

## 5.14 RECREATION

The recreation analysis is intended to determine the extent to which a project contributes to the physical deterioration of publicly provided recreation facilities. The EIR should discuss any increased demand for various recreational facilities and identify any potential need for new recreational facilities generated by the project. This section describes the recreational resources within the project area, and the applicable regulations that govern those resources. The following analysis of the potential environmental impacts related to recreation is derived from the following sources and agencies:

- Shasta County. *Shasta County General Plan*. 2004.
- Shasta County. *Shasta County Code, Title 15, Subdivision Regulations*.
- Shasta County. *Parks, Trails and Open Space Plan*. August 2009.

The section also discusses the proposed project in the context of regional and local recreational facilities and addresses the potential impacts to recreational resources that may occur as a result of the proposed project implementation.

### 5.14.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### REGIONAL SETTING

Shasta County provides an array of recreational opportunities through federal, State and County parks, forests, and fishing areas. These facilities include; Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Bureau of Land Management holdings, McArthur-Burney Falls Memorial State Park, Castle Crags State Park, Shasta Historic Park, and several fishing access areas. Five federal forests and national park sites lie within Shasta County, including Lassen National Forest, Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, and Lassen Volcanic National Park (Shasta County, 2009).

#### LOCAL SETTING

There are no existing regional or local recreational facilities in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site. The closest recreational facilities are located west of the proposed project in the City of Redding.

### 5.14.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### STATE

##### Quimby Act

The goal of the 1975 Quimby Act (California Government Code §66477) was to require developers to help mitigate the impacts of property improvements. Cities and counties have been authorized since the passage of the Quimby Act to pass ordinances requiring that developers set aside land, donate conservation easements, or pay fees for park improvements. Special districts must work with cities, and/or counties to receive parkland dedication and/or in-lieu fees. The fees must be paid and land conveyed directly to the local public agencies that provide park and recreation services communitywide.

The 1982 amendment to Quimby was designed to hold local governments accountable for imposing park development fees; hence the 1982 amendment to AB 1600 requires agencies to clearly show a reasonable relationship between the public need for the recreation facility or park land and the type of development project upon which the fee is imposed. Cities and counties were required to be more accountable and to show again, a strong direct relationship or nexus between the park fee exactions and the proposed project. Local ordinances must now include definite standards for determining the proportion of the subdivision to be dedicated and the amount of the fee to be paid.

The Quimby Act sets forth parkland standards for jurisdictions within the State of California. The Act provides for a maximum of three acres of park dedication/fee per 1,000 persons unless the amount of existing (at the time of adoption) neighborhood and community parkland exceeds that limit. If a jurisdiction exceeds the three acres per 1,000 persons then the jurisdiction is eligible to adopt the higher five acres per 1,000 persons standard.

## **LOCAL**

### **Shasta County Parks, Trails and Open Space Plan**

The intent of the *Shasta County Parks, Trails and Open Space Plan* is to identify the issues and opportunities for improving the provision of parks, trails, and open space in Shasta County. The plan outlines a set of strategies and recommendations for meeting current and future community needs based on changing trends in recreation, new patterns for recreation participation, and new areas of growth and development in the County.

The plan has a minimum local parkland of 40-acres total for the four designated town centers, including Burney/Johnson Park, Cottonwood, Fall River Mills/McArthur, and Palo Cedro. The minimum local parkland for the 25 designated rural community centers is a total of 125 acres. The proposed project is not located within a designated town center or rural community center.

### **Shasta County Code, Chapter 15.08.100, Dedication of Land**

Shasta County Code Chapter 15.08.100 sets limits on the amount of land required to be dedicated or irrevocably offered for dedication of park or recreational purposes within the County. The advisory agency may require as a condition of approval of a tentative or vesting tentative map that interests in real property be dedication, irrevocably offered for dedication or reserved for public purposes, including, but not limited to, those set forth in Government Code Sections 66475 through 66482. The Code requires that the dedication of land will not exceed one acre per one hundred lots and in combination with or in-lieu of such dedication, the advisory agency may require the payment of a fee for park and recreational purposes, in an amount established by a resolution of the Board of Supervisors.

### **Shasta County General Plan**

Government Code Section 65560(b)(3) specifies that open space for outdoor recreation be addressed in a community's General Plan. This topic has been addressed in the Open Space and Recreation Element of the Resources Group in the *Shasta County General Plan*. The Open Space and Recreation Element deals with recreation at the countywide level and recreation as it relates to the County tourist industry. The Element includes a discussion of the resources and facilities provided by federal, State and County

governments, as well as private interests, which are designed to accommodate users from the entire County. Applicable goals relative to the proposed project within these elements are below:

- *Policy OSR-a.* Protection of the open space resources under Shasta County jurisdiction shall be achieved primarily through policies recognizing the contributions of these resources to the economy of the County. Specifically, the Timber, Croplands, Grazing, and Small-Scale Croplands/Grazing, and Natural Resource Protection Habitat land use designations shall be used for this purpose. Other open space resources generally with no known economic value for timber, croplands, or grazing shall be classified as Natural Resources Protection – Open Space (N-O). The purpose of this N-O classification is to recognize open space values by permitting low density residential development along with the resource uses. Typically, lands classified as N-O are adjacent to major landforms, riparian corridors, habitat areas, etc. Residential densities that do not exceed one dwelling per twenty acres may be permitted. In recognition of their resource or open space value, federally-owned lands shall be classified as N-O. Land changed from public to private ownership shall remain in the N-O designation unless an approved General Plan amendment places the property in a more appropriate land use designation.

### 5.14.3 STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

#### SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

In accordance with State *CEQA Guidelines*, the effects of a project are evaluated to determine whether they would result in a significant adverse impact on the environment. An EIR is required to focus on these effects and offer mitigation measures to reduce or avoid any significant impacts that are identified. The criteria used to determine the significance of impacts may vary depending on the nature of the project. According to Appendix G of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a significant impact related to recreation, if it would:

- *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.* Refer to Impact 5.13-1, below.
- *Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.* Refer to Impact 5.13-2, below.

Based on these standards, the effects of the proposed project have been categorized as either a “*less than significant*” impact or a “*potentially significant*” impact. Mitigation measures are recommended for potentially significant impacts. If a potentially significant impact cannot be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of mitigation, it is categorized as a “*significant and unavoidable*” impact.

### 5.14.4 POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### METHODOLOGY

Recreational facilities and opportunities in the area were evaluated to determine whether they would be adversely affected by the proposed project. This evaluation included consideration of the overall number and area of parklands or other recreational facilities and proximity to the proposed project.

Recreation impacts are analyzed below according to topic. Mitigation measures directly correspond with an identified impact.

---

<b>IMPACT</b> 5.14-1	<b><i>Implementation of the proposed project would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.</i></b>
-------------------------	---

---

**Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Impact Analysis:** Under a build out scenario, the project would result in a population increase of 445 persons (refer to Section 5.12, POPULATION AND HOUSING). The proposed project would include six open space parcels that would total approximately 192.7 acres. The six separate open space parcels would be preserved to maintain sensitive habitat features and/or species. The largest open space parcel is generally located on steep slopes (greater than 30 percent slope) adjacent to waterways in the eastern portion of the project site. This 154.9 open space area would serve as both a conservation and permanent open space area that could be utilized by both subdivision and neighborhood residents. This is viewed as a long-term positive impact. Therefore, the potential increase in use at any one park is not expected to be significant or result in a detectable physical deterioration.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required. Impacts would *be less than significant*.

---

<b>IMPACT</b> 5.14-2	<b><i>Implementation of the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.</i></b>
-------------------------	---

---

**Significance: Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Impact Analysis:** The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. School facilities are typically used for sports and recreation. The City of Redding, located to the west of the project, also has a number of recreational facilities. In addition, there are tens of thousands of acres of rivers, lakes, forests, and other public lands available for recreation in Lassen National Park, the Shasta and Whiskeytown National Recreation Areas, the National Forests, and other public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Additionally, as stated above, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantially increased use of any area recreational facilities, and would therefore not require construction of new or expansion of any other existing recreational facilities. *Less than significant* impacts would occur in this regard.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

---

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required. Impacts would be *less than significant*.

## 5.14.5 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Significance:** Less Than Significant Impact.

**Cumulative Setting:** The geographic scope for cumulative impacts to recreation includes past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects as identified in Section 4.0, BASIS OF CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS. Impacts of the proposed project would be cumulatively considerable if they have the potential to combine with similar impacts of the identified cumulative projects.

**Impact Analysis:** With regard to project resulting in increased use of parks (Impact 5.14-1, above), the proposed project's impacts would be less than significant, as the project includes open space parcels that would have recreational opportunities. Recreation impacts are generally localized, and individual impacts would be addressed on a project-by-project basis. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to increased park usage would be minimal and would not combine with impacts from cumulative projects to result in a significant impact. Cumulative impacts are considered *less than significant*.

With regard to the construction expansion of new parks (Impact 5.14-2, above), the proposed project would not require construction of new or expansion of any other existing recreational facilities; therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impact. New development would be required to provide for recreational facilities through fees or the development of additional park facilities in compliance with the advisory agency's requirements for future residents. Additionally, it is anticipated that the park fees would be used to develop additional park and recreational facilities and maintain existing park facilities. The development of future parks and recreational facilities would be subject to the environmental review process. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project would not have the potential to combine with impacts from cumulative projects to result in a significant impact. Cumulative impacts are *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required. Cumulative recreation impacts would be *less than significant*.