

7.10 RECREATION

This chapter focuses on the impacts to recreation associated with the implementation of the alternatives carried forward for review under the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. In general, most recreation impacts are outside the USACE's statutory authority and responsibility under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The primary responsibility of evaluating and regulating recreation impacts resides with the local agencies such as cities and counties. As part of the NEPA review, the USACE is analyzing impacts on the environment associated with projects that receive authorizations under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

7.10.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

An alternative would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Increase the use of the existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.
- Substantially degrade the recreational use of existing parks.
- Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
- Preclude the implementation of planned facilities.

7.10.2 SAMP PROCESSING PROCEDURES AND PROGRAMS

As discussed previously, the proposed RGP and LOP procedures have been developed for future participants and current participants in the SAMP. The future participants have not yet defined projects for permitting by the RGP or LOP procedures. For projects proposed by future participants that would be eligible for authorization by the maintenance RGP, impacts to recreation would be minimal. Such activities would be associated with small maintenance projects, resulting in temporary impacts to a small area located in a mostly degraded landscape. Since there would be no change in recreation activities from these maintenance activities, impacts are not expected under the RGP. For projects eligible for authorization by the LOP procedures, not enough is known about the project size and location or potential impacts to analyze potential impacts to recreation. Such projects eligible for authorization by the LOP procedures will be subject to future NEPA review before a final permit decision can be made.

Current participants have analyzed their activities including SMWD Proposed Project, RMV Proposed Project, and alternatives that may have significant effects on the environment as noted in Chapter 6.0. Therefore, the authorization pursuant to the proposed permitting procedures may also have an effect on the environment per the thresholds of significance. These potential effects on recreation and minimization/mitigation measures applicable to these potential effects are further discussed below.

7.10.3 SMWD PROPOSED PROJECT

The SMWD Proposed Project would not impact recreational facilities. None of the SMWD facilities are in or adjacent to a park. Therefore, it would not degrade existing parks or have substantial indirect impacts (i.e., visual impacts). The construction of the Upper Chiquita

Reservoir and operation and maintenance activities would not result in any additional use of the recreational facilities nor result in over use of facilities.

7.10.4 ALTERNATIVE B-10 MODIFIED

7.10.4.1 Impacts

Increased Use of Recreation Facilities Resulting in Physical Deterioration

Alternative B-10 Modified would result in a substantial increase in population in the SAMP Study Area. Based on preliminary estimates using the type of housing proposed, the 14,000 dwelling units would generate a population of approximately 32,823 residents. Associated with this increase in population would be an increased demand for recreational resources. This increased demand would be served through the development of neighborhood and community parks that would be provided to serve the proposed development. Based on the County local park requirements, 2.5 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents would be required. Alternative B-10 Modified would have to provide an estimated 82 acres of local parkland. Through the provision of both active and passive parkland in compliance with the Local Park Code, spillover demand on other park facilities in currently developed areas is not expected. New local facilities would serve the future demand associated with the development in Alternative B-10 Modified. As a result, this alternative would not result in increased use of existing recreational facilities that would result in physical deterioration.

Effect on the Recreational Use of Existing Parks

Federal Parks

Alternative B-10 Modified would not have a significant impact on the Cleveland National Forest. The locations of proposed future development do not abut forest property. This would minimize indirect impacts, such as visual impacts. Increased population in the SAMP Study Area would mean that more people are proximate to the Cleveland National Forest and it would be more convenient to use the facilities. However, population associated with Alternative B-10 Modified would be less than what has been assumed in local and regional growth projections. The number of new residents in the area would be less than one percent of the number of people in the region (i.e., Orange and Riverside counties) adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest. Alternative B-10 Modified would provide opportunities for both passive and active recreation within the RMV Planning Area. Given the size of the forest and generally passive nature of the recreational opportunities within the SAMP Study Area portion of the Cleveland National Forest, the incremental increase in usage would not substantially degrade the forest.

State Parks

San Onofre State Beach. As previously indicated, existing uses within the Cristianitos subarea of San Onofre State Beach include a network of trails and the San Mateo Campground. The development of Alternative B-10 Modified would not have direct impacts on San Onofre State Beach. Limited development is proposed in the Talega Canyon Watershed, which would be the closest development area to the beach. There would be an approximately 500-foot setback between the RMV Planning Area and the park boundary. There is a very gradual elevation change from the San Mateo Campground to the proposed development areas within the RMV Planning Area. The campground sits at an elevation of about 50 feet. Traveling north to the southern edge of the RMV Planning Area, the elevation gradually rises to about 300 feet. The terrain throughout the RMV Planning Area rises and falls between approximately 500 feet to

about 1,300 feet with peaks reaching approximately 2,000 feet. This elevational change would provide visual barriers from much of the proposed development.

The visual character of the Cristianitos area is generally undeveloped; however, urban influences are visible within the State Beach, particularly in the southern portion of the park. I-5 is located in the southern portion of Cristianitos; high power lines from the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station traverse the lower portion of the Cristianitos area, and development in San Clemente and base housing is visible in the southern edge as well. Agricultural areas are adjacent to the San Onofre State Beach within MCB Camp Pendleton. The area surrounding the San Mateo Campground and the area proposed for hiking trails, primitive camps, and a primitive group camp is mostly undeveloped and natural. Views from San Mateo Campground would not be significantly altered because of the distance between the campground and the development associated with Alternative B-10 Modified. There would be no direct impact on proposed hiking trails and camps. Indirect impact associated with viewshed would be dependent on the timing of the park improvements relative to the timing of the implementation of Alternative B-10 Modified. Additionally, the design and orientation of the facilities would be a factor. There is the potential that the trails and camps would have mid-range views of development, rather than views of undeveloped canyons. Given the uncertainty of the timing and design of these future facilities and the limited affect the development would have, this would not be considered a significant impact.

Regional Parks

The countywide regional park system has been designed to serve the existing and future needs of the residents of Orange County. Alternative B-10 Modified would increase usage of the nearby facilities because it would introduce more people into the region. However, as part of County of Orange General Plan, the Master Plan of Regional Parks has been designed to meet the needs associated with the projected growth in the County. Based on information from the County's website (www.ocparks.com), the County currently has approximately 9,000 acres of existing regional parks, of which 3,300 acres (O'Neill Regional Park) are within the two-mile radius of the proposed development area for Alternative B-10 Modified. This acreage figure does not account for the proposed Prima Deshecha Regional Park, which currently operates as a landfill. The six County designated wilderness parks comprise approximately 23,600 acres, of which slightly more than 9,000 acres are within the two-mile radius of the development area (Caspers and Riley Wilderness Parks). With approximately 37 percent of the regional parks and wilderness parks designed to serve the entire County within two miles of the RMV Planning Area, it is anticipated the proposed development would not result in the over use of these regional facilities such that a substantial degradation of the recreational use of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.

General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park. Alternative B-10 Modified would not have any direct impacts on General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park. Indirect impacts due to the proximity of development to the park could potentially occur. A wilderness park is defined in the Recreation Element of the Orange County General Plan as:

"A regional park in which the land retains its primeval character with minimal improvements and which is managed and protected to preserve natural processes. The park (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude of a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also

contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic or historical value.”

The wilderness park designation requires that the undeveloped character not be substantially degraded, so as to not impact the park's function. The topography of the park helps to serve as a buffer between General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park and the surrounding area. The ridgelines along the perimeter of the park help to shield the interior portion of the park from surrounding development. Existing development is seen upon the approach to the park, as well as at the higher elevations within the park. Development surrounds the park on three sides. Areas designated for open space in Cañada Gobernadora and Chiquita Canyon would abut the park on its western and southern boundaries. This would provide an approximately 2,000-foot-wide buffer between development and the park boundary. Additionally, in closest proximity to General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park within Cañada Gobernadora and Chiquita Canyon would be low-density estate development. This would minimize the intrusion of urban development on the park. There would not be a significant impact on the park's wilderness experience for park visitors from urban development associated with Alternative B-10 Modified.

Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Park. Alternative B-10 Modified would not have any direct impacts on Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Park. This alternative does have the potential to have indirect impacts due to the proximity of proposed development in relationship to the park. As previously indicated, Caspers is designated as a wilderness park, so the undeveloped character of the park is integral to its function. The topography of Caspers Wilderness Park helps to serve as a buffer between park and the surrounding area. The ridgeline along the western edge of the park would generally minimize any views of Alternative B-10 Modified from within the park. As discussed in Chapter 7.7, Visual Resources, views of the development from within Caspers Wilderness Park would be limited to various vantage points, such as points along the Eastridge Trail and the parking lot for the observation deck. From these locations, there would be limited views of the proposed development in Verdugo Canyon Watershed. Similarly, along the Westridge Trail there would be views of development in the Central San Juan Watershed. Along this trail, there would be mid-range views of development to the west. A 500-foot-wide development setback is proposed along the RMV Planning Area boundary with Caspers Wilderness Park to serve as a buffer. More distant views would be possible along Oso Trail. Trail elevations rise from approximately 700 feet above mean sea level to approximately 1,450 feet above mean sea level. While the trail is located in the northern portion of the park, at the peak elevations there would be distant views of Alternative B-10 Modified. The distance between the development and these vantage points would reduce the impact on the park to a less than significant level. Overall, Alternative B-10 Modified would introduce an urban component into the open space surrounding the park. However, the wilderness character of the park would be preserved. Camping activities are in valley areas and no views of urbanization would occur. Given the limited scale of visible development and the protection of the surrounding areas in open space, there would be minimal impacts on the character of the park as a result of development.

O'Neill Regional Park. O'Neill Regional Park is approximately one mile west of the western boundary of the RMV Planning Area. Given intervening topography and other development (Las Flores Planned Community and Ladera Ranch), Alternative B-10 Modified would have limited influence on O'Neill Regional Park. The development would not be visible from any locations within the park. There is no drainage from the development area to Arroyo Trabuco which is located in O'Neill Regional Park. Alternative B-10 Modified provides for a wildlife corridor connection between O'Neill Regional Park, General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park, and Caspers Wilderness Park. The wildlife corridor would use the open space area adjacent to O'Neill Regional Park, which was established for wildlife movement between Las Flores and

Ladera Ranch. Across Chiquita Ridge, open space within Chiquita and Gobernadora Canyons would provide for wildlife movement. There would be no significant impacts on O'Neill Regional Park.

Require the Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities Resulting in Adverse Physical Effects on the Environment

Alternative B-10 Modified would be required to construct new parks and recreational facilities, such as trails and bikeways. The parks would all be constructed within the development areas associated with this alternative. Therefore, the impacts on the environment have been addressed as part of the development impacts. No additional significant impacts would result from construction of new recreational facilities.

The San Juan Creek Trail, Cristianitos Trail, and a portion of the Prima Deshecha Trail would be developed in conjunction with Alternative B-10 Modified. In addition, a staging area for riding and hiking trails is proposed near the San Juan Creek Trail junction with the Prima Deshecha Trail. These trails would be built in conjunction with the RMV Proposed Project; however, because of their proposed locations and linear nature they would traverse open space area. The impacts associated with the construction of the trails have been calculated as part of the overall infrastructure impacts associated with this alternative. Alternative B-10 Modified does not conflict with implementation of any of the proposed Master Plan facilities.

Additional community trails may be provided as a means of providing for connectivity to trails that have been developed in nearby communities. Generally, these trails would be located within development areas; therefore, there would not be adverse physical impacts beyond what has been addressed for Alternative B-10 Modified. However, to provide for connectivity to other community trails and/or recreational facilities, the trails would traverse areas designated for open space. The trails would generally use existing ranch roads to reduce the impact on natural resources within the open space areas.

There are two designated bikeways within the limits of Alternative B-10 Modified. Both bikeways would be provided for as part of the development of Alternative B-10 Modified. The Class II bikeway on Antonio Parkway would be constructed in conjunction with the widening of the roadway. The Class I San Juan Creek Bikeway is proposed to follow San Juan Creek. Approximately six miles of the San Juan Creek bikeway would fall within the Alternative B-10 Modified boundaries. It is anticipated the bikeway would be developed within the development areas and in open space adjacent to Cow Camp Road. Alternative B-10 Modified would not conflict with the implementation of the Master Plan bikeways.

7.10.4.2 Mitigation Program

In conjunction with the approval of the GPA/ZC, the County of Orange adopted a mitigation program to reduce the impacts associated with impacts on recreational facilities. These measures are listed below to provide the reader context of the mitigation program, though these measures would be implemented as part of the development project and would be the responsibility of the County of Orange for monitoring. No additional mitigation is required as part of the SAMP.

Project Design Features¹

- PDF 4.12-2 The project incorporates a 20- to 25-acre sports park.
- PDF 4.12-3 The project provides for 15,132² acres of open space within the Ranch Plan boundaries. The large amount of open space would provide for protection of many of the major ridgelines. Specifically, the open space in Planning Area 10 would provide a buffer with the General Thomas F. Riley and Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Parks. This minimizes indirect impacts on the existing parks.
- PDF 4.12-4 The project provides for trail linkages between the Ladera Ranch and the Ranch Plan community trails, which provides connection to the regional trail system.
- PDF 4.12-5 The project would facilitate implementation of the Master Plan of Regional Riding and Hiking Trails, through the construction of portions of the San Juan Creek, the Cristianitos, and the Prima Deshecha trails.
- PDF 4.12-6 The project would facilitate implementation of the Master Plan of County Bikeways through construction of portions of the San Juan Creek Bikeway.
- PDF 4.12-7 The project proposes the construction of up to four golf courses.
- PDF 4.12-8 Local park sites will be provided in accordance with the provisions of the Orange County Local Park Code as contained in the Park Implementation Plan for the Ranch Plan PC Area. Park sites will also be identified at the Master Area Plan level per Section II.B.3.a.6.

Standard Conditions and Regulations

Many of the standard conditions and regulations are enacted at subsequent levels of approval. The following are the County of Orange Standard Conditions associated with recreational resources that would apply to the project. These are listed even though they may not be applicable at the GPA/ZC level of approval, but because they would be applicable at subsequent levels of approvals (i.e., grading permits and tract maps). These standard conditions often identify lots that would be provided for public purposes. This level of information cannot be known until tract maps are proposed. However, as previously indicated, the identification of the standard conditions at this time is to allow the reader an understanding of conditions that are applicable to the project at subsequent levels of approval. The number of the standard condition is listed in parentheses at the end of each condition.

- SC 4.12-1 A. Prior to the recordation of any subdivision map that creates building sites and is immediately adjacent to or contains a public park lot, the subdivider shall make an irrevocable offer of fee dedication for local park purposes to the County of Orange or its designee over Lot(s) __.³ The form of the offer shall be suitable for recordation as approved by the Manager, Current Planning Services. Said offer shall be free and clear of money and all other

¹ PDF 4.12-1 and SC 4.12-3 pertained to a proposed new regional park. Alternative B-10 Modified, as adopted by the County of Orange did not include a new regional park; therefore, these Project Design Features were eliminated.

² Alternative B-12 would result in 16,942 acres of open space.

³ The lot numbers would be tied to specific lots identified on the tentative tract map when it is filed. At the GPA/ZC there is no tentative tract map; therefore, the precise lot numbers or letters are unknown and a placeholder is provided.

encumbrances, liens, leases, fees, easements (recorded and unrecorded), assessments and unpaid taxes except those meeting the approval of the Manager, Current Planning Services.

- B. The subdivider applicant shall grade Lot(s) __, the public park site(s), to provide a minimum ___ acres of creditable local park land and shall secure the park site(s) against erosion and shall stub out sewer, water, gas, electricity, telephone, storm drain, etc., connections to the property lines.
- C. The developer, or his assigns, and successors in interest shall maintain the offered park site(s) until such time as the County or its designee accepts the offer of dedication. (Standard Condition CP01 Public Park Dedication)

SC 4.12-2 A. Prior to the recordation of an applicable subdivision map which creates building sites, the subdivider shall make an irrevocable offer to dedicate an easement over Lot(s) ___ for private local park purposes to the County of Orange in a form approved by the Manager, the Manager, Current Planning Services. The subdivider shall not grant any other easement over the private park easement which is inconsistent with the local park uses, unless that easement is made subordinate to said local park easement in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, Current Planning Services.

- B. Prior to the recordation of an applicable final subdivision map, the subdivider shall submit a preliminary concept plan of the proposed private recreation facilities to the Manager, Current Planning Services, for review and approval. (Standard Condition CP02 Private Park Dedication)

SC 4.12-4 Prior to the recordation of each applicable subdivision map, the subdivider shall reserve open space Lots ___ for granting in fee to a homeowner's association who shall be responsible for their maintenance and upkeep in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager HBP/Program Management. (Standard Condition HP02 Open Space Dedications)

SC 4.12-5 The subdivider shall provide an easement for a recreational trail for riding and hiking trail purposes in accordance with the following:

- A. Prior to the recordation of an applicable subdivision map, the subdivider shall:
 - 1. Irrevocably offer a recreation easement for riding and hiking trail purposes in a location and in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager HBP/ Program Management. The subdivider shall not grant any easement(s) over the property subject to the recreation easement unless such easements are first reviewed and approved by the Manager HBP/Program Management.
 - 2. Design the necessary improvements for the trail, including, but not limited to grading, erosion control, signage, fencing, and a grade-separated crossing, as applicable, in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager HBP/ Program Management, in consultation with the Manager, Subdivision and Grading. Trail design shall also avoid affecting areas known to contain sensitive biological resources as identified in Section 4.9, Biological Resources.

3. Enter into an agreement, accompanied by financial security, with the County of Orange, to insure the installation of the necessary improvements.
- B. Prior to the issuance of precise grading permits, applicant shall obtain approval from the Manager HBP/ Program Management, that the proposed grading provides for and will not interfere with or preclude the installation of the recreational riding and hiking trail.
- C. Prior to the issuance of final certificates of use and occupancy and the release of financial security guaranteeing the riding and hiking trail improvements, the applicant shall install the riding and hiking trail improvements in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager HBP/Program Management, in consultation with the Manager, Construction. (Standard Condition HP03 Recreation Easement for Regional Trail)

Mitigation Measures

MM 4.12-1 In conjunction with approval of the first Master Area Plan, the applicant shall develop a Master Trail and Bikeways Implementation Plan for the Ranch Plan that would establish viable routes for trails and bikeways to provide connectivity to community trails and bikeways in adjacent developments and with existing and proposed recreational facilities. The Master Trail and Bikeways Implementation Plan shall meet with the approval by the Director of PSD in consultation with the Manager, Harbors, Beaches and Parks/Program Management.

7.10.4.3 Level Of Significance After Mitigation

Alternative B-10 Modified would not have any significant physical impacts on recreational resources. The implementation of the mitigation program provides measures to better protect resources. There would be no significant unavoidable impacts on recreational resources.

7.10.5 ALTERNATIVE B-12

7.10.5.1 Impacts

Increased Use of Recreation Facilities Resulting in Physical Deterioration

Alternative B-12 would result in a substantial increase in population in the SAMP Study Area. As with Alternative B-10 Modified, this increase in population would result in an increased demand for recreational resources. This increased demand would be served through the development of neighborhood and community parks that would be provided to serve the proposed development. Based on the County local park requirements, 2.5 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents would be required. Assuming the same amount of single-family and multi-family units as Alternative B-10 Modified, Alternative B-12 Modified would have to provide an estimated 82 acres of local parkland. As with Alternative B-10 Modified, Alternative B-12 would be required to comply with the Local Park Code to reduce spill over demand on other park facilities in currently developed areas. As a result, this alternative would not result in increased usage of recreational facilities that would result in physical deterioration.

Effect on the Recreational Use of Existing Parks

Federal Parks

Alternative B-12 would be similar to Alternative B-10 Modified in that it would not have a significant impact on the Cleveland National Forest. The locations of future development do not abut the forest thereby minimizing visual impact. The increased population in the area would mean that more people are in close proximity to the forest; however, the incremental increase in forest usage would not substantially degrade the forest.

State Parks

San Onofre State Beach. Alternative B-12 would not have direct impacts on San Onofre State Beach. This alternative limits the amount of development proximate to the Cristianitos Sub-basin to 500 acres (within the Talega/Blind Sub-basin). The precise location of the development has not been defined; however, the setback from the State Beach would likely be greater than the 500-foot-wide setback provided for in Alternative B-10 Modified. No other development in the San Mateo Watershed is proposed. Therefore, the potential for visual intrusion and other impacts associated with development is less than significant.

Regional Parks

General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park. Alternative B-12 would not significantly alter the wilderness character of General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park. The topography of the park helps to serve as a buffer between the park and the surrounding area. Areas designated for open space in Cañada Gobernadora and Chiquita Canyon would abut much of the park on its western and southern boundaries. With this alternative, residential development and a cemetery is proposed in Middle Chiquita (adjacent to Tesoro Creek High School), which assumes development closer to the park than was provided for Alternative B-10 Modified. The approximately 2,000-foot-wide buffer provided in Alternative B-10 Modified would also be provided under this alternative development scenario. Additionally, the remainder of Middle Chiquita is left undeveloped. This would enhance wildlife movement and minimize the intrusion of urban development on the park. There would not be a significant impact on the park's wilderness experience for park visitors from urban development associated with Alternative B-12.

Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Park. Alternative B-12 would not have any direct impacts on Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Park. Indirect impacts due to the proximity of development in relationship to the park would be similar in nature as Alternative B-10 Modified. However, with Alternative B-12, the amount of development in the Verdugo Canyon Watershed would be substantially reduced, thereby reducing the potential for visual intrusion. The topography of the park, which helps to serve as a buffer between Caspers Wilderness Park and the surrounding area, would not be altered with this alternative. As with Alternative B-10 Modified, views of development from within Caspers Wilderness Park would be limited to various vantage points, such as points along the Eastridge Trail and the parking lot for the observation deck, the Westridge Trail, and distant views along Oso Trail. The distance between the development and these vantage points would reduce the impact on the park to less than significant. Alternative B-12 would introduce an urban component into the open space surrounding the park. However, the wilderness character of the park would be preserved. Camping activities are in valley areas and no views of urbanization would be visible. Given the limited scale of visible development, and the protection of the surrounding areas in open space, there would be minimal impacts on the character of the park as a result of development.

O'Neill Regional Park. Similar to Alternative B-10 Modified, intervening topography and other development (Las Flores Planned Community and Ladera Ranch) would limit the influence of Alternative B-12 on O'Neill Regional Park. Proposed development would not be visible from any locations within the park. There is no drainage from the development area to Arroyo Trabuco, located in O'Neill Regional Park. Compared to Alternative B-10 Modified, Alternative B-12 expands the wildlife corridor connection between O'Neill Regional Park, General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park and Caspers Wilderness Park. There would be no significant impacts on O'Neill Regional Park.

Require the Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities Resulting in Adverse Physical Effects on the Environment

Alternative B-12 would be required to construct new parks and recreational facilities, such as trails and bikeways. All parks would be constructed within the RMV Planning Area. Therefore, the impacts on the environment have been addressed as part of the development impacts. No additional significant impacts would result from construction of new recreational facilities.

Similar to Alternative B-10 Modified, the San Juan Creek Trail, the Cristianitos Trail, a portion of the Prima Deshecha Trail, and the trail staging area would be developed in conjunction with Alternative B-12. These trails would be built in conjunction with development. The impacts associated with the construction of the trails have been calculated as part of the overall infrastructure impacts associated with the B-12 Alternative. Alternative B-12 does not conflict with implementation of any of the proposed Master Plan facilities. Similar to Alternative B-10 Modified, additional community trails may be provided as a means of providing for connectivity to trails that have been developed in nearby communities. Generally, these trails would be located within development area and along existing ranch roads to reduce the impact on natural resources within the open space areas.

Alternative B-12 would construct the Class II bikeway on Antonio Parkway and the Class I San Juan Creek Bikeway. The Antonio Parkway bikeway would be constructed in conjunction with roadway widening. The San Juan Creek bikeway would be located in open space at the edge of the development area, adjacent to Cow Camp Road. The bikeway would be entirely on the south side of the San Juan Creek. Alternative B-12 would not conflict with the implementation of the Master Plan of Bikeways.

7.10.5.2 Mitigation Program

The mitigation program adopted for Alternative B-10 Modified (see Chapter 7.10.4.2, above) would apply to Alternative B-12. Implementation and monitoring of these measures would be the responsibility of the County of Orange. No additional mitigation is required as part of the SAMP.

7.10.5.3 Level Of Significance After Mitigation

Alternative B-12 would not have any significant physical impacts on recreational resources. The implementation of the mitigation program provides measures to better protect resources. There would be no significant unavoidable impacts on recreational resources.

7.10.6 ALTERNATIVE A-4

7.10.6.1 Impacts

Increased Use of Recreation Facilities Resulting in Physical Deterioration

The impacts associated with Alternative A-4 would be the same as those outlined above for Alternative B-10 Modified. The development proposal and footprint for this alternative is the same as Alternative B-10 Modified. However, this alternative assumes that impacts to Waters of the U.S. would be processed with individual and nationwide permits rather than the SAMP. The increased demand associated with new development would be served through the development of neighborhood and community parks. Based on the County local park requirements, 2.5 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents would be required. Alternative A-4 Modified would have to provide an estimated 82 acres of local parkland. As with Alternative B-10 Modified, compliance with the Local Park Code would reduce spill over demand on other park facilities in currently developed areas. As a result, this alternative would not result in increased usage of recreational facilities that would result in physical deterioration.

Effect on the Recreational Use of Existing Parks

Federal Parks

Alternative A-4 would be similar to Alternative B-10 Modified in that it would not have a significant impact on the Cleveland National Forest. The locations of future development do not abut the forest thereby minimizing visual impacts. The increased population in the area would mean that more people are proximate to the forest; however, the incremental increase in forest usage would not substantially degrade the forest.

State Parks

San Onofre State Beach. Development of Alternative A-4 would not have direct impacts on San Onofre State Beach. As discussed in subchapter 7.10.4, the limited development proposed in the Talega Canyon Watershed, an approximately 500-foot-wide setback between the development area and the park boundary, and existing topography serve to limit the views of development from the park.

Regional Parks

General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park. As discussed above for Alternative B-10 Modified, the topography of the park helps to serve as a buffer between the park and the surrounding area. This buffering would minimize the potential impacts associated with Alternative A-4. Areas designated for open space in Cañada Gobernadora and Chiquita Canyon would abut much of the park on its western and southern boundaries, providing an approximately 2,000-foot-wide buffer between development and the park boundary. Low-density estate development would be the type of development in closest proximity to General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park within Cañada Gobernadora and Chiquita Canyon. This would lessen the intrusion of urban development on the park. There would not be a significant impact on the park's wilderness experience for park visitors from urban development associated with Alternative A-4.

Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Park. Alternative A-4 would not directly impact the Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Park. Indirect impacts due to the proximity of development in relationship to the park would be similar in nature as Alternative B-10 Modified. The topography of the park,

which helps to serve as a buffer between Caspers Wilderness Park and the surrounding area, would not be altered with this alternative. As with Alternative B-10 Modified, views of development from within Caspers Wilderness Park would be limited to various vantage points, such as points along the Eastridge Trail and the parking lot for the observation deck, the Westridge Trail, and distant views along Oso Trail. The distance between the development and these vantage points would reduce the impact on the park to less than significant. Alternative A-4 would introduce an urban component into the open space surrounding the park. However, the wilderness character of the park would be preserved. Camping activities are in valley areas and no views of urbanization would be visible. Given the limited scale of visible development, and the protection of the surrounding areas in open space, there would be minimal impacts on the character of the park as a result of development.

O'Neill Regional Park. Similar to Alternative B-10 Modified, intervening topography and other development (Las Flores Planned Community and Ladera Ranch) would limit the influence of Alternative A-4 on O'Neill Regional Park. The development would not be visible from any locations within the park. There is no drainage from the development area to Arroyo Trabuco, located in O'Neill Regional Park. A wildlife corridor connecting O'Neill Regional Park, General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park, and Caspers Wilderness Park would be provided. There would be no significant impacts on O'Neill Regional Park.

Require the Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities Resulting in Adverse Physical Effects on the Environment

Alternative A-4 would be required to construct new parks and recreational facilities, such as trails and bikeways. The parks would all be constructed within the development areas. Therefore, the impacts on the environment have been addressed as part of the development impacts. No additional significant impacts would result from construction of new recreational facilities.

Similar to Alternative B-10 Modified, the San Juan Creek Trail, Cristianitos Trail, a portion of the Prima Deshecha Trail, and the trail staging area would be developed in conjunction with Alternative A-4. These trails would be built in conjunction with development. The impacts associated with the construction of the trails have been calculated as part of the overall infrastructure impacts. Alternative A-4 does not conflict with implementation of any of the proposed Master Plan facilities. Similar to Alternative B-10 Modified, additional community trails may be provided as a means of providing for connectivity to trails that have been developed in nearby communities. Generally, these trails would be located within development area and along existing ranch roads to reduce the impact on natural resources within the open space areas.

Alternative A-4 would construct the Class II bikeway on Antonio Parkway and the Class I San Juan Creek Bikeway. The Antonio Parkway bikeway would be constructed in conjunction with roadway widening. The San Juan Creek bikeway would be located in both development and open areas adjacent to Cox Camp Road. Alternative A-4 would not conflict with the implementation of the implementation of the Master Plan of Bikeways.

7.10.6.2 Mitigation Program

The mitigation program adopted for Alternative B-10 Modified (see subchapter 7.10.4.2) would apply to Alternative A-4. Implementation and monitoring of these measures would be the responsibility of the County of Orange. No additional mitigation is required as part of the SAMP.

7.10.6.3 Level Of Significance After Mitigation

Alternative A-4 would not have any significant physical impacts on recreational resources. The implementation of the mitigation program provides measures to better protect resources. There would be no significant unavoidable impacts on recreational resources.

7.10.7 ALTERNATIVE A-5

7.10.7.1 Impacts

Increased Use of Recreation Facilities Resulting in Physical Deterioration

The County of Orange local park requirement calls for 2.5 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. Under the Alternative A-5 scenario, it is anticipated that in the larger blocks of development, this requirement would be met through the provision of local parks. However, in the more remote areas or smaller pockets of development, this local parks requirement may be met through the payment of fees. For those areas where fees are paid, residents would use existing parks until sufficient fees are collected for the County to provide park area. This could place additional demand on existing recreational facilities in the short term. However, in the long range, it is anticipated that sufficient parks would be provided. Whether through provision of parkland or the payment of fees, Alternative A-5 would be required to comply with the County's Local Park Code; no significant impacts would occur.

Effect on the Recreational Use of Existing Parks

Federal Parks

Alternative A-5 would allow development in closer proximity to the Cleveland National Forest than any of the other alternatives. In places, development would be allowed along the eastern edge of the RMV Planning Area. However, since this development would generally need to rely on the existing ranch road network, it is anticipated that the development in this portion of the RMV Planning Area would be low density. While it may introduce development closer to the Cleveland National Forest, it would not substantially degrade the viewshed from the forest. With Alternative A-5, the increased population in the area would be limited and the incremental increase in forest usage would not substantially degrade the forest.

State Parks

San Onofre State Beach. Development of Alternative A-5 would not have direct impacts on San Onofre State Beach. However, with this alternative, development would be allowed along the southern RMV Planning Area boundary immediately adjacent to the State Beach. Unlike the other alternatives, no setback from the park boundary is provided. This would alter the viewshed from the existing trails in the northern portion of the Cristianitos Sub-basin. While intervening topography would minimize views of the development beyond the Talega Watershed, the development in the southern portion of the RMV Planning Area would also be visible from the San Mateo campground. However, this would not be a significant impact because of the generally low density of the development.

Regional Parks

General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park. With Alternative A-5, there are locations where proposed development could occur immediately adjacent to the park boundary. However, the topography of the park would help serve as a buffer between park and the surrounding area. Given the overall low density of the development, this change would not be considered a significant impact because it would not substantially alter the use or the character of the park.

Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Park. Alternative A-5 would not have any direct impacts on the Ronald W. Caspers Wilderness Park. There would be potential indirect impacts due to the proximity of proposed development in relationship to the park. This alternative does not provide for a setback or buffer between development and the park. However, as with the other alternatives, existing topography would minimize the visual impacts from development on the park. Precise locations and grading quantities are not known for this alternative. It is anticipated that development would be visible in many of the same locations as with Alternative B-10 Modified but at a lower density. Views of development from within Caspers Wilderness Park are expected along the Eastridge Trail and the parking lot for the observation deck, the Westridge Trail, and distant views along Oso Trail. The distance between the development and these vantage points would reduce the impact on the park to less than significant. Although visible from certain vantage points, the wilderness character of the park would be preserved. Camping activities are in valley areas and no views of urbanization would be visible. Given the limited scale of visible development and the protection of the surrounding areas in open space, there would be minimal impacts on the character of the park as a result of development.

O'Neill Regional Park. Similar to the other alternatives, intervening topography and other development (Las Flores Planned Community and Ladera Ranch) would limit the influence of Alternative A-5 on O'Neill Regional Park. The development would not be visible from any locations within the park. There is no drainage from the development area to Arroyo Trabuco, located in O'Neill Regional Park. The overall density of development would be less with Alternative A-5. Dependent on the placement of development, a wildlife corridor connecting General Thomas F. Riley Wilderness Park to Caspers Wilderness Park would be provided. However, this alternative does not provide a defined wildlife movement corridor connecting Riley Wilderness Park to O'Neil Regional Park. However, it would not be an impact on the recreational value of the O'Neill Regional Park which is not designated a wilderness park. There would be no significant impacts on O'Neill Regional Park.

Impact

7.10.7-1 *Alternative A-5 may result in gaps in the implementation of the Master Plan of Riding and Hiking Trails within the RMV Planning Area.*

Impact

7.10.7-2 *Alternative A-5 may result in gaps in the implementation of the Master Plan of Bikeways and the OCTA within the RMV Planning Area.*

Require the Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities Resulting in Adverse Physical Effects on the Environment

Alternative A-5 would be required to construct new parks and recreational facilities, such as trails and bikeways. The parks would all be constructed within the development areas associated with Alternative A-5. Therefore, the impacts on the environment have been addressed as part of the development impacts. No additional significant impacts would result from construction of new recreational facilities.

The Master Plan of Riding and Hiking Trails depicts the San Juan Creek Trail, the Cristianitos Trail, a portion of the Prima Deshecha Trail, and the trail staging area within the RMV Planning Area. In those locations where trails are designated and development would occur, the trails would be implemented. However, there are large areas where trails are designated where no development would be allowed. Given the limited amount of development, it is uncertain if the entire trail network would be constructed. With limited residential development, it may not be financially possible for the 3,000 units to finance the implementation off-site portions of the trail network. This would result in gaps in the trail network. This would be a significant impact. Similarly, given the limited amount of residences, the provision of a community trails network may not be feasible. Community trails are desirable for providing connectivity to trails that have been developed in nearby communities, although it would not be a significant impact because it is not part of a regional trails network.

Similar to riding and hiking trails, Alternative A-5 would potentially leave gaps in the bikeway network. With Alternative A-5, Antonio Parkway would not be widened. As a result, the designated Class II bikeway would not be constructed. Since there is only limited development along San Juan Creek, it is uncertain if the Class I San Juan Creek Bikeway would be fully implemented. This alternative would not provide a parallel arterial highway (e.g., Cow Camp Road) which could be designed to include a Class I bike trail. With limited residences, it may not be financially possible for the 3,000 units to finance the implementation off-site portions of the bikeway network. Alternative A-5 would potentially conflict with the implementation of the County Master Plan of Bikeways.

7.10.7.2 Mitigation Program

The mitigation program adopted for Alternative B-10 Modified (see subchapter 7.10.4.2) would not apply to Alternative A-5. However, it is assumed that the County's standard conditions of approval outlined above would apply to future tentative tract maps. Implementation and monitoring of these measures would be the responsibility of the County of Orange. No additional mitigation is required as part of the SAMP.

7.10.7.3 Level Of Significance After Mitigation

Alternative A-5 would not have any significant physical impacts on recreational resources. However, this alternative does not provide for the comprehensive implementation of the County Master Plan of Riding and Hiking Trails, the County Master Plan of Bikeways or the OCTA Commuter Bikeway Strategic Plan within the RMV Planning Area. This would be considered a significant unavoidable impact on recreational resources.