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 6, 8, 32, 7, 1, 5, & 27.		Cara Allen, Environmental Scientist
Location in Unit:	Lake Natoma		Mike Green, State Park Ranger
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 9/14/15, final 3/23/22**
Evaluation Date:	May 21, 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		The FLSRA Road and Trail Management Plan is currently 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			
Part 3	Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation?		X		
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?	X			
Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?	X			
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		The trail segment is within a large recorded historic mining sites. Additional studies and evaluation would be conducted at the project specific level would be conducted for any proposed trail modifications. Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would also serve to avoid significant 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		

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 being completed as part of the FLSRA RTMP that is currently being prepared.
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 that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures		X		
Recommend that the CIU be put on hold		X		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Final Comments/Determinations

This segment of the Pioneer Express Trail is from Nimbus Dam to the eastern end of Mississippi Bar at the Snipes-Pershing Ravine outlet. The western portion of the trail is immediately adjacent to the paved bike path on the north side of Lake Natoma or along the shoulder of the paved bike path. The eastern half of this segment departs from the paved bike path and follows a service road for the WAPA power lines, returns to the paved trail and then passes through the dredger tailing piles eventually turning into a very narrow and little used trail before again crossing the paved trail at the Snipes Pershing Ravine outlet. The western portion of this segment gets regularly ridden by mtn bikes currently. Along much of the middle portion of the segment there are a number of non-system trails that run parallel to the trail and spur trails that provide access to Lake Natoma. The spur trails accessing Lake Natoma are an attraction for all users. The far eastern end of the trail gets much less use as it winds thought the tailing piles. There is evidence of equestrian use in this eastern portion, but not much evidence of bike use.

The western half of this trail segment is flat, sufficiently wide and open and a CIU could be implemented on this portion while providing for trail safety and trail sustainability. The eastern portion of this segment is much less suitable for a CIU due to the narrow trail through tailing cobbles with poor sight distance in numerous places.

Other trails in the Mississippi Bar area, including the Shady and Snowberry Trails,s are recommended for a CIU approval to add bike use which will provide single-track access and experience for bikes across the Mississippi Bar area. The American River Bike Path also provides access and connectivity for bikes. Approving this CIU would provide little additional benefit to cyclists. Keeping this trail equestrian/pedestrian will provide equestrian/pedestrian trail experience without bikes and loop trail options for these users in the Mississippi Bar area. There are options to develop a separate parallel multi-use trail through a portion of this area. There are numerous existing non-system trails in this area that could be adopted as system trails, with modifications as needed. This is a recommendation in the ongoing Road and Trail Management Plan.

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
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		Portions of the trail segments are used occassionally, by DPR vehiclesand other agencies for administrative purposes.
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	X			Portions used occassionally by vehicles for administrative purposes..
1.11	Fire Break				
1.12	Motorized Recreation				
1.13	Non-Motorized Recreation				
1.14	Road used as trail route	X			Portions of trail section are service road for WAPA towers and lines.
	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			There is some evidence of unauthorized use by bikes. This unauthorized use is not a determining factor in this CIU decision.
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, but there is no single track trail along the North/West side of Lake Natoma that provides connectivity for mtn bikes.
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		
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		Other CIUs in the area, including the Shady and Snowberry Trails are being recommended for approval and provide single-track access and connectivity for bikes across the Mississippi Bar area. The paved bike path through the area also provides bikes access and connectivity across the area. This CIU provides little additional benefit for cyclists.
3.2		Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occuring 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		
3.5		Create the potential need for use changes on adjacent or connecting trails or facilities?				All of the CIUs for the trails in this area and on the north and west side of Lake Natoma are being considered in the context of one another to ensure logical and appropriate connectivity and access to facilities.
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**		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
#4 Effects to Trail Safety					
Existing Conditions					
4.0	Are there documented safety concerns resulting from interactions between different user groups?		X		
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			Portions of this trail section are roads, most of the segement is on relatively level ground. The western half of trail has good sight distances and room for safe passage. The eastern half would need trail modifications in some locations.
4.2	With standard cyclical slough and berm removal, is there adequate tread width for safe passage of trail users with the CIU?	X			See above.
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			See above.
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			See above.
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?		X		Not much sinousity on western half of trail, but this half is wide with good sight distances.Eastern half of trail has sinousity in places.
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				No modifications needed to improve trail safety on the western half of the trail, brushing needed on the eastern half to improve sight lines.
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			Eastern portion of trail segment.
4.9	Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space	X			Trail bed and tread widening may be needed in a few locations in the eastern portion of the trail segment.
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		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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**			
#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	9			5 culverts, 4 dips documented in condition assessment.
5.8	Linear footage of berms	537			537 ft of berms documented in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches	none			No ditches identified in condition assessment, documented as points (ditch outs?) not linear features.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts	none			0 ft of rills and gullies documented in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail	61			61 ft of entrenched trail documented 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			

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation

Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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		
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			Might consider causeway or drain lens in one wet area near ponds adjacent to Lake Natoma.
	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			Wet weather closures could help with trail sustainability. Such closures would likely be implemented park wide and could be considered in the RTMP.

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		
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**			
#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		
6.5		A wetland, riparian or stream zone?		X		
6.6		A sensitive cultural feature?		X		Trail is located within a recorded historical mining landscape. While the trail is within a recorded site, few modifications to this trail segment are required as part of the CIU. Site specific environmental analysis would be conducted, including any required additional studies and evaluations, prior to implementing the CIU. Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would also serve to avoid significant impacts to cultural resources.
6.7		A sensitive palaeontological feature?		X		
6.8		Is the trail a historic feature?	X			Portions of the trail may be of 50 years old
6.9		Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?	X			Compliance with Section 106 of NHPA required for federal review & approval. CIU is not requiring any physical modifications for this segment of trail.
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**		Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would also serve to avoid significant 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 the CIU were implemented, the District coulld implement occassional patrols with staff or volunteers and provide trail safety end etiquette signing and other programs.
7.4	Require additional staff time to address compliance requirements of the management or design options?	X			Additional staff time would be required for trail maintenance, patrol and trail user education regarding trail safety and etiquette.
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			If the CIU were approved, trail safety and etiquette signage and education programs could be implemented along with occassional patrols.
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**		