

Park (Including classification):	Folsom Lake SRA	Evaluation	Jim Micheaels, Sr Park & Rec Specialist (Trails Coord.)
Park Sub-classification		Team Members	Greg Wells, Park & Rec Spec. (Trails specialist)
Trail Name:	Pioneer Express Segments #33, 43 & 18 (Dike 5 to Dike 4), Pioneer Express Trl Connector #1.		Cara Allen, Environmental Scientist
Location in Unit:	Folsom Lake		Rich Preston, State Park Superintendent III
Current Use Designation(s):	Equestrian, pedestrian		Steve Hilton, State Archaeologist
Proposed Use Type Change:	add bikes		
Use Change Initiated By:	FATRAC, Mtn Bike Focus Group		Initial Field Evaluation 10/27/15, final March/April 2022
Evaluation Date:	June 15, 2015		

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.

Prelin	ninary 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?	Χ			
0.2	Is the proposed CIU on a trail that passes through more than one unit or sub-unit?		Х		
0.3	Is there an approved general plan?	Х			
0.4	Is there an approved road and trail management plan?		Х		This CIU will be part of the ongoing RTMP at FLSRA.
0.5	Is there an approved area management plan?		Χ		
0.6	If there is an approved and relevant planning document, is the proposed CIU consistent with planning recommendations?	Y			
0.7	Has a previous CIU request been made and evaluated for this trail?		Χ		
0.8	Is the proposed CIU located on a non-system (volunteer trail)? This form can only be used to consider a CIU for system roads and trails.		Х		
0.9	Is the proposed CIU on a facility designated as a trail or road? This form cannot be used to consider a CIU for non-designated facilities such as a beach or desert wash.				



0.10	Based on the preliminary considerations, should the CIU be further	~		
0.10	evaluated? If yes, continue to the next page. If no, please explain.	^		

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?	Х			Except for private stables adjacent to park unit in this area.
Part 3	Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation?		Х		There are existing multi-use trails in the area that provide similar access and connectivity.
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?				Generally this trail has relatively gentle topography, good sight lines and is open with sufficient areas for different trail users to pass one another.
Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?				
Part 6	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) create significant negative impacts to the natural or cultural resources?		х		No. Implementing the CIU will not create significant impacts to natural or cultural resources.
Part 7	Will implementation of the CIU with management and design options create a significant on-going maintenance or operational workload?		Х		Implementing the CIU will not create an additional significant on-going operational or maintenance work load.

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	. Y		This CIU will be part of the ongoing RTMP being prepared for FLSRA.
Recommend that the CIU be approved		X	There are other trail connection options for mtn bikes in this area, including a parallel multi-use trail. The CIU teams sees benefit to retianing this segment of trail in its current designation as equestrian/pedestrian.



Recommend that the CIU-be approved with design options such a major or minor re-route or minor re-construction.	х	
Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures	Х	
Recommend that the CIU be put on hold	Х	

Final Comments/Determinations

This short segment of equestrian and pedestrian trail provides single-track access between Dikes 4 and 5. The service roads across the dikes accommodate multi-use trail access and there is a parallel multi-use single track trail between the two dikes as well. Given that there are multiple existing trail options for bikes in this area, this CIU would provide little additional benefit to bikes. There is a riding stable adjacent to the park unit in this area which utilizes the FLSRA trails through a concession agreement. There is a benefit to retaining this equestrian/pedestrian trail as an alternative to the multi-use trail that provides access and connection in the same area. 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.



Evaluation	on Considerations	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Part 1 Ex	cisting Conditions				Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed CUI and any other details related to proposal evaluation.
1.1	Is the trail a controlled access road?		Χ		
1.2	ADA Accessible Route of Travel		Χ		
1.3	Connection to a trail head or other accessible facility?		Χ		
1.4	What is the trail's current classification?				Enter the trail class (I, II, III, or IV)
	Trail or road surface type:	_	heck A plicab		Comments
1.5	Asphalt				
1.6	Concrete				
1.7	Gravel				
1.8	Native Material	>	(
	Trail and road facility use type				
1.9	Public	>	(
1.10	Administration				
1.11	Fire Break				
1.12	Motorized Recreation				
1.13	Non-Motorized Recreation				
1.14	Road used as trail route				
	Current trail uses allowed	Yes	No	NA	
1.15	Pedestrian	Χ			
1.16	Mountain Bike		Χ		
1.17	Equestrian	Х			
1.18	Other - specify in comment box				
	ompatibility with Existing Visitor Uses, Facilities, and Services			r	
	Conditions				
2.1	Is the trail high-use or in a high use area?	Χ			
2.2	Is there evidence of unauthorized use?	Χ			
2.3	Does the proposed use currently exist in the park?	Χ			
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 across the park unit. However, for this particular area there is a single track multi-use trail option that provides the same connection as the proposed CIU segment.



Evaluati	on Considerations	Yes	No	NA	Comments
2.5	Is there documented survey or statistical information that identifies a need/desire for the CIU?	Х			IIn 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		There are non-system spur trail connection to an existing stables on private property adjacent to the park unit. The stables does trips into the park unit under a special event permit.
2.7	Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU?		Х		There may be conflicts with existing equestrian use, particularly from the stables, but these conflicts are not anticipated to be significant.
Part 2	Based on above considerations, will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses and services?	Х			
#3 Effec	ts to Circulation Patterns				
	Does the CIU:				
3.1	Provide a loop, semi-loop, or other connection for the CIU user group?		X		In this area there is a single track multi-use trail option that provides the same connection as the proposed CIU segment and the service road across and between Dike 4 and 5 provides another multi-use trail option.
3.2	Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occuring in the unit?	Χ			
3.3	Provide a connection to adjacent land agency that allows similar use?		Χ		
3.4	Improve circulation or relieve congestion on other high-use trails?		Χ		
3.5	Create the potential need for use changes on adjacent or connecting trails or facilities?		Х		
3.6	Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts?		Χ		
3.7	If yes, will seasonal closures disrupt circulation patterns?			Χ	
Part 3	Based on above criteria, will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation for the new use type?		X		



Evaluati	on Considerations	Yes	No	NA	Comments
#4 Effec	ts to Trail Safety				
Existing	Conditions				
4.0	Are there documented safety concerns resulting from interactions between different user groups?		Х		
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?	Х			
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?	Х			
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?		Χ		This short segment of trail does not have much sinousity.
4.6	Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations?		Х		
Design (Options to Improve Safety				
	Check those design options that could be implemented to improve trail safety with the CIU				
4.7	Increase sinuosity through re-routing or re-construction		Χ		
4.8	Increase sight distances through re-routing or removal of visual obstructions		Х		
4.9	Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space		Χ		
4.10	Install speed control devices such as pinch points or tread texturing		Х		
Manage	ment Options to Improve Safety				
	Check those management options that could be implemented to improve trail safety with the CIU				
4.11	Alternating days of use		Χ		
4.12	One-way directional usage		Χ		
4.13	Installation of new signage	Χ			
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?				



Evaluati	on Considerations	Yes	No	NA	Comments
#5 Effec	ts 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?	Х			
5.2	Is the trail tread firm and stable?	Х			
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?	Х			
5.4	Is the fill slope stable?	Χ			
5.5	Is the back slope/cut bank stable?	Χ			
5.6	Does the trail tread remain firm and stable in wet conditions?	Χ			
	Supporting data from trail log				
5.7	Number of water breaks (water bars, dips, etc.) required for proper drainage		8		8 dips recorded in condition assessment.
5.8	Linear footage of berms				None recorded in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches				None recorded in condition assessment.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts	1	75		175 lineal ft of rills recorded in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail		2367		2367 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)	X		south end of segment
5.14	Full Soil Profile				
5.15	Partial Soil Profile/Sandy)	X		north end of segment
5.16	Sandy				
5.17	Based on these considerations is the trail currently sustainable?	Χ			
5.18	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU without management or design options (as recommended)?	Х			
Design (Options to Improve Sustainability				
	If not sustainable, can any of the following measures be implemented to make the trail sustainable for the CIU?				
5.20	Armoring of wet drainage crosings to reduce erosion and impacts to waterways?		Х		
5.21	Additional drainage structures (e.g. grade reversals, water bars, rolling grade dips, etc.) to manage increased mechanical wear?	X			



Evaluati	on Considerations	Yes	No	NA	Comments
	Additional bridges and puncheons/boardwalks to facilitate dry				
5.22	crossings necessary to reduce erosion and impacts to waterways?		Х		
	Reconstruction or replacement of bridges and puncheons to comply		.,		
5.23	with equestrian constuction standards?		Х		
5.24	Fill slope or cut bank retaining walls?		Χ		
5.25	Additional or upgraded turnpikes or causeways?		Χ		
	Minor reconstruction of trail tread would:				
5.26	Correct lack of outslope		Χ		
5.27	Stabilize abrupt grade changes		Χ		
5.28	Stabilize cut bank		Χ		
5.29	Stabilize fill slope		Χ		
5.30	Correct rilling and rutting	Х			There are a few sections of this trail that need to be reengineered and reconstructed to reduce erosion.
5.31	Provide for firm and stable surfaces		Χ		
	Minor realignment/re-route of trail within the immediate proximity of the existing trail would:				
5.32	Stabilize cut bank		Χ		
5.33	Stabilize fill slope		Χ		
5.34	Eliminate abrupt grade changes		Χ		
5.35	Correct unsustainable grades		Χ		
5.36	Correct lack of sinuosity		Χ		
5.37	Should a major reroute be considered to establish sustainability?		Χ		
Manage	ment Options to Improve Sustainability				
	If not sustainable, can any of the following measures be implemented to make the trail sustainable for the CIU?				
5.38	Can wet weather closures establish or maintain sustainability?		Χ		
	Can other mangement options be implemented to improve trail				
5.39	sustainability? If so, please describe.		Х		
Part 5	Based on the above considerations, will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?	х			
#6 Effec	ts 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?		Х		
6.2	Significant geologic features?		Χ		
6.3	Sensitive wildlife habitat?		Χ		



Evaluati	on Considerations	Yes	No	NA	Comments
6.4	Sensitive plant habitat?		Χ		
6.5	A wetland, riparian or stream zone?		Χ		
6.6	A sensitive cultural feature?		Χ		CIU on this trail should not impact cultural resources.
6.7	A sensitive palaeontological feature?		Χ		
6.8	Is the trail a historic feature?		Χ		It does not appear that this portion of trail is historic.
6.9	Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?		Х		
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		
#7 Effec	ts or Impacts to Maintenance and Operations				
	Would the CIU and/or needed modifications:				
7.1	Change the classification of the trail?		Χ		
7.2	Require additional maintenance?		Χ		
7.3	Require additional management practices to maintain user compliance?		Х		
7.4	Require additional staff time to address compliance requirements of the management or design options?		X		
7.5	Could the proposed modifications be completed by non-department work forces?			Х	
7.6	Could the proposed modifications be maintained by non-department work forces with minimal cost to the State?			Х	
7.7	Can necessary management strategies be enforced?			Χ	
7.8	If not, is there a volunteer group or partner agency that can assist with enforcement?			Х	
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		