Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Park (Including classification):	Folsom Lake SRA	**Evaluation Team Members**	Jim Micheaels, Sr Park & Rec Specialist (Trails Coord.)
Park Sub-classification			Greg Wells, Park & Rec Spec. (Trails specialist)
Trail Name:	Pioneer Express Segments #20 (Dike 6 to Dike 5)		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 3/23/22**
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.

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
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)? *This form can only be used to consider a CIU for system roads and trails.*		X		
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.*	X			
0.10	Based on the preliminary considerations, should the CIU be further evaluated? *If yes, continue to the next page. If no, please explain.*	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			Yes, this is a short isolated segment of equestrian/pedestrian trail that connects to multi-use trails on either end.
Part 3	Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation?		X		The CIU won't appreciably affect circulation for any users as there are other trail options including the road/trail between Dikes 5 and 6. However, given that this is an isolated segment of limited use trail, the CIU will improve single track circulation for bikes.
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?	X			Yes, trail safety can be maintained. With regular trail maintenance there is good sight distance along the trail. There is one trail modification proposed, eliminating a short steep user created short-cut at the south end of the trail.
Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?	X			Trail is already sustainable, other than the short steep user created connection to north end of Dike 6 noted below.
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		There is uncertainity regarding the cultrual resources present. Additional research and mapping are needed. CA Historical Marker #585 ("Pioneer Express Trail") is located along this short segment of trail. The marker was erected in 1957. However the CIU can be implemented without significant negative 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?		X		No, this is a very short segment of trail.

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			RTMP in progress.
Recommend that the CIU be approved		X		This is a very short isolated segment of equestrian/pedestrian trail that provides little benefit as a limited use trail. Mtn bikes currently use the trail regularly and often. Recommend the CIU be approved with the one trail modification noted below.
Recommend that the CIU-be approved with design options such a major or minor re-route or minor re-construction.	X			Most of the trail is sustainable and in good condition. However, the connection between this trail and Dike 6 needs improvement. Users (bikes) have made a steep shortcut up to this trail from the north end of Dike 6 which has become a steep eroding chute.
Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures		X		This is less than 1/4 mile of trail, other than updating trail signage, no management mesaures are required.
Recommend that the CIU be put on hold		X		

Final Comments/Determinations

This is a short, isolated segment of single-track trail, less than 1/4 mile in length. The single-track trail segment sits between Dikes 5 and 6, both of which have roads across the top of the dikes which are designated multi-use. The trail segment is ridden regularly by bikes, but this is not the sole or determing factor in the CIU decision. This short, isolated segment of equestrian/pedestrian trail provides little benefit as a limited use trail. The trail is on gentle terrain with good sight distance and trail safety and trail sustainability can be maintained with the CIU. However, the connection between this trail and Dike 6 needs improvement. Users (bikes) have made a steep shortcut up to this trail from the north end of Dike 6 which has become a steep eroding chute. This area should be addressed through a trail modification as part of implementing this CIU. **The recommendation is to approve this CIU with conditions.**

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					*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?		X		
1.2	ADA Accessible Route of Travel		X		
1.3	Connection to a trail head or other accessible facility?		X		
1.4	What is the trail's current classification?	I			*Enter the trail class (I, II, III, or IV)*
	Trail or road surface type:	*Check All Applicable*			**Comments**
1.5	Asphalt				
1.6	Concrete				
1.7	Gravel				
1.8	Native Material	X			
	Trail and road facility use type				
1.9	Public	X			
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	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			Yes, the trail segment is regularly ridden by bikes, but this is not a determining factor in the CIU decision.
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 mtn bike use, questionable whether or not this is adequate across the entire unit. However, in this particular area there is a single track multi-use trail that provides connection and access. Also - the top of Dike 5 also provides multi-use connection and access.

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 2014 the 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		
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			
#3 Effects to Circulation Patterns						
	Does the CIU:					
3.1		Provide a loop, semi-loop, or other connection for the CIU user group?		X		There are already a couple of options for mtn bikes to make trail connections through this area including the mutli-use trail to the west of this segment and the service road across and between Dikes 5 and 6.
3.2		Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occuring in the unit?	X			Yes, the trail segment is regularly ridden by bikes, but this is not a determining factor in the 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		
3.5		Create the potential need for use changes on adjacent or connecting trails or facilities?		X		
3.6		Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts?		X		
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		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.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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 sinousity, may have minimal effect on slowing user speeds.
4.6	Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations?		X		
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		X		
4.8	Increase sight distances through re-routing or removal of visual obstructions		X		
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		
Management 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		X		
4.12	One-way directional usage		X		
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**			

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			
5.2	Is the trail tread firm and stable?	X			
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?		X		
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			
	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				None recorded in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches				None recorded in condition assessment.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts	636			636 lineal ft of rill/rut recorded in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail	185			185 lineal ft of entrench 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			
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					
	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?		X		
5.21	Additional drainage structures (e.g. grade reversals, water bars, rolling grade dips, etc.) to manage increased mechanical wear?		X		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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 constuction 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		
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		
Management 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?		X		
5.39	Can other mangement options be implemented to improve trail sustainability? If so, please describe.		X		
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**			Trail is already sustainable, only one trail modification is proposed to eliminate a short steep short-cut.
#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		
6.4	Sensitive plant habitat?		X		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
6.5	A wetland, riparian or stream zone?		X		
6.6	A sensitive cultural feature?	X			The trail is within a larger cultural landscape. Currently there is insufficient information to determine whether the CIU, including proposed modifications to the trail, would have negative impacts to cultural resources. Additional studies and evaluation of the resources would need to be conducted to make these determinations. However, implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices will prevent significant negative impacts to cultural resources.
6.7	A sensitive palaeontological feature?		X		None known.
6.8	Is the trail a historic feature?		X		It is uncertain if any part of this trail is on an historical alignment. Mapping and reserch needed. CA Historical Marker #585 ("Pioneer Express Trail") is located along this short segment of trail. The marker was erected in 1957.
6.9	Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?		X		
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 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		
7.4	Require additional staff time to address compliance requirements of the management or design options?	X			Some staff time would be required to complete the one trail modification identified.
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.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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 can patrol the trail occassionally and will educate visitors on safe trail use and trail etiquette.
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**		