

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Park (Including classification): Folsom Lake SRA
 Park Sub-classification: _____
 Trail Name: Pioneer Express Segments #38, 40, 36, 3 and Beeks Bight to Pioneer Express Connector 1 and 2
 Location in Unit: NF Arm Folsom Lake - Beeks Bight to Sterling Pointe
 Current Use Designation(s): Equestrian, pedestrian
 Proposed Use Type Change: add bikes
 Use Change Initiated By: FATRAC, Mtn Bike Focus Group
 Evaluation Date: 1st half 6-17-15, 2nd half 3-9-16

Evaluation Team Members
Jim Micheaels, Sr Park & Rec Specialist (Trails Coord.)
Greg Wells, Park & Rec Spec. (Trails specialist)

Cara Allen, Environmental Scientist

Rich Preston, State Park Superintendent III
Steve Hilton, State Archaeologist

Initial field evaluation 3/25/16, final 3/22/22

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		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			
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		CIU is compatible with existing facilities, but may not be with existing equestrian use on the trail, particularly given the level of past complaints in this area, the sight distance challenges and the limited public land base which constrains the ability to implement the reroutes and other trail modifications needed.
Part 3	Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation?	X			The CIU would provide bike access and connectivity where it currently does not exist. This enhance circulation would be particularly true if this CIU were approved with the CIUs for adjacent segments of the Pioneer Express Trail.
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?		X		Even with re-routes, due to the narrow public land base the re-route options are limited and there will be many locations where sight distances are minimal and other locations where providing for safe passing will be limited due to rock outcrops and steep topography.
Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?		X		The trail sustainability can certainly be improved with the recommended design modifications (reroutes), but due to the limited public land base, ideal trail alignments for sustainability are not possible in all locations. Hence given the level of use and erosive nature of the soils in some locations, full sustainability will be a challenge to achieve.

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		CIU and design options/trail modifications may create some impacts, but most impacts can be avoided or minimized by implementing standard project conditions and best management practices.
Part 7	Will implementation of the CIU with management and design options create a significant on-going maintenance or operational workload?	X			There will be an increase in maintenance workload due to increased use by bikes and the erosive nature of the soils in this area. Also, there will likely be an increase in operational workload responding to complaints and conflicts.

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			An RTMP is being prepared for the park unit. This CIU evaluation will be incorporated into 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		See explanations above and below, while design options may mitigate some existing safety and sustainability issue with the existing trail, due to the limited land base these issues cannot be fully resolved with design options.
Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures		X		Some management options may be possible to implement, but enforcement would be difficult, if at all possible. These management options could not be effectively implemented and enforced with existing staffing levels. Alternating days of use could reduce conflicts and any trail safety concerns, but enforcement and compliance could be difficult and make a problematic option.
Recommend that the CIU be put on hold		X		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Final Comments/Determinations

This section of the Pioneer Express Trail runs from Beeks Bight in the north Granite Bay area to an intersection with the Sterling Pointe Connector Trail, which provides trail access at a County operated trailhead and staging facility just outside the SRA.

The public land base along this segment of trail is a narrow strip along the Folsom Lake shoreline with many rock outcroppings and steep drop offs between the park boundary and the lakeshore. The granitic soils in this portion of the park unit are much more erosive than those along the South Fork arm of Folsom Lake. The existing trail is not sustainable and has many sections of severe entrenchment and other areas where sight distances are limited due to topography. Safe passing of different users could be a challenge along portions of this trail segment due to narrow tread width and challenging terrain for users to move off the trail to allow others to pass.

In the past there have been conflicts and complaints regarding illegal mountain bike use of this trail segment.

While approving the CIU would provide additional trail opportunities for mountain bikes, this segment of trail is particularly challenging to successfully implement the CIU. Trail modifications, such as reroutes or re-engineering/re-constructing the trail are possible in some locations. However, due to the narrow public land base in other places it is not possible to reroute the trail to an entirely sustainable alignment or to provide the best alignment for trail safety.

Additionally, retaining this trail as pedestrian/equestrian will help preserve a non-bike trail experience and contribute to providing diverse trail opportunities, a goal of the FLSRA General Plan.

The recommendation is to not approve this CIU.

There is a non-system trail along the shoreline that parallels this trail segment. This non-system route(s) runs from Beeks Bight to Horseshoe Bar. Portions of this route are inundated when Folsom Reservoir is at full pool. However, there may be the opportunity to authorize a parallel multi-use route along the shoreline that provides mountain bikes access to the area. The Road and Trail Management Plan will include a recommendation regarding this concept.

Additionally, State Parks currently has plans to reroute some of the existing trails in the vicinity of Beeks Bight area which could provide access to the Hoffman Property trails from Beeks Bight in the future.

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
Part 1 Existing Conditions					<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 north end of this segment connects to the Sterling Pointe Connector Trail which connects to County trails that lead to the County operated Sterling Pointe Trailhead facility.
1.4	What is the trail's current classification?	I			<i>Enter the trail class (I, II, III, or IV)</i>
Trail or road surface type:		<i>Check All Applicable</i>			Comments
1.5	Asphalt				
1.6	Concrete				
1.7	Gravel				
1.8	Native Material	X			
Trail and road facility use type					
1.9	Public Administration	X			
1.10	Fire Break				
1.11	Motorized Recreation				
1.12	Non-Motorized Recreation	X			
1.13	Road used as trail route				
1.14					
Current trail uses allowed		Yes	No	NA	
1.15	Pedestrian	X			
1.16	Mountain Bike		X		
1.17	Equestrian	X			
1.18	Other - specify in comment box				
Part 2 Compatibility with Existing Visitor Uses, Facilities, and Services					
Existing Conditions					
2.1	Is the trail high-use or in a high use area?	X			
2.2	Is there evidence of unauthorized use?	X			
2.3	Does the proposed use currently exist in the park?	X			
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 mountain bike use, whether these other trails provide adequate accomodation is debatable. There is no mountain bike trail access north of Beeks Bight.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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		Andy Fisher from Placer County indicates that all County trails, including those at Sterling Point, are multi-use.
2.7	Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU?	X			
Part 2	Based on above considerations, will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses and services?		X		There may be of conflict with the existing equestrian/pedestrian use, the many narrow portions of the trail without adequate passing room and many locations of limited site distance due to topogrpahy and rock outcroppings which cannot all be resolved through maintenance or re-routes.
#3 Effects to Circulation Patterns					
Does the CIU:					
3.1	Provide a loop, semi-loop, or other connection for the CIU user group?	X			This CIU is being evlauated with others as part of the RTMP, including other segments of the Pioneer Express and the Los Lagos Trail. If the appropriate segments were all approved for CIU this could provide connectivity and possible loop options (along with non-system trails on Hoffman Property) for mountain bikes. If all segments of the Pioneer Express from Beeks Bight along the North Fork arm were approved, this would provide trail connection to ASRA for bikes.
3.2	Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occuring in the unit?	X			There is more evidence of illegal mtn bike use on the southern portion of this segment of trail (from Los Lagos to a an informal access midway along this segment). There was relatively little evidence of illegal mountain bike use on the northern portion of this segment.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
3.3	Provide a connection to adjacent land agency that allows similar use?	X			Placer County indicates that their trails from the Sterling Pointe TH are multi-use.
3.4	Improve circulation or relieve congestion on other high-use trails?	X			
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.
3.6	Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts?		X		Wet weather closures could help with trail sustainability. Such closures would likely be implemented park wide and could be considered in the RTMP.
3.7	If yes, will seasonal closures disrupt circulation patterns?			X	
Part 3	Based on above criteria, will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation for the new use type?	X			
#4 Effects to Trail Safety					
Existing Conditions					
4.0	Are there documented safety concerns resulting from interactions between different user groups?	X			In the past there have been complaints about illegal mtn bike use on the Pioneer Express Trail from Old County Road to the Los Lagos Trail and some for the southern portion of this segment of 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		Re-routes are needed to address sight distance problems in severely entrenched areas. Even with these re-routes there are still some locations where sight distance will be limited due to topography.
4.2	With standard cyclical slough and berm removal, is there adequate tread width for safe passage of trail users with the CIU?		X		Entrenched sections of trail need to be re-routed.
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		Not adequate room for passage in areas of severely entrenched trail. Need to re-route entrenched sections to provide adequate passing space.
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		There are places where it is not easy to get off the trail or to pass safely, drop offs on the downhill side.
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?	X			

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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 have been trail conflicts in the past. The CIU may require additional staff time to enforce speed limits and respond to conflicts.
Design Options to Improve Safety					
<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		There is limited public land base along much of this trail segment which limits the extent of reroutes.
4.8	Increase sight distances through re-routing or removal of visual obstructions	X			Brushing will help sight distances in places. There are limits to the extent of reroutes possible due to limited public land base.
4.9	Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space	X			Eliminate severely entrenched sections of trail.
4.10	Install speed control devices such as pinch points or tread texturing	X			Could incorporate existing rock outcroppings into pinch points.
Management Options to Improve Safety					
<i>Check those management options that could be implemented to improve trail safety with the CIU</i>					
4.11	Alternating days of use		X		It is possible to implement an alternating days of use option, but with current staffing levels such a management option could not be effectively enforced or managed, which does not make this a good option.
4.12	One-way directional usage		X		It is possible to implement a one-way directional use option, but with current staffing levels such a management option could not be effectively enforced or managed which does not make this a good option.
4.13	Installation of new signage	X			
4.14	Other (Describe)				
Part 4	Based on the above considerations, would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?		X		Even with re-routes, due to the narrow public land base the re-route options are limited and there will be many locations where sight distances are minimal and other locations where providing for safe passing will be limited due to rock outcrops and steep topography.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
#5 Effects on Trail Sustainability					
Existing Conditions					
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		Section of this trail segment are heavily entrenched and have captured run-off and altered natural drainage patterns. The highly erosive soils in the area exacerbate the entrenchment and erosion.
5.2	Is the trail tread firm and stable?		X		Trail tread is eroding in places.
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?	X			
5.4	Is the fill slope stable?			X	Not really any fill slopes.
5.5	Is the back slope/cut bank stable?	X			
5.6	Does the trail tread remain firm and stable in wet conditions?		X		Firm and stable in upland areas, there area wet and muddy areas in low spots and near drainages.
Supporting data from trail log					
5.7	Number of water breaks (water bars, dips, etc.) required for proper drainage		108		3 - 18" culverts, 38 dips, 64 waterbreaks and 3 ditch-outs recorded in condition assessment.
5.8	Linear footage of berms				None recorded in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches				ditch-outs recorded (see above), no lineal feet of ditch recorded in condition assessment.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts		560		560 lineal ft of rills recorded in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail		19,759		19,759 lineal ft of entrenched trail recorded in condition assessment (Total lineal ft of this section of trail is 25,097).
Describe the locations of soil types and matrixes encountered on trail					
5.12	Rocky				
5.13	Rocky/Partial Soil Profile		X		
5.14	Full Soil Profile				
5.15	Partial Soil Profile/Sandy				
5.16	Sandy				
5.17	Based on these considerations is the trail currently sustainable?		X		
5.18	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU without management or design options (as recommended)?		X		
Design Options to Improve Sustainability					
<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			

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
5.21	Additional drainage structures (e.g. grade reversals, water bars, rolling grade dips, etc.) to manage increased mechanical wear?	X			Reroutes and re-engineering/re-construction of trail are proposed to address drainage and mechanical wear problems. Drainage dips could be incorporated.
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			May need additional retaining walls on some of the recommended reroutes.
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			
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			Reroute of severely entrenched sections needed.
Management Options to Improve Sustainability					
<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		Wet weather closures could help with trail sustainability. Such closures would likely be implemented park wide and could be considered in the RTMP. Implementing such closures could be difficult to enforce and manage with current staffing levels.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
5.39	Can other mangement options be implemented to improve trail sustainability? If so, please describe.		X		It is possible to implement an alternating days of use or one direction use options, but with current staffing levels such a management option could not be effectively enforced or managed, which does not make this a good option.
Part 5	Based on the above considerations, will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?		X		The trail sustainability can certainly be improved with the recommended design modifications (reroutes), but due to the limited public land base, ideal trail alignments for sustainability are not possible in all locations. Hence given the level of use and erosive nature of the soils in some locations, sustainability will be a challenge to achieve.
#6 Effects or Impacts to the Natural or Cultural Resources					
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			Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle exit holes observed on elderberry shrubs.
6.4	Sensitive plant habitat?	X			Elderberry shrub, host of VELB, is present.
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		This segment of trail passes through a historical mining landscape. Some segments of the trail are within historic features, or parallel historical linear features associated with historical water storage and conveyance. There are historic resources and features located along and adjacent to the trail, including tailings, water conveyance systems, material borrow pits, sluiced tributaries, and other industrial infrastructure. Currently, there is insufficient information and evaluation of these resources and features to determine whether implementing the CIU will have significant impacts. Evaluation of the historical resources and the potential effect at a project level will be required in order to make this determination. Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would help avoid or minimize avoid impacts to natural and cultural resources.
6.7	A sensitive palaeontological feature?		X		
6.8	Is the trail a historic feature?	X			The portion of the trail along the ditch appears to be over 50 years old. Some portions of the trail cross, bisect, traverse and incorporate historical features within the existing trail system.
6.9	Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?	X			USFWS, ACOE permits. Section 106 and consultation with SHPO will be required as part of the federal agency review and approval.
Part 6	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		Proposed trail modifications could be compromised in order to avoid protected natural resources (VELB specifically) and/or costly mitigation could be required. Additional studies and evaluation at the project level are required in order to determine if the CIU would have significant impacts on 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.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
#7 Effects or Impacts to Maintenance and Operations					
Would the CIU and/or needed modifications:					
7.1	Change the classification of the trail?		X		
7.2	Require additional maintenance?	X			
7.3	Require additional management practices to maintain user compliance?	X			If CIU were approved, additional trail patrol and trail safety and etiquette education programs would need to be implemented.
7.4	Require additional staff time to address compliance requirements of the management or design options?	X			There would likely be the need for ongoing staff time to address complaints and conflict management.
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		Adequate patrol and enforcement could be a challenge at current staff levels.
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			There will be an increase in maintenance workload and there will likely be an increase in operational workload responding to complaints and conflicts.