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3.4 Recreation

The section provides a description of the recreation sites and areas within the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor Study Area (Study Area); presents an overview of the regulations of federal, state, and local land management agencies that provide recreation opportunities; and describes direct effects to recreation sites/areas. Direct effects involving other environmental disciplines on recreation resources are discussed, as appropriate, in Section 3.3, Land Use; Section 3.9, Visual and Aesthetic Resources; and Section 3.14, Biological Resources. Recreation sites/areas that qualify as Section 4(f) are discussed in Chapter 4, and Section 6(f) resources are discussed in Section 3.3, Land Use.

3.4.1 Regulatory Setting

Many federal, state, and local agencies provide recreation opportunities and facilities in the Study Area, including United States Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), National Park Service (NPS), Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), Arizona State Parks and Trails, Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), and local and county governments. These entities provide and/or manage recreation activities on public lands with management plans developed as part of their guiding authority. Table 3.4-1 (Agencies and Policies and Regulations for Managing Recreation) summarizes the policies and regulations for federal, state, and county/municipal agencies that manage recreation within the Study Area.

3.4.2 Methodology

The recreation analysis is focused on identifying publicly owned recreation sites/areas for which any portion is contained within the 2,000-foot-wide corridor, or which could be directly impacted by construction of I-11 due to proximity. Acreages of potential impacts are quantified for the recreation sites/areas within the 2,000-foot-wide corridor and are compared to the overall acreage of the recreation sites/areas. Context for the impacts to these recreational areas is obtained by considering the impact to the portion within the Build Corridor Alternative against the total area of the recreation site. The analysis does not address future refinements to the alignments to minimize impacts or address co-location with existing roadways. Those topics are part of potential mitigation strategies and future Tier 2 projects.

The Project Team identified recreation resources using a variety of public sources. Recreation information for public lands administered by the BLM, USFS, and NPS were identified from a review of available data in existing Resource Management Plans and websites. In addition, designated parks and open spaces on state, county, and municipal lands were identified from websites and the recreation and open space elements of comprehensive plans, general plans, and other land use management plans adopted by the State of Arizona, counties, and incorporated cities.

Recreation sites that currently exist, are under construction, or within a regulatory permitting stage are addressed. Although impacts to recreation on private property would likely occur from all alternatives, this analysis focuses on publicly-owned recreation areas. Identification of recreation opportunities on private lands would be addressed in Tier 2.
### Table 3.4-1 Agencies and Policies and Regulations for Managing Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Policy or Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Resource Management Plan for the Field Office, BLM Planning Area, or National Monument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Federal    | USFS   | National Forest Management Act of 1976  
National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable legislation and regulations  
Wilderness Act (16 USC 1131)  
Land and Resource Management Plan |
| Federal    | NPS    | Legislation that created the park  
Foundation Document or General Management Plan  
NPS Organic Act (54 USC 100101(a), 100301 et seq.)  
NPS Management Policies 2006  
Code of Federal Regulations Title 36 Parts 1-5 or Chapter 1 Parts 1-7 and 34 USC Titles 16, 18, 21 and 54  
Park specific regulations within the Superintendent’s Compendium |
| State      | Arizona State Parks and Trails | 2018-2022 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan  
Arizona Trails 2015 (statewide motorized and non-motorized trails plan) |
| State      | AGFD   | Management Plan for Robbins Butte Wildlife Area  
Property Purpose/Management Focus for Public Land Order 1015 lands |
| State      | Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) | No specific management plans for State Trust lands within the analysis area. |
| Local      | County Comprehensive Plans and Municipal General Plans | Local comprehensive plans include an element for parks, open space, or recreation that identify an overall vision or direction for recreation as it relates to community needs, and provides direction for specific facilities and opportunities. |

AGFD = Arizona Game and Fish Department, ASLD = Arizona State Land Department, BLM = Bureau of Land Management, NPS = National Park Service, USC = United States Code, USFS = US Forest Service.

### 3.4.3 Affected Environment

The Study Area includes a variety of recreation sites/areas on federal lands managed by BLM, NPS, and USFS. These sites/areas include two National Monuments, one National Park, one National Historical Park (NHP), and one National Historic Trail (NHT). Recreation sites/areas on BLM lands include primarily trails, whereas the USFS and NPS areas contain more developed facilities, such as campgrounds and picnic areas. The Study Area also includes three designated wildernesses areas – two within the Sonoran Desert National Monument (SDNM) and one within Saguaro National Park (SNP). State lands and county and municipal parks also provide recreation opportunities, which typically have developed recreation facilities.

The following section describes existing recreation sites/areas in the Study Area from south to north. Additional information about recreation management areas, designated national trails,
3.4.3.1 Existing Recreation Sites/Areas

Within the South Section, numerous recreation opportunities are provided on federal lands managed by BLM, NPS, and USFS and include one National Monument, one National Park, one NHP, and one NHT. Recreation opportunities include off-highway vehicle use, hiking, biking, horseback riding, camping, hunting, sightseeing, target shooting, wildlife viewing, plant viewing, photography, birdwatching, visiting historic and archaeological sites, visiting fossil and geological resources, picnicking, scenic driving, cultural demonstrations, and scenic viewing. The Tucson Mountain District of the SNP includes trails, campground, a picnic area, and a visitor center.

The South Section also includes one state park managed by Arizona State Parks and Trails, and State Trust lands managed by the ASLD. Recreation opportunities on State Trust land include picnicking, hiking, wildlife viewing, and camping. Additional recreation activities are allowed on State Trust lands with a permit (e.g., hunting). There also are six AGFD-designated Game Management Units (GMUs) and one wildlife area. GMUs are hunting areas consisting of state, federal, military, and private land. Hunters must have written or verbal permission from private property owners to hunt on private property or to cross private property to reach State Trust lands.

Recreation opportunities are provided by the Town of Marana, and Town of Sahuarita, but majority of the local parks and trails in the Study Area are managed by the City of Tucson and Pima County. Parks within the Tucson metropolitan area generally provide a more urban recreation experience compared to regional parks located outside of Tucson.

Figure 3.4-1 (Recreation Sites in Project Vicinity – South Section) depicts the recreation sites/areas within the South Section of the Project Area. Appendix E4 describes these sites/areas in greater detail.

Within the Central Section, the BLM provides numerous recreation opportunities on federal lands and include one National Monument, one Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA), one Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA), and one NHT. Recreation opportunities include off-highway vehicle use, hiking, biking, horseback riding, camping, hunting, sightseeing, target shooting, wildlife viewing, photography, visiting historic and archaeological sites, backpacking, star gazing, and picnicking.

The Central Section also includes the Robbins Butte Wildlife Area and Public Land Order 1015 lands managed by AGFD. State Trust lands in the Central Section provide recreation opportunities that primarily focus on waterfowl management, upland game bird management, hunting, bird watching, hiking, fishing, wildlife viewing, outdoor education, and other wildlife-oriented recreation uses. Additional recreation activities are allowed on State Trust lands with a permit (e.g., hunting). Land in the Central Section also is within five AGFD-designated GMUs and part of two wildlife areas.

Maricopa County maintains one regional park that provides a variety of developed recreation facilities. Pinal County currently provides recreation at one park and is in the process of developing a regional park.
Figure 3.4-1  Recreation Sites in Project Vicinity – South Section
Figure 3.4-2 (Recreation Sites in Project Vicinity – Central Section) depicts the recreation sites/areas within the Central Section of the Project Area. Appendix E4 describes these sites/areas in greater detail.

The BLM provides dispersed recreation opportunities on land it manages in the North Section as the Vulture Mountains Recreation Management Zone (RMZ), or Vulture Mountains Recreation Area (VMRA). This includes the Vulture Mine Off-Road Challenge Race Course for off-highway vehicles (OHV). The VMRA consists of approximately 70,000 acres of land south of Wickenburg, Arizona. Activities on the land are guided by two primary planning documents: the 2010 Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan (RMP) and the 2012 RMZ Plan.

The North Section also includes State Trust lands managed by the ASLD. Recreation opportunities on these lands focus on hunting, wildlife viewing, and other wildlife-oriented recreation uses. However, additional recreation activities are allowed on State Trust lands with a permit (e.g., hunting). The North Section is within three AGFD-designated GMUs.

Figure 3.4-3, (Recreation Sites in Project Vicinity – North Section) depicts the recreation sites/areas within the North Section of the Project Area. Appendix E4 describes these sites/areas in greater detail.

3.4.4 Environmental Consequences

This section analyzes the impacts that developing I-11 would have on recreation sites/areas. Detailed information, including a description of the impacts to each recreation site/area, along with the acreage of each recreation site/area by Corridor Option, is included in Appendix E4.

3.4.4.1 General Recreation Impacts Common to the Build Corridor Alternatives

I-11 would have temporary construction impacts and permanent impacts on federal, state, and local recreation resources and opportunities. The following discussion clarifies anticipated general impacts on recreation. These general impacts are common to the Build Corridor Alternatives. Construction impacts are addressed in Section 3.15.

Impacts on Recreation Land and Recreation Settings

Development of I-11 could result in the permanent loss of acreage for recreation opportunities, particularly along Corridor Options not co-located with an existing interstate. Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are committed to coordinating with additional agencies to identify options that avoid, minimize, or mitigate the impacts. However, the exact nature of those options will not be developed until Tier 2.

Development of I-11 also would result in impacts to the setting of recreation and wilderness areas. Although recreation opportunities may continue to be available after the construction of I-11, the settings in which they occur could be affected visually or audibly, access to recreation areas may change, and ultimately some users may choose to recreate elsewhere. The change in setting from a natural or natural-appearing setting to a busy interstate could be noticeable for non-motorized recreation opportunities and for recreation experiences dependent upon quiet natural experiences. Potential impacts from increased noise, air pollution, light pollution, and scenic views may occur in federally designated wilderness areas.
Figure 3.4-2 Recreation Sites in Project Vicinity – Central Section
Figure 3.4-3 Recreation Sites in Project Vicinity – North Section
Impacts on Accessibility

Potentially both an impact and a benefit, the presence of I-11 could result in increased access to recreation sites/areas, which could increase recreation use and alter recreation experiences due to changes in setting (increased crowding, noise, loss of solitude, etc.).

Impacts to Recreation on State Trust Lands and GMUs

Permanent impacts to dispersed recreation on State Trust lands from development of I-11 would include reduced acreage for recreation opportunities, potential increase in access (and potentially use) of State Trust lands due to new road access, and alteration of the recreation setting to a more developed setting where I-11 would be visible or audible (see Sections 3.8 and 3.9 for more information about noise and visual impacts). Recreation experiences for users of existing State Trust lands would likely sustain more permanent change along Corridor Options not co-located within an existing interstate due to alterations to the recreation setting and potential changes in use levels due to increased access.

Permanent impacts from the development of I-11 within a given GMU could include:

- Loss of hunting areas due to taking of dedicated right-of-way for I-11;
- Potential long-term change in wildlife presence, and thus hunting locations;
- Potential increase in access to the GMU for both hunters and other recreationists due to new road access; and
- Alteration of the recreation setting to a more developed setting where I-11 would be visible or audible.

Adverse impacts to hunting would be more severe on GMU lands within Corridor Options not co-located with existing interstates; those recreation settings would sustain more change and would likely have higher wildlife displacement. Adverse impacts to hunting could affect recreation experience quality for hunters.

3.4.4.2 Purple Alternative

The Purple Alternative could result in potential impacts to six federal recreation resources, including undesignated BLM lands (managed by three different field offices), one BLM SRMA, one NHT, and one NHP. It would potentially impact recreation within four other federal recreation areas including the Nogales Recreation Area, Ironwood Forest National Monument, SNP, and SDNM, one state park, 10 GMUs, State Trust lands, a regional park, and a local recreation area. The Purple Alternative also may impact recreation at Tucson Mountain Park, although the interstate would not be physically located within this area.

The Purple Alternative would affect the fewest recreation areas/sites in the South and Central Sections, and could have fewer permanent and temporary impacts on the SDNM than the other alternatives. The main area affected in the Central Section would be the proposed Palo Verde Regional Park.

The Purple Alternative would affect the same number of federal, state, and local recreation areas as the other Corridor Alternatives in the North Section, although to a different extent. It would bisect the race course within VMRA.
Table 3.4-2 (Recreation Resources and Acreage within the Purple Alternative) provides a summary of the number of recreation resources and the acreage identified within the 2,000-foot-wide corridor for each Option. These sites may or may not be impacted by I-11 and additional recreation sites also may have air, noise, or visual impacts as further defined in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects, Section 3.17.

### Table 3.4-2  Recreation Resources and Acreage within the Purple Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Number of Sites/ Areas</th>
<th>Acres within Option</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,955</td>
<td>14,028</td>
<td>10,929</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>4,4515</td>
<td>4,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4,597</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4.4.3 Green Alternative

The Green Alternative has the potential to impact eight federal recreation resources, including undesignated BLM lands (managed by three different field offices), two BLM SRMAs, one ERMA, one NHT, and one NHP. Despite not being physically located within these areas, the Green Alternative could impact recreation within four other federal recreation areas including the Nogales Recreation Area, Ironwood Forest National Monument, SNP, and SDNM. It could affect recreation at 10 GMUs, State Trust lands, one state wildlife area, four local parks, and one local recreation area. Similar to the Purple Alternative, the Green Alternative could impact recreation at Tucson Mountain Park, though the facility would not be physically located within this area.

The Green Alternative would have recreation impacts similar to the Purple Alternative relative to the options in the South Section, although it would have more impact on local recreation areas, particularly at the Anamox Recreation Center. The Green Alternative could affect recreation within the Buckeye Hills area (BLM SRMA and ERMA and a regional park) in the Central Section, which would be avoided by the Purple Alternative.

The Green Alternative would affect the same number of federal, state, and local recreation areas as the other Corridor Options in the North Section, although to a different extent. It would bisect the race course within VMRA. The Green Alternative would potentially have slightly less impact on the VMRA than the Purple Alternative in terms of acres.

Table 3.4-3 (Recreation Resources and Acreage within the Green Alternative) provides a summary of the number of recreation resources and the acreage identified within the 2,000-foot-wide corridor for each Option. These sites may or may not be impacted by the project and additional recreation sites also may have air, noise, or visual impacts as further defined in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects, Section 3.17.
### Table 3.4-4 Recreation Resources and Acreage within the Orange Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Number of Sites/ Areas</th>
<th>Acres within Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes trail miles.

### 3.4.4.4 Orange Alternative

The Orange Alternative could impact seven federal recreation resources, including undesigned BLM lands (managed by two different field offices), two BLM SRMAs, one BLM ERMA, one National Monument, and one NHP. It also could impact the Nogales Recreation Area, despite not being physically located within this area, as well as recreation at one state park, 11 GMUs, State Trust lands, one state wildlife area, 21 local parks, three trails/greenways, and two local recreation areas.

Construction of the Orange Alternative has the potential to affect a much larger number of recreation areas/sites within the South Section but would result in fewer permanent impacts to recreation areas/sites because I-11 would be co-located with existing interstate facilities. Unlike the other alternatives, it would physically pass through the SDNM.

The Orange Alternative would affect the same number of federal, state, and local recreation areas as the other Corridor Options in the North Section, although to a different extent. The Green Alternative would have the least effect within the VMRA because it could pass beside this recreation area.

Table 3.4-4 (Recreation Resources and Acreage within the Orange Alternative) provides a summary of the number of recreation resources and the acreage or trail miles identified within the 2,000-foot-wide corridor by Option. These sites may or may not be impacted by the project and additional recreation sites also may have air, noise, or visual impacts as further defined in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects, Section 3.17.
3.4.4.5 No Build Alternative

If the No Build Alternative is selected, I-11 would not be constructed and vehicles would continue to utilize the existing transportation network. Only programmed projects would be implemented under this alternative, including pavement preservation and other maintenance projects. The No Build Alternative would not result in impacts to recreation areas beyond those already identified improvement projects.

3.4.4.6 Summary

All the Build Corridor Alternatives would have similar overall impacts on recreation resources. The main types of permanent impacts include changes to the recreation setting, increased access to recreational areas, altered experience quality at recreation sites, and reduced acreage of recreation areas. Table 3.4-5 (Summary of the Potential Impacts to Recreation) located at the end of this section, provides a summary of potential impacts. Additional information about indirect and cumulative effects can be found in Section 3.17.

The AGFD identified recreation resources as a priority for their agency. Moving forward, ADOT expects close coordination with AGFD as individual projects advance to the Tier 2 environmental process.

3.4.5 Potential Mitigation Strategies

There are several mitigation strategies that could be employed to minimize impacts to recreation. Potential mitigation should be based not only on the effect anticipated, but also on the characteristics of the specific resource affected.

Examples of potential mitigation strategies could include:
- Design or route modifications to avoid or minimize impacts on the recreation properties and use of recreation properties.
- Design the alignment to allow for maintenance of existing access to recreation areas and continue to provide connectivity between recreation areas/lands, including demonstrating how access to BLM, USFS, and other recreation lands would be provided during and after construction.
- Develop trail connections between portions of recreation areas that may be separated due to the new roadway.
- Construction modifications to avoid use or acquisition of recreation resources.
- Schedule construction to avoid peak recreation season and special events, including hunting and birdwatching seasons, when possible.
- Context-sensitive design in future stages of project development.
- Development of natural design features, such as earthen berms and vegetative plantings.
- Design features, such as fencing and designated crossings, to protect the safety of those using the recreation area and to provide continuity to divided recreation areas.
- Designate pedestrian crossings for trails.
- Traffic plans and details that avoid and minimize construction access limitations involving roads, including BLM designated routes that access recreation sites/areas, as well as...
undesignated BLM lands to minimize the duration of access disruption and provide on-site and online information about alternative access options.

- Develop crossings to maintain permeability for OHV race course in VMRA.
- Address updated access routes to SNP and Tucson Mountain Park due to the relocation of Sandario Road on either end of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor as part of the Central Arizona Project Design Option.
- Establish connection between the two segments of the Palo Verde Regional Park to minimize permanent impacts.
- Schedule construction to avoid temporary closure of the entire Loop Trail at one time. At a minimum, one of the east-west connections of the Loop Trail should remain open.
- Provide information about trail closures and alternate trail options during closures on-site and online.
- Address noise policies through mitigations including potential use of temporary and permanent sound barriers (if not already present and warranted by ADOT regulation) adjacent to local parks along I-10 and I-19.
- Locate construction staging and laydown areas away from recreation sites to the extent possible.

### 3.4.6 Future Tier 2 Analysis

Tier 2 analyses would include a more detailed analysis of the following items:

- Updating the list of recreation sites/areas within the project-level Study Area;
- Refining the list of recreation sites impacted by the selected Build Corridor Alternative, if chosen, including identification of acres of potential impacts and impacts to specific access roads;
- Reviewing the current recreation planning documents applicable to the Study Area;
- Clarifying the potential construction and operation impacts to each site including ancillary facilities (intersections, laydown areas, etc.);
- Specifying the temporary and permanent impacts to each recreation site/area; and
- Identifying site-specific mitigation at individual recreation resources.
- An update of recreation sites/areas to include any new facilities built or moved to the permitting stage also would be included within the Tier 2 analysis.
### Table 3.4-5 Summary of the Potential Impacts to Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>No Build Alternative</th>
<th>Purple Alternative</th>
<th>Green Alternative</th>
<th>Orange Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Resource Features</td>
<td>No I-11 impacts identified; Existing conditions and baseline trends would continue; Other projects within the Study Area are subject to their own evaluation.</td>
<td>Potential to impact the Hassayampa SRMA, Juan Bautista de Anza NHT Management Area, Tumacacori NHP, Picacho Peak State Park, VMRA including the Vulture Mine Off-Road Challenge Race Course, and other recreation resources.</td>
<td>Potential to impact the Hassayampa SRMA, Tumacacori NHP, Juan Bautista de Anza NHT Management Area, Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA, Robbins Butte Wildlife Area, Buckeye Hills Regional Park, Anamax Recreation Center, VMRA including the Vulture Mine Off-Road Challenge Race Course, and other recreation resources.</td>
<td>Potential to impact the SDNM, Hassayampa SRMA, Tumacacori NHP, Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA, Robbins Butte Wildlife Area, Picacho Peak State Park, Buckeye Hills Regional Park, VMRA, and other recreation resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Resources</td>
<td>BLM Undesignated Lands in the Tucson Field Office, Lower Sonoran Field Office, and Hassayampa Field Office; Hassayampa SRMA; VMRA; Tumacacori NHP; and Juan Bautista de Anza NHT Management Area.</td>
<td>BLM Undesignated Lands in the Tucson Field Office, Lower Sonoran Field Office, and Hassayampa Field Office; Hassayampa SRMA; Tumacacori NHP; and Juan Bautista de Anza NHT Management Area; Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA, and Buckeye Hills West ERMA.</td>
<td>BLM Undesignated Lands in the Lower Sonoran Field Office, and Hassayampa Field Office; SDNM; Hassayampa SRMA; VMRA; Tumacacori NHP; Buckeye Hills East Trails SRMA; and Buckeye Hills West ERMA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Resources</td>
<td>Numerous GMUs; State Trust Lands; and Picacho Peak State Park.</td>
<td>Numerous GMUs; State Trust Lands</td>
<td>Numerous GMUs; State Trust Lands</td>
<td>Numerous GMUs; State Trust Lands; Robbins Butte Wildlife Area; Picacho Peak State Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>No Build Alternative</td>
<td>Purple Alternative</td>
<td>Green Alternative</td>
<td>Orange Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Palo Verde Regional Park.</td>
<td>Palo Verde Regional Park and VMRMZ; Historic Hacienda de la Canoa (Raul M. Grijalva Canoa Ranch Conservation Park); Anamax Recreation Center; and Buckeye Hills Regional Park.</td>
<td>Oury Park; La Mar Park; El Parque De San Cosme; El Paso and Southwestern Greenway; Bonita Park; Garden of Gethsemame; Estevan Park; Francesco Elias Esquer Park; Julian Wash Greenway; Julian Wash Archaeological Park; Pima Community College, Desert Vista Campus; David G. Herrera and Raymond Quiroz Park; Historic Hacienda de la Canoa (Raul M. Grijalva Canoa Ranch Conservation Park); Santa Cruz River Park; Rillito River Park; The Loop; Sweetwater Wetlands Park; Ted Walker Park; Canada Del Oro River Park; Rillito Vista Park; San Lucas Community Park; Anamax Recreation Center; Palo Verde Regional Park; Pinal County West/Korsten Park; and Buckeye Hills Regional Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3.4-5 Summary of the Potential Impacts to Recreation (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>No Build Alternative</th>
<th>Purple Alternative</th>
<th>Green Alternative</th>
<th>Orange Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects</td>
<td>Programmmed transportation improvements plus projected population and employment growth could:</td>
<td>Land development induced by the project could:</td>
<td>Similar to the Purple Alternative, except:</td>
<td>Similar to the Green Alternative, except:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce the availability of land that could be used for future parks, recreational facilities and open space.</td>
<td>• Reduce the availability of land that could be used for future parks, recreational facilities and open space. Could increase the rate and geographic extent of this impact compared to the No Build Alternative.</td>
<td>• The resources present within the corridor have greater potential to be indirectly affected by induced changes to land use and traffic.</td>
<td>• More resources are present within the corridor and so could be indirectly affected by induced changes to land use and traffic. However, these resources are already located adjacent to a transportation facility in the South and Central Sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased use of park, recreational facilities and open space due to an increased population.</td>
<td>• Increased use of park, recreational facilities and open space due to an increased population. Could cause more pressure for open space protection if the Build Alternative results in induced growth in additional areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce the availability of certain recreation opportunities and experiences due to the expansion of urban areas into formerly rural areas.</td>
<td>• Affect the visitor experience at recreation resources that are close to the corridor, by changing the views from the park or the visual character of the area outside the park, adding to noise or traffic levels in the vicinity and changing visitor use of recreation resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack transportation facilities to reach recreational facilities.</td>
<td>• Improve accessibility and increased park visitors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4-5 Summary of the Potential Impacts to Recreation (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>No Build Alternative</th>
<th>Purple Alternative</th>
<th>Green Alternative</th>
<th>Orange Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>due to increasing population in proximity to parks, recreation lands and open space increasing awareness of natural and historic resources.</td>
<td>Improve firefighting and emergency accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Effects</td>
<td>Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects and planning could:</td>
<td>Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects could:</td>
<td>Similar to the Purple Alternative.</td>
<td>Similar to the Purple Alternative, except:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Decrease the potential land available for recreation uses.</td>
<td>- Reduce the amount of land available for future parks, recreational facilities or open space, compared to No Build Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effects to specific parks, recreational facilities or open space, but these are more likely to already be in proximity to an existing transportation use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase the demand to provide parks, recreational facilities and open spaces in growing urban/suburban areas.</td>
<td>- Alter the recreation setting, opportunities and experiences as well as user expectations similar to the No Build Alternative, particularly for existing recreation resources due to an increase in accessibility of these sites due to I-11 and other planned transportation facilities and a potential increase in use of existing facilities due to increased accessibility and potential radiating urbanization around I-11 in conjunction with new planned</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduce the amount of land available for future parks, recreational facilities or open space, compared to No Build Alternative (less than Purple and Green Alternatives because large portions of corridor are in developed areas).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase the demand to provide protected land with recreational components in rural/undeveloped areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Alter the recreation setting, opportunities and experiences, but to a lesser degree than the Purple and Green Alternatives due to the already developed nature of most of the Orange Alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alter the recreation setting for existing and future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4-5  Summary of the Potential Impacts to Recreation (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>No Build Alternative</th>
<th>Purple Alternative</th>
<th>Green Alternative</th>
<th>Orange Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recreation resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Change the existing and potential recreation opportunities, ability to reach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recreation destinations, and experiences available within an area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>