

1 **6.14 RECREATION**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2 **6.14.1 Approach to Analysis**

3 This analysis identifies the recreational facilities that could be affected by short-term project
4 construction. The project would have no long-term impact on recreational resources.

5 **6.14.2 Impact Significance Criteria**

6 The analysis of significance of impacts of the project is based on the above environmental checklist
7 and an additional consideration. The project would be deemed to have a significant
8 environmental impact if it would cause or accelerate physical deterioration of existing parks or
9 recreation facilities, or if it would include or require new recreational facilities that would have an
10 adverse environmental impact. For the purposes of this analysis, the project would also be
11 considered to have a significant environmental impact if it would substantially disrupt the use of
12 existing recreational facilities to the extent that it would affect the recreational value of such
13 facilities; this discussion is included under criteria c below.

14 **6.14.3 Impact Mechanisms**

15 Projects that create a demand for recreation may require the construction or expansion of
16 recreational facilities. Project impacts on recreational facilities would be temporary because the
17 project does not propose to construct any parks or recreational areas, permanently alter any
18 existing facilities, or increase the use of existing facilities. Construction associated with the project
19 could temporarily disrupt adjacent or nearby recreational facilities, and decrease the availability or
20 value of recreational opportunities, during construction activities.

1 **6.14.4 Impact Assessment**

2 **6.14.4.1 San Francisco Bay Area Network**

- 3 a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational*
4 *facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*
- 5 b. *Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of*
6 *recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

7 The project involves new conduit installation, conduit repair and replacement work, and the
8 construction of seven point of presence (POP) sites primarily along already disturbed corridors
9 that comprise the Caltrain and Union Pacific Railroad rights-of-way. The project does not include
10 construction of any new recreational areas. As the project would not result in any direct increases
11 in population, there would be no increase in the demand for existing recreational facilities. The
12 project would not result in increased use of existing recreational facilities or demand for new
13 recreational facilities, so it would not substantially deteriorate, or accelerate the deterioration of,
14 existing recreational facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational
15 facilities. Consequently, there would be no long-term impacts on recreation.

- 16 c. *Would the project result in permanent and/or temporary impacts, such as possible disruption of*
17 *recreational activities, affecting the recreational value of existing facilities?*

18 **Impact REC-1:** The project would intermittently and temporarily disrupt existing recreational
19 facilities during project construction. Each recreational facility would be affected for a duration of
20 1 to 62 days. (Less than Significant with Identified Mitigation)

21 Project construction would involve installing new underground conduit for fiber optic cable. The
22 project would employ two different construction techniques for installing new conduit: trenching
23 and directional boring. Table 3-1 in Chapter 3, Project Description, shows that construction
24 activities would proceed at a rate of 85 to 2,600 feet per day, depending on the type of surface and
25 method of construction being employed. The project would pass for a distance of up to 1 mile
26 adjacent to recreational facilities. Therefore, trenching could occur adjacent to recreational areas
27 for a duration of 1 to 62 days, depending on the trenching rate and the distance to be trenched.
28 Therefore, disruption of recreational facilities would range from days to weeks. Installation would
29 produce nuisance noise and air quality emissions, although it would not preclude use of
30 recreational facilities. Impacts would be potentially significant but mitigable.

31 Tables 5.14-1 and 5.14-2 in section 5.14 list existing and proposed recreational facilities that could
32 be affected by construction associated with Metromedia's proposed San Francisco Bay Area
33 Network.

34 Project construction along the proposed Backbone would not directly affect or alter any
35 recreational facility. In places where the alignment would cross recreational facilities like Gomes
36 Park in Fremont, Kelley Park in San Jose, and the Alameda Creek Trail in Fremont, construction
37 would occur within the railroad right-of-way corridor and not on park property. Project
38 construction would not substantially impair the use or value of any such facility, although these
39 activities would be visible and audible from recreational areas.

1 Table 5.14-2 identifies existing and proposed Bay Trail routes that could be affected by conduit
 2 repair or replacement work on the Pacific Bell Structure. New Build Locations 1, 2, 14 and 26
 3 (Figures 4-2a, 4-2b, and 4-2c) either cross or are adjacent to proposed Bay Trail routes. Each of
 4 these conduit repair or replacement sites is within an existing utility corridor. Proposed
 5 construction would not affect the viability of these lands for use as the Bay Trail.

6 Project construction associated with New Build Location 27 (Figure 4-2c) would temporarily
 7 disrupt the use of an existing part of the Bay Trail route for a distance of approximately 1 mile.
 8 This segment of the Bay Trail runs parallel to the Bayfront Expressway in Menlo Park.
 9 Construction impacts would be temporary in nature as the installation would move at a rate of 85
 10 to 2,600 feet per day, resulting in construction occurring over a period of up to 62 days. Ground
 11 surface disturbed would be restored as close to pre-project conditions to the extent practicable.
 12 Metromedia would obtain and comply with the Local Encroachment Permit for conduit repair or
 13 replacement work within the segment of the Bay Trail in Menlo Park. Permit conditions would
 14 potentially include detours for bicycles and pedestrians affected by project construction, and
 15 storage of construction materials in designated areas only. Short-term impacts on recreational uses
 16 would be potentially significant.

17 **Mitigation Measure REC-1a:** Limit construction to weekday non-peak hour use periods. This
 18 restriction would minimize short-term disruptions to recreational facilities that would occur
 19 during construction.

20 **Mitigation Measure REC-1b:** All ground surfaces will be restored as close to pre-project
 21 conditions as soon as possible or practicable.

22 **6.14.4.2 Los Angeles Basin Network**

23 Potential recreation impacts associated with the Los Angeles Basin Network would be similar to
 24 those discussed above for the San Francisco Bay Area Network. Table 5.14-3 identifies all local
 25 parks and recreational facilities adjacent to new build construction. Unlike the San Francisco Bay
 26 Area Network, construction of the Los Angeles Basin Network would not cross through any park
 27 facility, but would be visible and audible to users of such facilities.

28 a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational*
 29 *facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

30 b. *Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of*
 31 *recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

32 Please see the San Francisco Bay Area Network discussion for criteria a and b. Impacts would be
 33 the same for the Los Angeles Basin Network. Impacts would be less than significant.

34 c. *Would the project result in permanent and/or temporary impacts, such as possible disruption of*
 35 *recreational activities, affecting the recreational value of existing facilities?*

36 Impact REC-1 listed above for the San Francisco Bay Area Network would also apply to the Los
 37 Angeles Basin Network. The project would pass for a distance of up to 1 mile adjacent to
 38 recreational facilities, with the exception of Heartwell Park and Golf Course, where the cable route
 39 would pass adjacent to recreational facilities for a distance of 2 miles. Trenching could occur

6.14 Recreation

1 adjacent to recreational areas for a duration of 1 to 62 days (up to 124 days along Heartwell Park
2 and Golf Course), depending on the trenching rate and the distance to be trenched. Therefore,
3 disruption of recreational facilities would range from days to weeks. Trenching activities would
4 produce nuisance noise and air quality emissions, although it would not preclude use of
5 recreational facilities.

6 Mitigation measure REC-1a and REC-1b would apply to the Los Angeles Basin Network and
7 would reduce impacts to less than significant.