

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.13	Recreation	4.13-1
4.13.1	Environmental Setting	4.13-1
4.13.2	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.13-4
4.13.3	References	4.13-8

Tables

Table 4.13-1 UC Davis Park and Open Space Resources

4.13 RECREATION

This section of the EIR describes the current recreation uses on the UC Davis campus and surrounding area and the ways in which the implementation of the 2003 LRDP would lead to physical deterioration of existing recreation facilities or the creation or expansion of recreation facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Public comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation did not raise any issues concerning impacts to recreation facilities.

4.13.1 Environmental Setting

4.13.1.1 *Campus Recreation Facilities*

UC Davis contains many park-like areas and recreation facilities. Park facilities at UC Davis range in size from small picnic and landscaped areas within campus housing areas to extensively landscaped areas in the academic core of the central campus, such as the Arboretum. Areas such as the Quad, the landscaped areas along A Street and Russell Boulevard, the Putah Creek Riparian Reserve in the west campus, and many areas within the Arboretum are used regularly by members of the UC Davis campus and visitors to the campus.

Table 4.13-1 summarizes the UC Davis campus open spaces and park resources. Although the campus has not established a standard for parkland, currently park-like lands are available on campus at a ratio of about 14.2 acres per 1,000 of campus population.

**Table 4.13-1
UC Davis Park and Open Space Resources**

Land Use Category	Existing Acres (approximate)
Formal Open Space	20
PE/Intercollegiate Athletic/Recreation	107
Open Space Teaching and Research	376
Total	503

Source: UC Davis Existing Land Use Diagram.

Recreation facilities on the campus include structures, bike paths, and fields used for physical education, intercollegiate athletics, intramural sports, sports clubs, and general recreation. Recreation structures include Hickey Gym, Recreation Hall, the Recreation Swimming Pool, and Recreation Lodge. Two major recreation facilities are currently under construction: the Activities and Recreation Center and the Schaal Aquatic Center. The general public may purchase privilege cards for access to some facilities or join community or campus organizations that have specific access to campus recreation facilities. UC Davis provides recreation facilities and constructs new facilities based on demand for facilities and the availability of financial resources and land.

4.13.1.2 *Off-Campus Recreation Facilities*

As described in Section 4.11 Population and Housing (Volume II), LRDP-related population would constitute more than 3 percent of the total population in four communities near the campus including Davis, Dixon, Winters, and Woodland. Therefore this EIR examines recreation facilities in these communities.

City of Davis. The City of Davis has an extensive parks system. In addition to parks, the recreation facilities in Davis include greenbelts, picnic areas, buildings, fields, play structures, pools, and theaters (City of Davis 2003). Currently the city offers approximately 167 acres of parklands (including community parks, neighborhood parks, mini-parks, and other parks) (City of Davis 2002). Parks are provided in the City of Davis based on the number of city residents. The City maintains a goal of providing 5 acres of parks for every 1,000 residents. The City of Davis General Plan notes that in 1995 the City had approximately 2.8 acres of parks for every 1,000 residents and that the parks planned through 2010 would result in 3.4 acres of parks for every 1,000 residents. The general plan does not project when the City might achieve its goal of 5 acres of parks per 1,000 residents. The general plan identifies community parks, neighborhood parks, and mini parks as park types and identifies a preferred size for each park type as well as a goal of providing one community park within 1.5 miles of each dwelling unit and one neighborhood park within 3/8 of a mile of each dwelling unit (City of Davis 2001).

The City of Davis maintains an extensive variety of recreation facilities within city parks, including recreation fields, swimming pools, tennis and basketball courts, picnic facilities, play equipment, fitness equipment, and bicycle paths. The City also has a central park, which is located in downtown Davis. This park includes a teen center, a museum, recreation facilities, and a carousel and is the site of the biweekly farmer's market. Other special parks in the City include the municipal golf course, the Civic Center softball fields, and the Little League Park baseball fields. An extensive greenbelt system connects many areas of the City, including park facilities and major roadways to park facilities (City of Davis 2001).

The City of Davis General Plan lists the following recreation goals:

- Goal POS 1. Provide ample, diverse, safe, affordable, and accessible parks, open spaces, and recreation facilities and programs to meet the current and future needs of the City's various age and interest groups and to promote a sense of community, pride, family, and cross-age interaction.
- Goal POS 3. Identify and develop linkages, corridors, and other connectors to provide an aesthetically pleasing and functional network of parks, open spaces, greenbelts, and bike paths throughout the City.
- Goal POS 4. Distribute parks, open spaces, and recreation programs and facilities throughout the City.
- Goal POS 5. Respect natural habitat and agricultural land in planning and maintaining the City's park system.
- Goal POS 6. Encourage local organizations, the Davis Joint Unified School District, UC Davis, and the private sector to provide, develop, and maintain needed parks, open space, recreation facilities, programs, activities, and special events to the greatest extent possible.

- Goal POS 7. Reflect a balance between preservation, education, recreation, and public health and safety in park and open space planning.

To implement the goals listed above, the City of Davis General Plan contains detailed policies, actions, and standards that identify specific ideas and steps for providing parks and recreation facilities in the City of Davis (City of Davis 2001).

City of Woodland. The City of Woodland operates 31 parks and recreation facilities on 309 acres, including 149 acres within the city and 160 acres outside its limits. In addition to parks, the other recreation facilities include swimming pools, skate parks, ball fields, and centers (J. Laurence Mintier & Associates 2003). City policy locates parks adjacent to public schools where possible, and coordinates with the Woodland Joint Unified School District to provide for joint use of athletic facilities. The General Plan sets varying standards for provision of park acreage depending on the types of use, but a total of 11 acres of various types of parkland are to be provided per 1,000 population. In 1996, this standard resulted in a city requirement for 367 acres of parkland, while actual parkland totaled 312 acres. Total new development within and outside City limits by 2020 was projected to result in a demand for 241 additional parkland acres. 19 acres of parkland are identified in the Southeast Area Specific Plan for development in the City. Other sites would need to be identified within the City to provide parkland at the General Plan standards (J. Laurence Mintier & Associates 1996).

City of Winters. Winters had about 6 acres of parklands in 1991, or about 1.3 acres of parklands per 1,000 residents. The 1991 General Plan anticipated an increase in the demand for parklands as a result of the projected increased population, as well as increased pressures on existing facilities, recreation programs, and regional recreation opportunities. A Park Master Plan for the City proposes to add four new neighborhood parks of 5 to 10 acres each, two large special-purpose parks, senior and teen centers, a golf course, a visitor center, and a network of paths and bicycle trails, for a total of 92 acres of developed parkland. Parks are to be distributed around the city for equal service of all neighborhoods. The General Plan sets an objective of providing 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. The City's zoning and land development ordinance requires developers to dedicate (or pay in lieu of) 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents of the development. Development fees provide funds for acquisition and development of parks (Duncan & Jones 1991).

City of Dixon. The 1993 Dixon General Plan sets a standard to maintain at least 5 acres of parkland per each 1,000 residents. Parklands are to be distributed throughout the city. Joint uses with the Dixon Unified School District are encouraged by policy, but these spaces do not contribute to the identified parkland quota. In 1993, the city had 85.77 acres of designated parklands (City of Dixon 1993). This exceeded the City's parkland standard for the then-current population of 11,324. Population in 2001 was about 16,000, and thus parklands were still sufficient to meet the standard.

The Dixon Parks Master Plan called for a total of 113.74 acres of developed parklands and recreation facilities by 2010. General Plan policy mandates that proponents of new development in the City be required to contribute to the acquisition and development of new parks (City of Dixon 1993).

4.13.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.13.2.1 *Standards of Significance*

The following standards of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For the purposes of this EIR, an impact to recreation would be considered significant if the implementation of the proposed LRDP would:

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

The standards of significance for the 1994 LRDP EIR for recreation were discussed in the community services section of that EIR. The 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance for parklands considered whether or not the acquisition of additional parklands was required to conform to locally acceptable or adopted park standards. This 2003 LRDP EIR does not evaluate impacts on recreational facilities in terms of additional acreage that may be needed to meet local standards but examines the demand for recreational facilities and the potential environmental effects from the development of additional lands for recreational uses.

4.13.2.2 *CEQA Checklist Items Adequately Addressed in the Initial Study*

The Initial Study determined that all CEQA checklist items require further evaluation.

4.13.2.3 *Analytical Method*

To evaluate potential impacts on campus recreation facilities, the increased on-campus population expected during the implementation of the 2003 LRDP is compared to the existing on-campus population. In the 2003 LRDP, to evaluate potential impacts associated with recreation facilities in the cities of Davis, Woodland, Winters, and Dixon, information in the general plans of these communities was examined to determine whether additional parks and recreational facilities would be needed to serve the projected population growth, including LRDP-related population projected to reside in these communities, and if so what the likely environmental effects of park development would be. The analytical method for the cumulative impacts analysis of this section is similar to that used for the Public Services section and is described in Section 4.12.2.3.

4.13.2.4 *2003 LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures*

The implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in the construction of new recreation facilities on the campus. The 2003 LRDP designates approximately 520 additional acres of land as Formal Open Space, Physical Education/Intercollegiate Athletics/Recreation (PE/ICA/Recreation), and Teaching and Research Open Space, which when combined with the existing 500 acres, would bring the total of recreational space on campus to about 1,020 acres. The impacts from the designation of this space for this use are evaluated in all other sections of

this EIR. The specific potential impacts of the recreation facilities proposed as part of the Neighborhood Master Plan are presented in Section 2 (Volume III) of this EIR. Environmental impacts from the construction and operation of a new stadium are presented in Section 4 Multi-Use Stadium Complex (Volume III). Physical impacts from the development of recreational facilities on campus are therefore adequately addressed in other sections of this EIR. The analysis below focuses on the potential for increased use to lead to the deterioration of recreational facilities on campus. Environmental impacts from new facilities needed to serve LRDP-related off-campus population are discussed in Section 4.13.2.5 under Cumulative Impacts.

LRDP Impact 4.13-1: Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in increased use of campus recreation facilities but would not result in deterioration of facilities.

Significance: Less than significant

LRDP Mitigation: Mitigation is not required.

Maintenance of the existing recreation facilities at UC Davis is adequate to match the intensity of facility usage caused by the current population at UC Davis. Increased population at UC Davis is expected to result in increased demand for and usage of recreation facilities, which could result in the accelerated deterioration of UC Davis recreation facilities. To counteract the effects of increased usage, the campus typically increases its maintenance levels of existing facilities and will continue to do so during the life of the 2003 LRDP. Increased maintenance of the current facilities would be adequate to prevent the accelerated deterioration of existing facilities. Accelerated deterioration of off-campus recreation facilities would not be expected because maintenance practices could be increased to offset increased facility usage. Such demand-based maintenance practices are the typical management strategy of recreation providers.

The 2003 LRDP designates approximately 18 acres of land west of SR 113 for future conversion to recreation fields. The 2003 LRDP also designates land for greenbelts to the west of State Route 113, expansion of the campus Arboretum, expansion of the Putah Creek Riparian Reserve, and enhanced formal open space (garden walks and formal courtyards) within the central campus. The construction of new facilities would take place when warranted by increased demand and when financially feasible. Because of the planned construction of new facilities and because increased maintenance for existing recreation facilities would prevent the deterioration of existing facilities, this impact is identified as less than significant.

* * *

4.13.2.5 *Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures*

LRDP Impact 4.13-2: Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, together with the cumulative impacts of other regional development, could increase the use of off-campus recreation facilities, the development of which could result in significant environmental impacts.

Significance: Significant

LRDP Mitigation 4.13-2: If documented unmitigated significant environmental impacts are caused by the construction of recreation facilities in the

Cities of Dixon, Woodland, and/or Winters that are needed in part due to implementation of the 2003 LRDP, UC Davis shall negotiate with the appropriate local jurisdiction to determine the campus' fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3) of the costs to implement any feasible and required environmental mitigation measures so long as the unmitigated impacts have not been otherwise reduced to less-than-significant levels through regulatory requirements, public funding, or agreements. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any other costs associated with implementation of recreation facilities.

Residual Significance: Significant and unavoidable

The study area for cumulative impacts on recreation facilities is the three-county area in which the majority of the LRDP-related off-campus population is expected to reside. This LRDP-related population would place a demand on recreation facilities in the affected communities, which would combine with effects stemming from other regional growth. The cumulative impacts of this combined growth on recreation facilities in the affected communities are examined below.

Section 4.11 Population and Housing (Volume II) describes the methodology used to develop the pattern in which off-campus population would be distributed. Based on the projected distribution, four communities, namely the cities of Davis, Dixon, Winters, and Woodland, would likely receive LRDP-related population that would constitute more than 3 percent of each affected community's total population in 2015. It would be reasonable to assume that LRDP-related population in the rest of the regional communities would be too small (as a fraction of total population) to substantially affect the recreation facilities in those communities. Therefore, the analysis below focuses on these four regional communities.

Because LRDP-related population growth in these communities is essentially a part of the overall regional growth, information in the general plans of each of these communities was examined to determine what demand the projected growth would place on each community's recreation facilities, and whether that demand would then require new or modified facilities that could result in environmental impacts. The results of this analysis are presented below.

City of Davis. As discussed in Section 4.11 Population and Housing, approximately 970 of the new faculty, staff and UC-affiliated employees would likely occupy housing in the City of Davis. These employees and their dependents would make up a total of approximately 2,600 persons out of a total 2015 population of 67,240 persons as projected by SACOG. This population would place a demand on the City's recreation facilities, and potential impacts from that demand in conjunction with growth in city population are discussed below.

The acreage of existing parklands in the City of Davis is substantially below the level of service goal of the City of Davis (5 acres per 1,000 population) for its current population. UC Davis park and recreation spaces contribute substantially to the park facilities used by City of Davis residents. The proposed construction of new park facilities on the central campus and the west campus as part of the 2003 LRDP, which would be readily accessible to Davis residents, would provide increased park facilities in the Davis area in excess of the City of Davis' goal of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. Accordingly, the impact to the City of Davis park and recreation facilities is identified as less than significant.

City of Woodland. An estimated 3,200 LRDP-related persons are expected to reside in Woodland. This population would constitute about 5 percent of the City's population of 60,415 persons in 2015 based on current SACOG projections. According to the City's General Plan EIR, the City expects to attain a population of 65,860 by 2020 (J. Laurence Mintier & Associates 1996). Total new development within and outside City limits by 2020 was projected to result in a demand for 241 additional parkland acres to meet the City's level of service standards. Some sites have been identified, but none have been environmentally assessed. The City would need to identify additional sites in order to provide parkland at the General Plan standards. To the extent that an increase in off-campus population associated with the 2003 LRDP could contribute to the demand for park facilities, in compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.13-2, the campus would negotiate with respective jurisdictions to determine the University's fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3) of costs for feasible mitigation to reduce associated significant environmental impacts. However, it is unknown at this time if that increased demand will be met with the acquisition of these lands. It is unknown whether parkland development would result in significant and unavoidable environmental effects from issues such as loss of prime agricultural lands and habitat.

City of Winters. An estimated 670 LRDP-related persons are expected to reside in Dixon. This population would constitute about 6.3 percent of the City's projected population of 10,610 persons in 2015 based on current SACOG projections. According to the City's General Plan, which was last adopted in 1991, the City expected to attain a population of 12,500 by 2010 (Duncan & Jones 1991). A Park Master Plan for the City proposes to develop a total of 92 new acres of parkland around the City within the plan period to accommodate the existing population and anticipated population growth. The General Plan sets an objective of providing 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, although the City in 1991 offered only 1.3 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Substantial park development will be required within the plan period to meet this standard for the projected population. To the extent that an increase in off-campus population associated with the 2003 LRDP could contribute to the demand for park facilities, in compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.13-2, the campus would negotiate with respective jurisdictions to determine the University's fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3) of costs for feasible mitigation to reduce associated significant environmental impacts. Because specific park and recreation facility sites either have not been identified or have not been assessed, the future amount and condition of recreation facilities cannot be determined. It is unknown whether parkland development would result in significant and unavoidable environmental effects from issues such as loss of prime agricultural lands and habitat.

City of Dixon. An estimated 940 LRDP-related persons are expected to reside in Dixon. This population would constitute about 3.8 percent of the City's population of 24,300 persons in 2015 based on current ABAG projections. According to the City's General Plan, which was last adopted in 1993, the City expects to attain a population of 20,325 by 2010 (City of Dixon 1993).

The Dixon Parks Master Plan called for a total of approximately 114 acres of developed parklands and recreation facilities by 2010. General Plan policy mandates that proponents of new development in the City be required to contribute to the acquisition and development of new parks. Thus, increased development of parks would be expected to be consistent with population increases in the City. To the extent that an increase in off-campus population associated with the 2003 LRDP could contribute to the demand for park facilities, in compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.13-2, the campus would negotiate with respective jurisdictions to determine the

University's fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3) of costs for feasible mitigation to reduce associated significant environmental impacts. It is unknown whether parkland development would result in significant and unavoidable environmental effects from issues such as loss of prime agricultural lands and habitat.

Based on General Plan policies that address the need for parks and recreation services, it is anticipated that new parks and recreation facilities could be constructed in the cities of Dixon, Winters, and Woodland during the planning period, in response to the demands of increased population, contributed by implementation of the 2003 LRDP in conjunction with other regional growth. Depending on the site, this development could result in impacts such as loss of prime farmland, or valuable habitat. These impacts are less likely where parks or recreation facilities would be built as infill, as is the case for facilities to be built within residential developments. Habitat impacts of development in some cases could be mitigated through the designation of open space areas, which would be preserved as parks. These beneficial uses in some cases would mitigate the impacts of other development. Because specific park and recreation sites either have not been identified, or have not been environmentally assessed in most cases, it would be speculative for this EIR to arrive at the conclusion that the impacts would be less than significant. Therefore it is concluded that the environmental impacts from the development of recreation facilities triggered by the cumulative demand in the region would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.13-2.

* * *

4.13.3 References

City of Davis. 2001. *City of Davis General Plan Update*.

City of Davis. 2002. City of Davis Website. www.city.davis.ca.us

City of Davis. 2003. City of Davis Parks and Facilities Website www.cityofdavis.org/pcs/facility

City of Dixon. 1993. *Dixon 1993 General Plan*. Prepared with the assistance of Duncan & Jones in affiliation with J. Daniel Takacs.

City of Woodland. 2003. City of Woodland Parks, Recreation, Community Services Guide to Facilities Website. www.ci.woodland.ca.us/prcs/guide.htm

Duncan & Jones. 1991. *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Winters Draft General Plan* (SCH# 91073080). October.

J. Laurence Mintier & Associates. 1996. *Woodland General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report* (SCH# 95053061). Prepared for the City of Woodland. February.

Jones & Stokes. 2000. *Draft Program EIR for the City of Davis General Plan Update and Project EIR for Establishment of a New Junior High School*. Prepared for the City of Davis. January.