

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Park (Including classification): Folsom Lake State Recreation Area  
 Park Sub-classification: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Trail Name: Monte Vista Trail North, Monte Vista Trail South, Monte Vista North/South Connector Trail, Monte Vista Service Rd, Monte Vista Trailhead Access Spur  
 Location in Unit: South Fork Arm Folsom Lake  
 Current Use Designation(s): Equestrian, pedestrian  
 Proposed Use Type Change: add bicycles  
 Use Change Initiated By: District staff due to proximity of Browns Ravine CIU  
 Evaluation Date: May 11, 2015

**Evaluation** Jim Micheaels, SR Park & Rec Specialist (Trails Coord.)  
**Team Members** Rich Preston, Folsom Sector Supt. (Supt III)  
Greg Wells, Park & Rec Specialist (Trails specialist)  
Cara Allen, Environmental Scientist  
Steve Hilton, Associate State Archaeologist  
**Initial Field Evaluation 6/29/15, 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		A RTMP for FLSRA is currently being prepared.
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			CIU is consistent with General Plan, and RTMP is being prepared and CIU recommendation will be part of RTMP.
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			
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			

*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			Generally compatible, but there may be some conflicts with existing equestrian use if bikes added.
Part 3	Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation?		X		Minimal. The Browns Ravine Trail CIU that will allow bikes on these trails that would provide short loop opportunities for cyclists. However, the Monte Vista CIU would provide relatively little benefit to circulation for bikes.
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?	X			Yes, trail safety could likely be maintained.
Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?	X			Yes, the trails could be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with trail modifications.
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		No with design modifications and management strategies, the CIU could avoid significant negative 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		No, implementation of the CIU with trail modifications would not cause significant ongoing maintenance and operational workload.



## 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			A RTMP is being prepared for FLSRA and this CIU survey and recommendation will be part of the RTMP.
Recommend that the CIU be approved		X		
Recommend that the CIU be approved with design options such a major or minor re-route or minor re-construction.		X		Recommend this CIU not be approved. Do not allow bikes on these trails, keep these trails equestrian/pedestrian.
Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures		X		The only management option proposed is additional signage regarding trail etiquette/trail safety and park rules at key locations.
Recommend that the CIU be put on hold		X		CIU recommendation should be made as part of RTMP.

### Final Comments/Determinations

The Monte Vista Trails were not specifically requested for a CIU during the 2014 stakeholder meetings and public input on the RTMP. The CIU evaluation for the Monte Vista Trails was initiated by District staff due to the proximity and connectivity of these trails to the Browns Ravine Trail which is recommended for a CIU approval to add bikes. District staff considered that if bikes are added to the Browns Ravine Trail, the Monte Vista Trails could experience an increase in illegal bike use due to the connectivity with the Browns Ravine Trail.

With trail design and management modifications, these trails can be made sustainable and trail safety could be maintained with the CIU. However, as part of completing the FLSRA RTMP, California State Park staff considered the effects and experiences of all trail users in making CIU decisions across the FLSRA trail system. Along the South Fork Arm of Folsom Lake, the Browns Ravine Trail CIU, if approved and implemented, will give bicyclists access along the length of the South Fork with connections to the Darrington and South Fork Trails, providing substantial uninterrupted single-track riding opportunities and connectivity for bikes. The Monte Vista Trails are a small network of trails in a scenic setting and are often used by hikers and equestrians. The approval of this CIU would provide access to relatively little additional trail mileage for cyclists and would not enhance connectivity for cyclists.. Keeping the Monte Vista Trails equestrian/pedestrian-only will preserve a non-bike trail opportunity in the park and region for equestrians and pedestrians. **The recommendation is to not approve this CIU.**

*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			One segment, the Monte Vista Service Rd, is a controlled access road, all others are trails.
1.2	ADA Accessible Route of Travel		X		
1.3	Connection to a trail head or other accessible facility?	X			Trailhead is primitive/undeveloped facility and not ADA compliant
1.4	What is the trail's current classification?			I	All Trails Class I, except Monte Vista Trail North Segment 5 listed as Class II.
<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		X		Monte Vista Service Rd only.
1.11	Fire Break				
1.12	Motorized Recreation				
1.13	Non-Motorized Recreation				
1.14	Road used as trail route		X		Though many of these trails appear to be on old road beds. Only Monte Vista Service Rd is identified as a road in the trail inventory.
<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 trail is in a moderate use area.
2.2	Is there evidence of unauthorized use?	X			A few bike tire tracks, but minimal.
2.3	Does the proposed use currently exist in the park?	X			Mtn bike use occurs elsewhere within park unit.

# 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			If the Browns Ravine to Old Salmon Falls CIU adding bikes is approved, as anticipated, that CIU provides the most connection and circulation benefit for mtn bikes on the SF Arm of Folsom Lake. The Monte Vista Trails provide relatively little additional mileage or connectivity.
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. This CIU was initiated by District staff to consider the effects of implementing a CIU on the Browns Ravine Trail which has many connections to the Monte Vista Trails.
2.6	Would the CIU create conflicts with existing facilities connected or adjacent to the trail (trail heads, stables, campgrounds etc)?	X			Could be some conflicts with horse trailer parking and mtn bike parking if lots of mtn bikers utilize the Falconcrest/Monte Vista parking lot.
2.7	Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU?		X		There may be some user conflicts.
<b>Part 2</b>	<b>Based on above considerations, will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses and services?</b>	X			Adding mtn bike use is not completely compatible with existing use, but conflicts could be managed.
<b>#3 Effects to Circulation Patterns</b>					
Does the CIU:					
3.1	Provide a loop, semi-loop, or other connection for the CIU user	X			
3.2	Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occurring in the unit?	X			
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			Perhaps, but the Monte Vista area does not have the same access and proximity to urban/suburban areas as the Granite Bay trail system.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
3.5	Create the potential need for use changes on adjacent or connecting trails or facilities?		X		The adjacent and connecting Browns Ravine Trail is already going through a CIU evaluation. One of the reasons for evaluating the Monte Vista trails for a CIU was the proximity and connectivity with the Browns Ravine Trail.
3.6	Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts?		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.
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		Implementation of this CIU would only improve circulation for bikes minimally.
<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		Not aware of documented safety concerns on the Monte Vista Trails. 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			Most of these trails are old road beds with plenty of room for safe passing.
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?		X		Sinuosity is limited, there are a few locations with some sinuosity. Proposed re-routes as part of CIU will improve sinuosity in those locations.
4.6	Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations?		X		

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<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			
4.8	Increase sight distances through re-routing or removal of visual obstructions	X			Brushing of trails.
4.9	Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space			X	Not needed.
4.10	Install speed control devices such as pinch points or tread texturing		X		The terrain is too open for pinch points to be effective where they are needed, users might bypass around pinchpoints on open ground.
<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			
<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			There are a few places where the trail is capturing drainage and causing erosion down portions of the trail. The two proposed re-routes will address a couple of the worst areas.
5.2	Is the trail tread firm and stable?	X			
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?		X		Grades exceed desired standards on some segments of trail, but grade changes are not abrupt for the most part.
5.4	Is the fill slope stable?	X			
5.5	Is the back slope/cut bank stable?	X			
5.6	Does the trail tread remain firm and stable in wet conditions?	X			Soil is firm and stable, presume it remains so in wet conditions except in a couple isolated places.
Supporting data from trail log					
5.7	Number of water breaks (water bars, dips, etc.) required for proper drainage		13		13 dips, culverts on existing trails/road. Data from condition assessment.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
5.8	Linear footage of berms	1958			1,958 linear feet of berms, primarily on Service Rd. Data from condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches	3625			3,625 linear feet of ditches primarily along Service Rd. Data from condition assessment.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts	6523			6,523 linear feet of rills and gullies - from condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail	2,986			2,986 linear feet of entrenched trail from condition assessment. Total distance of all of Monte Vista trails/road is 11,683 linear feet.
Describe the locations of soil types and matrixes encountered on trail					
5.12	Rocky				
5.13	Rocky/Partial Soil Profile	X			Soils vary between full soil profile and rocky/partial soil profile.
5.14	Full Soil Profile	X			
5.15	Partial Soil Profile/Sandy				
5.16	Sandy				
5.17	Based on these considerations is the trail currently sustainable?	X			Generally the trails are sustainable, except a few locations where there are erosion problems. The two proposed re-routes will address a couple of the segments of least sustainable trail.
5.18	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU without management or design options (as recommended)?		X		
<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		
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		
Minor reconstruction of trail tread would:					
5.26	Correct lack of outslope	X			
5.27	Stabilize abrupt grade changes		X		



# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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			
<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	Seasonal closures are not proposed specifically for this CIU. 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>			
<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		Proposed re-routes will reduce erosion on those trail segments.
6.2	Significant geologic features?		X		
6.3	Sensitive wildlife habitat?		X		There may be sensitive wildfire habitat, but implementing all of the standard project conditions will insure that significant impacts are avoided.
6.4	Sensitive plant habitat?		X		There may be sensitive plant habitat, but implementing all of the standard project conditions will insure that significant impacts are avoided.
6.5	A wetland, riparian or stream zone?		X		

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
6.6	A sensitive cultural feature?		X		There are historic foundations in the area, but not immediately along these trails and they would not be affected by the CIU.
6.7	A sensitive palaeontological feature?		X		
6.8	Is the trail a historic feature?	X			Several of the trails may be historic roads, but the CIU is not expected to affect these roads.
6.9	Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?		X		
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?</b>		X		
<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		For the most part the answer is no, all of the trails are currently Class I, except one segment of Monte Vista North Trail, which is Class II. CIU would likely shift classification of that trail segment from II to I.
7.2	Require additional maintenance?	X			Additional bike use may require additional or more frequent maintenance, such as trio maintenance.
7.3	Require additional management practices to maintain user compliance?	X			Some additional staff time may be required for trail maintenance and trail user education regarding trail safety and etiquette.
7.4	Require additional staff time to address compliance requirements of the management or design options?	X			Some additional staff time implementing proposed re-routes and monitoring CIU.
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			Sector/District staff could patrol the trail occasionally and could educate visitors on safe trail use and trail etiquette.

# 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. Volunteer groups assist with patrol of trails and reporting problems, but don't get involved in enforcement.
<b>Part 7</b>	<b>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?</b>		X		Adding bike use may increase operation and maintenance workload, but not significant amount.