4.11 RECREATION

The proposed Project passes through Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento, and Placer counties. In three of those counties, there are recreational resources within 1 mile of the proposed Project right-of-way (ROW). This Section describes the existing condition of recreation resources and evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed Project on those resources. Section 4.11.1 describes the recreation setting, with an emphasis on the Project vicinity, rather than the proposed alignment ROW. Recreation facilities within 0.5 miles of the proposed Project are identified.

4.11.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed pipeline alignment traverses lands in Sutter County, Yolo County, Sacramento County, Placer County, and within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Roseville. The area along the proposed alignment passes through predominantly agricultural or undeveloped areas. Line 406 is located entirely in north-central Yolo County and extends from the existing Lines 400 and 401 to the existing Line 172A for approximately 14 miles through unincorporated areas of Yolo County. The area traversed by Line 406 is generally used for agricultural production. Line 407 West extends from the eastern terminus of Line 406 in Yolo County to the junction of Riego Road and Powerline Road, approximately 1 mile east of the Sacramento River, in Sutter County. Line 407 East extends from the eastern terminus of Line 407 West and extends east to the intersection of Fiddyment road and Baseline Road.

Yolo County

Recreational opportunities within Yolo County include community parks, State recreation areas, historic parks, lakes, wine tasting, golf, river rafting, boating, and swimming. Yolo County owns and maintains 11 parks and recreation facilities throughout the County, and none of these recreation facilities are located directly within the Project area. The Esparto Community Park is the closest park to the Project area at approximately 2.5 miles south of the Line 406 Project area, in the town of Esparto. However, recreational activities that may take place in the vicinity of the Project area consist of water sports and leisure activities along Cache Creek and the Sacramento River. A portion of the eastern end of Line 407 West is adjacent to the Gray’s Bend area of the Sacramento River. The line then continues east and passes under the Sacramento River. There are no boat-launching facilities or public beaches on the Yolo County side of the Sacramento River in these areas;
however, boats, kayaks, or river rafts launched from other parts of the river may be present at any given time.

**Sutter County**

The main recreational activities offered in the Sutter County portion of the Project area revolve around the Sacramento River. Lines 407 West and 407 East cross approximately 6 miles of unincorporated Sutter County. There are no community parks or other recreational facilities within 0.5 mile of the Project area. Recreational activities are limited to the vicinity of the Sacramento River crossing. The Rio Ramaza Marina is a private marina on an approximately 0.35-mile stretch of the Sacramento River, which is open to public access. The north end of the marina is immediately adjacent to the Sacramento River crossing of Line 407 West. This marina offers activities such as fishing, swimming, camping, and boating.

**Sacramento County**

Sacramento County supports a wide variety of recreational activities. The Powerline Road Distribution Feeder Main (DFM) segment of the Project is in the northwest corner of the county. The nearest recreation area to the Project site is the Teal Bend Golf Course, which is approximately 2 miles southwest of the DFM area.

There are no recreational areas in Sacramento County within 0.5 mile of the Line 407 East Project area. The closest recreational area is the Dry Creek Parkway, managed by Sacramento County. The northern border of the parkway is approximately 1.5 miles south of the Line 407 East Project site.

**Placer County**

Line 407 East extends approximately 6.5 miles into the southwestern corner of Placer County, terminating within the City of Roseville’s sphere of influence. Bill Santucci Park, located within the Roseville city limits, is the closest recreational facility to the Project at 0.41 miles from the eastern terminus of Line 407 East. Doyle Ranch Park and Morgan Creek Golf Club, also located in Roseville, are approximately 0.85 and 0.80 miles south of the proposed Project, respectively. Existing and proposed bikeways are located immediately adjacent to the Line 407 East Project area. The City of Roseville has designated Baseline Road and Fiddyment Road as Class II bikeways, i.e., on-road bikeways. These roads mark the boundary of the city’s western limits and the termination of Line 407 East.
Junction Boulevard, approximately 0.3 mile east of the Project, is designated as a proposed bikeway by the City of Roseville.

4.11.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal

There are no Federal regulations applicable to recreation resources, since there are no federally-managed recreation areas, wilderness areas or wild and scenic rivers in the Project vicinity.

State

California State Park General Plans

A General Plan is required for units of the California State Park System before permanent facilities can be provided. When completed, the General Plan directs the long-range development and management of a park by defining broad policy and program guidance. The General Plan is specific to each park and gives a general description of the applicable park; an evaluation of applicable resources including cultural resources, natural resources, and management; a discussion of land use and facilities at the park; park operations; and environmental impacts related to the park. The closest State Parks to the Project site are Woodland Opera House State Historic Park in Woodland and Colusa-Sacramento River State Recreation Park in Sacramento, neither of which is located within the Project area.

Local

Yolo County General Plan

The following recreation goals, objectives, and policies related to recreation from the Open Space and Recreation Element of the Yolo County General Plan (Yolo County 2002) were considered in this analysis.

Policy REC 1: Recreation Basic. Yolo County acquires, maintains and provides a variety of park, open and natural areas for recreational and leisure pursuits at the regional, community and neighborhood level through means of California statute, established land use controls, regulations, real property transfer, and the advice, guidance and cooperation of other jurisdictions and through coordination with other elements of this General Plan, as amended. It shall be the basic recreation policy of the County to:
1. Protect and preserve as many of the County's recreational and scenic resources as possible;

2. Maintain diversified regional-type recreation facilities and programs;

3. Assist in preserving the open space resources of the County;

4. Cooperate with special districts, cities, adjacent counties, and State and Federal agencies in the acquisition, development and administration of recreation facilities, resources and programs for joint use and mutual advantage;

5. Cooperate with and encourage private individuals and organizations in the preservation, acquisition, and administration of recreation resources;

6. Assist local rural communities in obtaining a basic level of recreation service;

7. Encourage and assist in the development of bicycle and hiking trails in and to County parks and recreation areas;

8. Encourage Greater understanding of the park system and the resources it protects by development of an interpretive program.

Sutter County General Plan

The following recreation goals, objectives, and policies related to recreation from the Conservation/Open Space Element of the Sutter County General Plan (Sutter County 1996) were considered in this analysis.

Goal 5.A: To provide adequate park and open space areas for passive and active recreational, social, educational, and cultural opportunities for the residents of Sutter County.

Policy 5.A-1: The County shall strive to maintain and improve the distribution of local and regional parks to support the recreational needs of Sutter County residents.

Policy 5.A-2: The County shall strive to achieve and maintain a standard of 10 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. This target ratio should be further divided between neighborhood, community, and regional parks according to the standards set forth in the County's park and recreation master plan.
The following recreation goals, objectives, and policies related to recreation from the Land use Element of the Placer County General Plan (Placer County 1994) were considered in this analysis.

**Goal 1.G:** To designate land for and promote the development and expansion of public and private recreational facilities to serve the needs of residents and visitors.

**Goal 5.A:** To develop and maintain a system of conveniently-located, properly-designed parks and recreational facilities to serve the needs of present and future residents, employees, and visitors.

**Policy 5.A.1:** The County shall strive to achieve and maintain a standard of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space per 1,000 population.

**Policy 5.A.4:** The County shall consider the use of the following open space areas as passive parks to be applied to the requirement for 5 acres of passive park area for every 1,000 residents.

- a) Floodways
- b) Protected riparian corridors and stream environment zones
- c) Protected wildlife corridors
- d) Greenways with the potential for trail development
- e) Open water (e.g., ponds, lakes, and reservoirs)
- f) Protected woodland areas
- g) Protected sensitive habitat areas providing that interpretive displays are provided (e.g., wetlands and habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species.)

Buffer areas are not considered as passive park areas if such areas are delineated by setbacks within private property. Where such areas are delineated by public easements or are held as common areas with homeowner/property owner access or public access, they will be considered as
passive park areas provided that there are opportunities for passive recreational use.

Policy 5.A.8: The County shall strive to maintain a well-balanced distribution of local parks, considering the character and intensity of present and planned development and future recreation needs.

Policy 5.A.13: The County shall ensure that recreational activity is distributed and managed according to an area’s carrying capacity, with special emphasis on controlling adverse environmental impacts, conflict between uses, and trespass. At the same time, the regional importance of each area’s recreation resources shall be recognized.

Policy 5.A.22: The County shall encourage compatible recreational use of riparian areas along streams and creeks where public access can be balanced with environmental values and private property rights.

Sacramento County General Plan

The following open space goals and policies related to recreation from the Open Space Element of the Sacramento County General Plan (Sacramento County 1993) were considered in this analysis.

Goal: Open space lands in Sacramento permanently protected through coordinated use of regulation, acquisition, density transfer, and incentive programs.

Policy OS-1: Permanently protect, as open space, areas of natural resource value, including wetlands preserve, riparian corridors, woodlands, and floodplains.

Policy OC-2: Maintain open space and natural areas that are interconnected and of sufficient size to protect biodiversity, accommodate wildlife movement and sustain ecosystems.

City of Roseville General Plan

The following parks and recreation goals and policies related to recreation from the Parks and Recreation Element of the City of Roseville General Plan (City of Roseville 2004) were considered in this analysis.
Parks and Recreation Goal 1: Provide adequate park land, recreational facilities, and programs within the City of Roseville through public and private resources.

Parks and Recreation Goal 2: Provide residents with both active and passive recreation opportunities by maximizing the use of dedicated park lands and open space areas.

Parks and Recreation Policy 1: The City shall ensure the provision of 9 acres of park land per 1,000 residents.

Parks and Recreation Policy 5: Cooperate with other jurisdictions to provide regional recreation facilities, where appropriate.

4.11.3 Significance Criteria

An adverse impact on recreation or special use areas is considered significant and would require mitigation if Project construction or operation would:

1. Prevent or impede access to an established recreation area during its peak use periods or for more than 1 year;

2. Adversely affect areas of special recreational concern (such as a wilderness area or wilderness study area);

3. Provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas;

4. Result in permanent alteration of a recreation resource (e.g., use of recreation lands or waters, disturbance to unique vegetation, habitat or outstanding landscape characteristics);

5. Result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, resulting in physical deterioration; or

6. Result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities.

4.11.4 Applicant Proposed Measures

No Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) have been identified by PG&E related to recreation.
4.11.5 Impact Analysis and Mitigation

Impact Discussion

Cache Creek, the Sacramento River, Rio Ramaza Marina, and existing Class II bikeways and Bill Santucci Park in the City of Roseville are the recreational facilities located within 0.5 mile of the Project area (California State Parks 2008, City of Roseville 2008, Placer County 1994, Sacramento County 1993, Sutter County 1996, Yolo County 2002). Project construction would not require the construction of new facilities. The Project would not impact population in the area and, consequently, would not create the need for new or expanded parks or facilities.

Access to Established Recreation Area

The Project would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area during its peak use periods or for more than 1 year. The proposed Project would not limit access to special use and recreational areas during either Project construction or operation. The Project would be constructed within 0.5 mile of Cache Creek, the Sacramento River, Rio Ramaza Marina, and existing Class II bikeways and Bill Santucci Park in the City of Roseville. The Sacramento River would be crossed using horizontal directional drilling techniques, so boating, rafting, and use of the Rio Ramaza Marina would not be interrupted. There would be no need to close City of Roseville bikeways within the vicinity of the Project area because the Project would not extend past the intersection of Baseline Road and Fiddyment Road. Access to Bill Santucci Park would not be affected by construction or operation of the proposed Project. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant (Class III).

Special Recreational Concern

The Project would not adversely affect areas of special recreational concern (such as a wilderness area or wilderness study area). There are no areas of special recreational concern within the Project area. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant (Class III).

Environmentally Sensitive Area Access

The Project would not provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas. The proposed Project would not include construction of new roads and therefore would not provide access to previously inaccessible areas. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant (Class III).
Permanent Alteration to Recreation Resource

The Project would not result in permanent alteration of a recreation resource (e.g., use of recreation lands or waters, disturbance to unique vegetation, habitat or outstanding landscape characteristics). The Project would be constructed within 0.5 mile of Cache Creek, the Sacramento River, Rio Ramaza Marina, and existing Class II bikeways and Bill Santucci Park in the City of Roseville. However, these recreational resources would not be impacted by the proposed Project and no permanent alteration would occur to these recreational resources. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant (Class III).

Increased Use of Parks

The Project would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, resulting in physical deterioration. Increases in demand for recreational facilities are typically associated with substantial increases in population. Since the proposed Project is a response to projected growth in the region, the Project would not result in increased population growth or the increased use of neighborhood, regional, or other recreational activities such that substantial physical deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated. As further described in Section 4.12, Population and Housing/Public Services/Utilities and Service Systems, the proposed Project would require 90 to 130 construction workers, including PG&E and contracted construction personnel. These employees would be drawn primarily from the local area per union agreement. While the construction workers may use nearby recreation facilities during breaks, this would be temporary in nature and would not substantially increase the use of recreational facilities in the Project vicinity.

The proposed Project would not result in a substantial increased demand for recreational facilities or adversely affect Yolo County, Sutter County, Sacramento County, Placer County, and City of Roseville park/population facilities because the construction activities would be temporary. Therefore, impacts related to the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, resulting from deterioration, would be less than significant (Class III).

Recreational Facilities

The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. The proposed Project does not include any plans for the addition of any recreational facilities nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed Project
would not result in any adverse physical effects on the environment from construction or expansion of additional recreational facilities. This impact would be less than significant (Class III).

4.11.6 Impacts of Alternatives

A No Project Alternative as well as twelve options have been proposed for the alignment in order to minimize or eliminate environmental impacts of the proposed project and to respond to comments from nearby landowners. The twelve options, labeled A through L, have been analyzed in comparison to the portion of the proposed route that has been avoided as a result of the option. Descriptions of the options can be found in Section 3.0, Alternatives and Cumulative Projects, and are depicted in Figure 3-2A through 3-2K.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative Lines 406 and 407 would not be constructed. As a result there would not be any impact to recreational resources.

Option A

The area through which the Option A alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option A portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option A would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option A adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option A area. Nor would Option A provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option A. Option A would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option A.

Option B

The area through which the Option B alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation
resources to be avoided along the Option B portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option B would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option B adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option B area. Nor would Option B provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option B. Option B would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option B.

Option C

The area through which the Option C alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option C portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option C would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option C adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option C area. Nor would Option C provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option C. Option C would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option C.

Option D

The area through which the Option D alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option D portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option D would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option D adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option D area. Nor would Option D provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option D. Option D would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option D.
significance criteria. Option D would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option D adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option D area. Nor would Option D provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option D. Option D would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option D.

Option E

The area through which the Option E alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option E portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option E would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option E adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option E area. Nor would Option E provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option E. Option E would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option E.

Option F

The area through which the Option F alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option F portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option F would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option F adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since
there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option F area. Nor
would Option F provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally
sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option F. Option F
would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor
result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered
recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the
proposed Project under Option F.

Option G

The area through which the Option G alignment would be similar to the proposed
Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation
resources to be avoided along the Option G portion of the proposed alignment;
therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation
resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the
significance criteria. Option G would not prevent or impede access to an established
recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas.
Nor would Option G adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since
there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option G area. Nor
would Option G provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally
sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option G. Option G
would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor
result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered
recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the
proposed Project under Option G.

Option H

The area through which the Option H alignment would be similar to the proposed
Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation
resources to be avoided along the Option H portion of the proposed alignment;
therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation
resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the
significance criteria. Option H would not prevent or impede access to an established
recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas.
Nor would Option H adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since
there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option H area. Nor
would Option H provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally
sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option H. Option H
would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option H.

**Option I**

The area through which the Option I alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option I portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option I would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option I adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option I area. Nor would Option I provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option I. Option I would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option I.

**Option J**

The area through which the Option J alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option J portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option J would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option J adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option J area. Nor would Option J provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option J. Option J would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option J.
recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option J.

**Option K**

The area through which the Option K alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option K portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option K would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option K adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option K area. Nor would Option K provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option K. Option K would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option K.

**Option L**

The area through which the Option L alignment would be similar to the proposed Project and consist primarily of agricultural areas. There are not any recreation resources to be avoided along the Option L portion of the proposed alignment; therefore, there would be no change in impacts regarding protection of recreation resources. There would not be a change in the magnitude of impacts for any of the significance criteria. Option L would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area since this alignment would not pass through any recreational areas. Nor would Option L adversely affect areas of special recreational concern since there are no areas of special recreational concern within the Option L area. Nor would Option L provide or enable access to previously inaccessible, environmentally sensitive areas, since no roads would be constructed as part of Option L. Option L would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, nor result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities. Therefore, all impacts would remain the same as the proposed Project under Option L.
Table 4.11-1: Comparison of Alternatives for Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Comparison with Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>No Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option E</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option F</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option G</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option H</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option I</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option J</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option K</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option L</td>
<td>Similar Impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.11.7 Cumulative Projects Impact Analysis

The construction of other projects in the vicinity of the proposed Project could cumulatively affect recreational resources if the construction activities occurred simultaneously. As discussed in Section 3.4, Cumulative Related Future Projects, several projects are planned in the vicinity of the proposed Project. The timing of construction for the cumulative projects is unknown, and it is possible that portions of these projects could be constructed at the same time and in the same vicinity as the proposed Project. However, the proposed Project would not result in any long-term impacts on recreational resources, and would therefore not be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

4.11.8 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Since the Project would not prevent or impede access to an established recreation area, adversely affect areas of special recreational concern, provide or enable access to previously inaccessible environmentally sensitive areas, result in
increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or result in substantial adverse physical effects from construction of new or altered recreational facilities, no mitigation measures have been proposed.