i.e., Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland) over the past century has resulted in an increase in demand for recreation resources and a subsequent dedication of parklands and open space consistent with current local plans and policies. This has increased the number of developed parklands, trails, and recreational facilities, and the amount of preserved open space within the county.

Projects and activities included within the categories of urban and rural development would continue the trend of increasing the demand for recreational resources and could combine other projects within the county to result in a cumulative increase in demand for recreational resources. Consistent with the general plans of Yolo County, West Sacramento, Davis, Winters, and Woodland, further development of parklands and trails and preservation of open space would occur as planned development proceeds under the No Action Alternative. Therefore, the amount of parkland is expected to increase within the county over time with implementation of planned park and open space uses in the *Yolo County Parks and Open Space Master Plan*, *Yolo County Cache Creek Area Plan*, and CCRMP. This increase is expected to offset the cumulative increase in demand for recreation resources.

In addition, future development implemented under the No Action Alternative would comply with the policies set forth in city and county general plans. Development in rural areas would be limited to preserve the rural landscape as established by Policy CC-1.2 of the *Yolo County General Plan*. Further, recreation resources and open space would increase over time to comply with Policy CO 1.1, which calls for expanding and enhancing an integrated network of open space to support recreation and Policy CO 1.10, which has a target threshold for resource parks of 20 acres per 1,000 total county population. Additional policies from the Conservation and Open Space Element (provided in the setting of this section) of the *Yolo County General Plan* establish standards and goals to mitigate recreation resources. In addition, the general plans of the Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland contain policies applicable to development and maintenance of recreation resources. Compliance with general plan policies, described above under Section 8.2.2, would direct future development of recreation facilities consistent with the demand for recreation within each jurisdiction.

As identified above in the alternative specific impact discussion, required biological resources mitigation actions under the No Action Alternative would either retain lands in their existing condition (i.e., preserve habitat), or convert lands to a more natural state (i.e., habitat restoration or creation), which would not adversely affect recreation resources either individually or cumulatively.

ALTERNATIVE B—PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE (PERMIT ISSUANCE/PLAN IMPLEMENTATION)

Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

The Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B) incorporates the same development-related activities identified for the No Action Alternative (urban projects and activities, rural projects and activities, and public and private operations and maintenance), with the HCP/NCCP providing a mechanism for the Wildlife Agencies to provide incidental take authorization for these lawfully undertaken covered activities. Recreation resource impacts as a result of these activities would be the same as those described under the No Action Alternative.

Where the Proposed Action Alternative differs from the No Action Alternative is the implementation of the Yolo HCP/HCCP, including its conservation strategy and neighboring landowner protection program, as well

as the required use of Avoidance and Minimization Measures during implementation of covered activities. The following impact discussion focuses on these elements of the Proposed Action Alternative that differ from the No Action Alternative. Components of the conservation strategy include but are not limited to habitat assessment surveys and population surveys; habitat management; restoration, enhancement, and creation of habitats; conversion of agricultural lands to create habitat; construction of facilities necessary for management and maintenance; and monitoring; and control of invasive nonnative species. However, the primary result of the neighboring landowner protection program, from a recreation perspective, would be the general preservation of existing conditions on lands adjacent to reserve system lands. The voluntary neighboring landowner protection program is described in more detail in Chapter 2, *Proposed Project and Alternatives*. Because the program would not change the demand for recreation resources or directly affect recreation facilities, it would not have an effect on recreation resources, and is not evaluated further in the impact discussions below.

Effect REC-1: Potential increase in use of recreation facilities or demand for recreation opportunities such that substantial deterioration would occur.

Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would involve natural resources conservation through the preservation of natural and seminatural landscapes and maintenance of ecological integrity of large habitat blocks, ecosystem function, and biological diversity. The conservation strategy included in the Proposed Action Alternative also includes habitat enhancement, where existing habitat conditions and values to covered species would be improved in an area, and habitat restoration and creation where an existing natural or seminatural land cover type would be converted to a different natural land cover type (e.g., restoration of riparian habitat on land that once supported riparian habitat, but currently contains annual grassland vegetation). These elements of the conservation strategy designed to preserve and augment existing ecosystem health and biological diversity could provide additional passive recreation opportunities related to establishment of the reserve system in the Plan Area, but would not increase the demand for recreational facilities or result in any physical deterioration of existing recreation resources. In addition, preservation of large tracts of land may provide additional recreational opportunities, if passive recreation compatible with preservation, such as wildlife viewing, is allowed. Because a coordinated system of linked reserve lands would be established for habitat preservation, enhancement, and restoration/creation, additional recreation and open space opportunities would be provided compared to the No Action Alternative because continuous areas of land, rather than smaller discrete sites, would be established as mitigation sites that could provide additional passive recreation opportunities.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **beneficial**.

Establishment and management of a reserve system under the Proposed Action Alternative could provide additional passive recreation opportunities while not increasing demand for recreational facilities.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to Existing Conditions, this impact is **beneficial**.

No mitigation is required.

Effect REC-2: Potential construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Implementation of the various elements of the HCP/NCCP conservation strategy would primarily involve the preservation and enhancement of existing land covers and habitat restoration/creation in some areas. These activities would not result in the construction or expansion of additional recreation facilities. Although preservation of lands within the Plan Area may provide additional opportunities for passive recreation such as wildlife viewing, no new or expanded recreation facilities that would require construction are proposed as part of the Proposed Action Alternative.

Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would result in the preservation and enhancement of natural and seminatural areas to promote habitat and ecosystem health and biological diversity. The existing recreation opportunities of these sites would be retained, or lands could be modified towards a more natural state (i.e., habitat restoration/creation), which would generally be considered to have a neutral or beneficial effect on recreation resources.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **less than significant**.

Potential effects from establishment and management of a reserve system under the Proposed Action Alternative would have a neutral or beneficial effect on recreation resources.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to Existing Conditions, this impact is **less than significant**.

No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Effects

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area resulting from past and present projects is described above for the No Action Alternative and remains the same for the Proposed Action Alternative.

The contribution of the Proposed Action Alternative to the cumulative condition for recreation resources would include a potential increase in passive recreation opportunities from establishment of the reserve system in the Plan Area. These enhancements to recreation resources would result from the enhancement and restoration/creation of habitats and open space and be retained through the ongoing maintenance and monitoring of conservation areas. As described above, recreation resources would be improved as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative through preservation and enhancement of large areas of open space compared to the existing conditions. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative effect on recreation resources and open space.

The Proposed Action Alternative would make less of a contribution to any potential adverse cumulative effects compared to the No Action Alternative.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **beneficial**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to Existing Conditions, this impact is **beneficial**.

ALTERNATIVE C—REDUCED TAKE ALTERNATIVE

Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

As described in Section 2.3.3, the Reduced Take Alternative (Alternative C) would include the same categories of covered activities as the Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B); however, Alternative C contains eight areas designated for development under the Proposed Action Alternative in which no activities that would result in take of covered species would be permitted. See Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3, *Alternative C-Reduced Take Alternative* for more information on this alternative.

Impacts to recreation resources as a result of implementation of the Reduced Take Alternative would be similar to those discussed above for the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives. However, given that less development would occur, there would be less potential for passive recreation opportunities in some circumstances compared to the development effects described for the No Action Alternative. If the prohibition on take of covered species in the eight designated areas resulted in less overall development in the Plan Area, demand for recreation from development related activities could be slightly less under Alternative C. However, the prohibition on take in the eight areas could result in the development planned for these locations being diverted to another part of the Plan Area. If any of the new locations were in areas currently used for recreation, this could result in greater impacts on existing recreational facilities. Overall, under the Reduced Take Alternative, Effects, REC-1 and REC-2 and VIS-4 would not be appreciably different from what is described for the Proposed Action Alternative though beneficial effects may be slightly less.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **beneficial**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **beneficial**.

No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Effects

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area resulting from past and present projects is described above for the No Action Alternative and remains the same for the Reduced Take Alternative. The individual effects on recreation resources under the Reduced Take Alternative are not substantially different from those described for the Proposed Action Alternative. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Take Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative effect on recreation resources. The Reduced Take Alternative would make less of a contribution to any potential adverse cumulative effects compared to the No Action Alternative.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **beneficial**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **beneficial**.

ALTERNATIVE D – REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

The Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative D) would include the same categories of covered activities as the Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B), but under Alternative D, development within a portion of the west side of the Dunnigan area, and the Elkhorn Specific Plan Area, would not be covered activities under the Plan and, therefore, would not be provided incidental take authorization through the Plan. (See Chapter 2, Section 2.3.4, *Alternative D-Reduced Development Alternative* for more information on this alternative.) If the prohibition on take of covered species in these designated areas resulted in less overall development in the Plan Area, demand for recreation from development related activities could be slightly less under Alternative D. However, the prohibition on take in these areas could result in the development planned for these locations being diverted to another part of the Plan Area. If any of the new locations were in areas currently used for recreation, this could result in greater impacts on existing recreational facilities.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **beneficial**.

Overall, under the Reduced Development Alternative, Effects, REC-1 and REC-2 and VIS-4 would not be appreciably different from what is described for the Proposed Action Alternative though beneficial effects may be slightly less.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **beneficial**.

No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Effects

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area resulting from past and present projects is described above for the No Action Alternative and remains the same for the Reduced Development Alternative. The individual effects on recreation resources under the Reduced Development Alternative are not substantially different from those described for the Proposed Action Alternative. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative effect on recreation resources. The Reduced Development Alternative would make less of a contribution to any potential adverse cumulative effects compared to the No Action Alternative.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **beneficial**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is **beneficial**.

This page intentionally left blank.