

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Park (Including classification): Folsom Lake SRA  
 Park Sub-classification: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Trail Name: Los Lagos Trail segments 1, 2 and 3  
 Location in Unit: North Granite  
 Current Use Designation(s): Equestrian, pedestrian  
 Proposed Use Type Change: add bikes  
 Use Change Initiated By: FATRAC, Mtn Bike Focus Group  
 Evaluation Date: February 29, 2016

**Evaluation** Jim Micheaels, Sr Park & Rec Specialist (Trails Coord.)  
**Team Members** Greg Wells, Park & Rec Spec. (Trails specialist)  
Cara Allen, Environmental Scientist  
Rich Preston, State Park Superintendent III  
Steve Hilton, State Archaeologist  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
**Initial field evaluation 3/14/16, Final 3/23/22**  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

*This worksheet is designed to help park managers make an objective, defensible, and consistent determination regarding a proposed change-in-use (CIU) for a trail in the state park system. The first section is designed to make an initial determination regarding the compatibility of the proposed CIU with the park's classification and management. Refer to the rules and regulations for the park's classification as well as approved planning documents when making this preliminary decision. If the CIU is found to be incompatible, note the rule, regulation, or planning document under which the determination to deny was made.*

Preliminary Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
0.1	Is the proposed CIU compatible with the park unit classification or sub-classification per the CA Public Resources Code and/or Code of Regulations?	X			
0.2	Is the proposed CIU on a trail that passes through more than one unit or sub-unit?		X		
0.3	Is there an approved general plan?	X			
0.4	Is there an approved road and trail management plan?		X		Road and Trail Management Plan in process. This CIU evaluation and recommendation will be part of the ongoing FLSRA RTMP.
0.5	Is there an approved area management plan?		X		
0.6	If there is an approved and relevant planning document, is the proposed CIU consistent with planning recommendations?	X			
0.7	Has a previous CIU request been made and evaluated for this trail?		X		
0.8	Is the proposed CIU located on a non-system (volunteer trail)? <i>This form can only be used to consider a CIU for system roads and trails.</i>		X		

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



0.9	Is the proposed CIU on a facility designated as a trail or road? <i>This form cannot be used to consider a CIU for non-designated facilities such as a beach or desert wash.</i>	X		The trail is located on Placer County owned property for which State Parks holds a recreation trail easement. The District has had discussions with the Los Lagos HOA and Placer County regarding relinquishing the easement for segments 1 and 3 of the Los Lagos Trail. Segment 2 provides an important connection between the Hoffman Property Trails, the Pioneer Express Trail and Beeks Bight.
0.10	Based on the preliminary considerations, should the CIU be further evaluated? <i>If yes, continue to the next page. If no, please explain.</i>	X		Consider CIU for Segment 2 only at this time.

*If found to be compatible, the following pages aid park managers in considering the broader impacts of the proposed CIU, including necessary management or design options. Clearly identify the primary concerns and considerations for each item that significantly contributes to approval or denial of the CIU proposal.*

## Summary of Findings and Considerations

*Complete this section last*

*Transfer the results from the following pages to this summary page.  
If using the electronic version, the results will transfer automatically.*

		Yes	No	NA	Comments
Part 2	Will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses, facilities, and services?	X			CIU would be compatible with existing uses of Beeks Bight Parking Lot and Trailhead, may have have conflicts with existing equestrian users on the Pioneer Express Trail to which the Los Lagos Trail connects. However if Beeks Bight Trail Reroutes Project is implemented, this should lessen chance for conflicts.
Part 3	Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation?		X		On its own, no. However, if the Beeks Bight Trail Reroutes Project is implemented and if Hoffman Property Trails are adopted into the trail system, this CIU of segment 2 of the Los Lagos Trail would improve trail connectivity and enhance circulation.
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?	X			Trail safety can be maintained if proposed trail modifications are made, including a reroute of a portion of segment #2, and the Beeks Bight Reroute project is implemented in conjunction with this CIU.
Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?	X			Trail sustainability can be maintained if proposed trail modifications are made, including a reroute of a portion of segment #2, and the Beeks Bight Reroute project is implemented in conjunction with this CIU.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Part 6	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) create significant negative impacts to the natural or cultural resources?		X		Significant impacts are not anticipated, however additional site specific evaluation is needed to confirm impacts to natural and cultural resources can be avoided. Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would help avoid or minimize avoid impacts to natural and cultural resources.
Part 7	Will implementation of the CIU with management and design options create a significant on-going maintenance or operational workload?		X		CIU would create some additional workload, both maintenance and operational, however this is not anticipated to be a significant increase.

## Recommendation Based on Evaluation Considerations

*Substantiate in Comment Box*

Recommend that the park's general plan or road and trail management plan be developed or amended to evaluate the CIU	X			This CIU is being considered as part of the FLSRA RTMP.
Recommend that the CIU be approved		X		Trail design modifications needed in order to approve CIU.
Recommend that the CIU-be approved with design options such a major or minor re-route or minor re-construction.	X			Recommend CIU be approved with trail design modifications for Segment 2 only of this trail. Do not approve CIU for segments 1 and 3 at this time. Timing of implementing this CIU for segment 2 must be compatible with other related projects, including Beeks Bight Trail Reroutes Project.
Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures		X		No management options, other than signing, are recommended.
Recommend that the CIU be put on hold		X		CIU to be considered as part of the FLSRA RTMP.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Final Comments/Determinations
<p>Most of the Los Lagos Trail is very lightly used and frequently gets overgrown. The trail is located on Placer County owned property for which State Parks holds a recreation trail easement. The District has had discussions with the Los Lagos HOA and Placer County regarding potentially relinquishing the easement for segments 1 and 3 of the Los Lagos Trail. The District wants to retain the southeastern portion of the trail (segment 2 and a portion of Segment 1) of the Los Lagos Trail as it provides an important connection between the Hoffman Property Trails, the Pioneer Express Trail and Beeks Bight.</p> <p>The Los Lagos Trail connects with the Pioneer Express Trail at its southern end in segment 2. The lower portion of the Los Lagos Trail is well used (but illegally) by bikes coming from the Hoffman Property non-system trails, which go on to ride on the Pioneer Express Trail. There have been numerous complaints and reports of conflicts of mountain bike use in this area in the past. The mountain bike focus group convened in 2014 requested a CIU for the Pioneer Express from Beeks Bight all the way to Auburn SRA, as well as the Los Lagos Trail. As part of a current project, the Beeks Bight Trail Reroutes Project, some of the connections from Beeks Bight to the Pioneer Express Trail will be closed (sustainability issues) and a new connection from Beeks Bight to the Pioneer Express will be constructed. This CIU is recommending a reroute of the southern end of the Los Logos Trail to eliminate a steep, entrenched and unsustainable section of trail. This re-route would connect to the new trail connector currently being planned as part of the Beeks Bight Reroute Project from Beeks Bight to the Pioneer Express Trail. If the Beeks Bight Reroute Project is implemented, it is possible to recommend the approval of the CIU for this trail without requiring any CIU for any portion of the existing Pioneer Express Trail.</p> <p><b>The recommendation is to approve this CIU with conditions only for the southeastern portion (segment 2 and a portion of segment 1) of the Los Lagos Trail.</b></p>

*Multiple CIU requests may require development or amendment of a unit wide road and trail transportation management plan.*

*Qualified staff, including a DPR-trained Trail Coordinator will complete this survey and checklist to:*

- (1) Determine the sustainability, safety, and feasibility of a proposed CIU for a single trail.*
- (2) Determine the appropriateness of the CIU in relation to cumulative impacts to the existing uses (users, routing, hiking opportunities, etc)*
- (3) Validate the existing conditions described on the attached trail log. The trail log should address typical log elements and positive and negative attributes related to the evaluation criteria.*

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<b>Part 1 Existing Conditions</b>					<i>Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed CUI and any other details related to proposal evaluation.</i>
1.1	Is the trail a controlled access road?		X		
1.2	ADA Accessible Route of Travel		X		
1.3	Connection to a trail head or other accessible facility?		X		The Los Lagos Trail does not directly connect to any accessible facility. It does connect to the Pioneer Express trail which connects to the Beeks Bight Parking Area and Trailhead which is an accessible facility.
1.4	What is the trail's current classification?	II			<i>Enter the trail class (I, II, III, or IV)</i>
<b>Trail or road surface type:</b>		<i>Check All Applicable</i>			<b>Comments</b>
1.5	Asphalt				
1.6	Concrete				
1.7	Gravel				
1.8	Native Material	X			
<b>Trail and road facility use type</b>					
1.9	Public	X			
1.10	Administration				
1.11	Fire Break				
1.12	Motorized Recreation				
1.13	Non-Motorized Recreation	X			
1.14	Road used as trail route				
<b>Current trail uses allowed</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>	
1.15	Pedestrian	X			
1.16	Mountain Bike		X		
1.17	Equestrian	X			
1.18	Other - specify in comment box				
<b>Part 2 Compatibility with Existing Visitor Uses, Facilities, and Services</b>					
<b>Existing Conditions</b>					
2.1	Is the trail high-use or in a high use area?		X		The lower portion of the Los Lagos Trail gets moderate to heavy use, the upper segments are overgrown and get very little use.
2.2	Is there evidence of unauthorized use?	X			Bike tire tracks on the portion of the Los Lagos Trail closest to Folsom Lake.
2.3	Does the proposed use currently exist in the park?	X			

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
2.4	Are there other routes in the unit or on nearby public land that adequately accommodate the type of use proposed?		X		There are other trails within the park unit that allow mtn bike use, questionable whether or not this is adequate. There is no mountain bike trail access north of Beeks Bight.
2.5	Is there documented survey or statistical information that identifies a need/desire for the CIU?	X			In the 2014 FLSRA Trail User Survey, there were many comments requesting more multi-use trails. At FLSRA/FPSHP, the trail mileage by use type is: 5.5 mi of pedestrian only; 11 mi. of ped./bike; 46 mi. of ped./equestrian; 38 mi. of unpaved multi-use and 19 mi. of paved multi-use.
2.6	Would the CIU create conflicts with existing facilities connected or adjacent to the trail (trail heads, stables, campgrounds etc)?		X		Beeks Bight is lightly used by equestrians as a staging area. No conflicts are anticipated at the existing adjacent facilities. If the CIU were approved for the entire Los Lagos Trail, it is possible some adjacent neighbors might complain about the bike use.
2.7	Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU?	X			The Los Lagos Trail connects to the Pioneer Express Trail which has received complaints about illegal bicycle use. Implementing the Beeks Bight Reroute Project in conjunction with this CIU may help reduce conflict.
<b>Part 2</b>	<b>Based on above considerations, will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses and services?</b>	X			The CIU will be compatible with the parking and trailhead facilities at Beeks Bight, but likely less compatible with the existing equestrian use on the Pioneer Express Trl to which the Los Lagos Trail connects. CIU would be compatible with Hoffman property non-system trails which connect to to the Los Lagos Trail. See discussion in final comments section regarding how this CIU could fit with the proposed Pioneer Express Beeks Bight Trail Reroutes Project.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<b>#3 Effects to Circulation Patterns</b>					
Does the CIU:					
3.1	Provide a loop, semi-loop, or other connection for the CIU user group?	X			On its own this CIU does not necessarily improve connectivity. However, if this CIU implemented in conjunction with Beeks Bight Reroute Project and converting some of the Hoffman Property non-system trails into system trails, this CIU would provide connectivity and possible loop options for bikes from Beeks Bight to Hoffman Property trails.
3.2	Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occurring in the unit?	X			Mtn bike tracks were noted on the lower portion of the Los Lagos Trail. This is not a determining factor in this CIU decision.
3.3	Provide a connection to adjacent land agency that allows similar use?		X		
3.4	Improve circulation or relieve congestion on other high-use trails?	X			This CIU, in conjunction with converting Hoffman Property non-system trails, could also draw in additional mtn bike use and help relieve congestion on other heavily used trails in the Granite Bay Area.
3.5	Create the potential need for use changes on adjacent or connecting trails or facilities?	X			This segment is being considered for a CIU along with connecting segments of the Pioneer Express. With some changes that are currently planned for the Pioneer Express Trail in the Beeks Bight vicinity, it is possible this CIU could be considered without requiring any CIU to the Pioneer Express Trail. The CIU could also be considered along with CIUs for portions of the Pioneer Express Trail.
3.6	Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts?		X		No, not if trail modifications implemented for CIU. Wet weather closures may be considered as part of the RTMP.
3.7	If yes, will seasonal closures disrupt circulation patterns?			X	
<b>Part 3</b>	<b>Based on above criteria, will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation for the new use type?</b>		X		On its own no, if combined with other CIUs or projects (see above) it could improve connectivity.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<b>#4 Effects to Trail Safety</b>					
<b>Existing Conditions</b>					
4.0	Are there documented safety concerns resulting from interactions between different user groups?	X			There have been past complaints about illegal mtn bike use on the adjacent Pioneer Express Trail, some of that mtn bike use is coming from Hoffman Property Trails and down the Los Lagos Trail. The park unit has looked at documented trail accidents at the park unit over the past 10 years (from 2022), the vast majority of accidents are solo accidents.
4.1	With standard cyclical trail brushing (as determined by vegetation type), is there adequate sight distance to address safety concerns resulting from the CIU?	X			
4.2	With standard cyclical slough and berm removal, is there adequate tread width for safe passage of trail users with the CIU?	X			
4.3	With equestrian users is there adequate space for non-equestrian users to retreat to the downhill side of trail for safe passage?	X			
4.4	If tread widths are narrow, are the fill slopes gentle, firm, and stable for users to retreat to the downhill side of trail for safe passage?	X			
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?	X			Some sinuosity in some sections of the trail.
4.6	Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations?	X			CIU would draw additional attention to an area where there are already trail conflicts. The CIU may require additional staff time to enforce speed limits and respond to conflicts and possibly, neighbor complaints.
<b>Design Options to Improve Safety</b>					
<i>Check those design options that could be implemented to improve trail safety with the CIU</i>					
4.7	Increase sinuosity through re-routing or re-construction	X			Could be done, but not required.
4.8	Increase sight distances through re-routing or removal of visual obstructions		X		Trail just needs maintenance level brushing to standard.
4.9	Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space		X		
4.10	Install speed control devices such as pinch points or tread texturing	X			Could be done, but not expected to be needed. Site specific planning for trail modifications will determine if needed.



# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<b>Management Options to Improve Safety</b>					
<i>Check those management options that could be implemented to improve trail safety with the CIU</i>					
4.11	Alternating days of use		X		
4.12	One-way directional usage		X		
4.13	Installation of new signage	X			
4.14	Other (Describe)				
<b>Part 4</b>	<b>Based on the above considerations, would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?</b>	X			Brushing trail to standards is the primary requirement for trail safety.
<b>#5 Effects on Trail Sustainability</b>					
<b>Existing Conditions</b>					
5.1	Is the trail draining to natural topographic drainage features, such as creeks and swales or natural sheet flow, and not being captured and concentrated to the man-made drainage structures?	X			Trail is mostly draining to natural topographic features, but some drainage has been captured on segments of trail, particularl lower portion of trail closest to Folsom Lake where trail is deeply entrenched.
5.2	Is the trail tread firm and stable?	X			Mostly, wet in a few locations, but recommended bridges and puncheon will address these areas.
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?	X			Only at portion of trail closest to Folsom Lake.
5.4	Is the fill slope stable?			X	Not much cut bank or fill slope on trail.
5.5	Is the back slope/cut bank stable?			X	Not much cut bank or fill slope on trail.
5.6	Does the trail tread remain firm and stable in wet conditions?		X		Bridges and puncheon needed in areas where trail crosses drainages.
Supporting data from trail log					
5.7	Number of water breaks (water bars, dips, etc.) required for proper drainage				None recorded in condition assessment.
5.8	Linear footage of berms		1218		1218 lineal feet recorded in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches				None recorded in condition assessment.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts		10		10 lineal ft of rills recorded in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail		2577		2577 lineal ft of entrenched trail recorded in condition assessment.
Describe the locations of soil types and matrixes encountered on trail					
5.12	Rocky				
5.13	Rocky/Partial Soil Profile				
5.14	Full Soil Profile	X			
5.15	Partial Soil Profile/Sandy				
5.16	Sandy				

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
5.17	Based on these considerations is the trail currently sustainable?		X		Trail needs bridges and puncheons installed in order to be considered sustainable.
5.18	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU without management or design options (as recommended)?		X		No - bridges and puncheon needed for sustainability. Additionally there may be a few areas that would benefit from causeway construction.
<b>Design Options to Improve Sustainability</b>					
<i>If not sustainable, can any of the following measures be implemented to make the trail sustainable for the CIU?</i>					
5.20	Armoring of wet drainage crossings to reduce erosion and impacts to waterways?		X		
5.21	Additional drainage structures (e.g. grade reversals, water bars, rolling grade dips, etc.) to manage increased mechanical wear?		X		
5.22	Additional bridges and puncheons/boardwalks to facilitate dry crossings necessary to reduce erosion and impacts to waterways?	X			2 bridges and 1 puncheon needed.
5.23	Reconstruction or replacement of bridges and puncheons to comply with equestrian construction standards?		X		
5.24	Fill slope or cut bank retaining walls?		X		
5.25	Additional or upgraded turnpikes or causeways?	X			Causeways in a few areas would improve trail sustainability.
Minor reconstruction of trail tread would:					
5.26	Correct lack of outslope	X			Causeways.
5.27	Stabilize abrupt grade changes		X		
5.28	Stabilize cut bank		X		
5.29	Stabilize fill slope		X		
5.30	Correct rilling and rutting	X			
5.31	Provide for firm and stable surfaces	X			
Minor realignment/re-route of trail within the immediate proximity of the existing trail would:					
5.32	Stabilize cut bank		X		
5.33	Stabilize fill slope		X		
5.34	Eliminate abrupt grade changes	X			
5.35	Correct unsustainable grades	X			
5.36	Correct lack of sinuosity	X			
5.37	Should a major reroute be considered to establish sustainability?	X			Major re-route needed for portion of trail closest to Folsom Lake - from near Los Lagos pond to junction with Pioneer Express Trail.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<b>Management Options to Improve Sustainability</b>					
<i>If not sustainable, can any of the following measures be implemented to make the trail sustainable for the CIU?</i>					
5.38	Can wet weather closures establish or maintain sustainability?	X			Trail modifications will address most of the wet weather concerns regarding trail use. Wet weather closures may be considered as part of the RTMP.
5.39	Can other mangement options be implemented to improve trail sustainability? If so, please describe.		X		
<b>Part 5</b>	<b>Based on the above considerations, will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?</b>	<b>X</b>			Trail modifications for Segment #2 need to be implemented and CIU needs to be coordinated with Beeks Bight Trail Reroutes Project.
<b>#6 Effects or Impacts to the Natural or Cultural Resources</b>					
Would the CIU and/or needed modifications significantly impact:					
6.1	Erosion of existing trail tread and sedimentation of adjacent streams?		X		
6.2	Significant geologic features?		X		
6.3	Sensitive wildlife habitat?		X		Will avoid eldeberry or other sensitive habitat.
6.4	Sensitive plant habitat?		X		Will avoid eldeberry or other sensitive habitat.
6.5	A wetland, riparian or stream zone?		X		
6.6	A sensitive cultural feature?		X		Site specific surveys and studies at the project level are needed to confirm the CIU would not significantly impact sensitive cultural features.
6.7	A sensitive palaeontological feature?		X		
6.8	Is the trail a historic feature?		X		
6.9	Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?		X		It is uncertain if permits will be needed. The required trail modifications for this CIU will get project specific environmental review and that evaluation will determine any permitting needed. Drainages do not have a defined bed, bank or channel and proposed trail modification activities will not substantially divert, obstruct or remove material from the drainages. Therefore, it is not anticipated the bridges or puncheon will require permits from RWQCB or CDFW. Drainages outside jurisdiction of ACOE. Waterway on other side of Auburn-Folsom Rd is known habitat for steelhead. We will need to determine drainage patterns for drainage located at northern end of Los Lagos trail.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<b>Part 6</b> Based on the above considerations, would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) create significant negative impacts to the natural or cultural resources?			X		It is not anticipated that the CIU and trail modifications would create significant negative impacts on natural or cultural resources. However, additional studies and evaluation at the project level are required in order to determine if the CIU would have significant impacts on natural and cultural resources and to develop any measures to avoid or minimize these impacts. Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would help avoid or minimize avoid impacts to natural and cultural resources.
<b>#7 Effects or Impacts to Maintenance and Operations</b>					
Would the CIU and/or needed modifications:					
7.1	Change the classification of the trail?	X			CIU would likely increase use and change Trail Classification from Class II to Class I.
7.2	Require additional maintenance?	X			
7.3	Require additional management practices to maintain user compliance?		X		None required, but additional trail patrols or other public outreach regarding trail etiquette and safety may be implemented.
7.4	Require additional staff time to address compliance requirements of the management or design options?	X			Sector/District staff will educate visitors on safe trail use and trail etiquette through signs, roving interpretation and other methods.
7.5	Could the proposed modifications be completed by non-department work forces?	X			Some of the modifications could be completed by non-department work forces, but the more involved modifications, such as reroutes and major reconstruction are best completed by Department staff.
7.6	Could the proposed modifications be maintained by non-department work forces with minimal cost to the State?	X			Some trail maintenance work could be completed by non-department work forces, other maintenance work is best suited to Department staff. Using non-department work forces still requires coordination and oversight of Department staff.
7.7	Can necessary management strategies be enforced?	X			No management strategies required other than signs, but additional trail patrols or other public outreach regarding trail etiquette and safety may be implemented.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
7.8	If not, is there a volunteer group or partner agency that can assist with enforcement?		X		There is a volunteer mounted patrol and the Sector is finalizing an agreement with a bike patrol organization. Both of these groups could help patrol the trail, reporting problems and education, but volunteers do not get involved in enforcement.
Part 7	Based on the above considerations, will implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) create a significant on-going maintenance or operational workload?		X		