

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Park (Including classification): Folsom Lake SRA

Park Sub-classification: \_\_\_\_\_

Trail Name: Pioneer Express Segments #24, #45 and #41; Pioneer Express Access #1, #4, #7 & #8. Oregon Bar Access Rd #3.

Location in Unit: NF Arm Folsom Lake - Rattlesnake Bar to ASRA (Oregon Bar)

Current Use Designation(s): Equestrian, pedestrian

Proposed Use Type Change: add bikes

Use Change Initiated By: FATRAC, Mtn Bike Focus Group

Evaluation Date: June 2, 2016

**Evaluation** Jim Micheaels, Sr Park & Rec Specialist (Trails Coord.)

**Team Members** Greg Wells, Park & Rec Spec. (Trails specialist)

\_\_\_\_\_

Cara Allen, Environmental Scientist

\_\_\_\_\_

Rich Preston, State Park Superintendent III

\_\_\_\_\_

Steve Hilton, State Archaeologist

\_\_\_\_\_

**Initial field evaluation 6/17/16, 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		Trail continues into ASRA, but connects to multi-use trail options at the FLSRA/ASRA interface.
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			Facilities could be made compatible with existing facilities, however there could be conflicts with existing uses. The trail currently appears to be lightly used.
Part 3	Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation?	X			The CIU would provide bike access and connectivity where it currently does not exist. If approved with other Pioneer Express Trail segments being evaluated it could provide connectivity to Auburn SRA for bikes where it currently does not exist. However, not all segments of the Pioneer Express between Granite Bay and ASRA are recommended for approval.
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?	X			With implementation of complete trio maintenance, several re-routes, puncheons and tread widening in selected locations trail safety could be improved. Even with these modifications there will be some locations where there are steep side slopes with limited options to move off the trail.
Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?	X			Trail sustainability could be maintained with implementation of complete trio maintenance, several re-routes, puncheons and tread widening in selected locations.

# 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	Significant impacts are not anticipated, however additional site specific evaluation is needed to confirm impacts to cultural resources can be avoided. Also there is habitat for several sensitive plant species, which will need to be surveyed and avoided at the project level. 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	It is possible that the CIU could create an additional work load in order to enforce rules, resolve and respond to conflicts and to maintain the trail in a sustainable manner. It may not be a significant ongoing 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		This CIU being considered as part of the FLSRA 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	The CIU would require trail modifications including several minor re-routes, tread widening in places and puncheon replacement or construction. The entire segment needs regular maintenance.
Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures		X	If the CIU were approved, wet weather closures may be desirable. Alternating days could be a management option to provide bike access on this trail, however enforcement could be very challenging.
Recommend that the CIU be put on hold		X	

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



## Final Comments/Determinations

This CIU evaluation is for the section of the Pioneer Express Trail from Rattlesnake Bar to the boundary with Auburn SRA near Oregon Bar. With the exception of the stretch from Rattlesnake Bar to Averys Pond, this segment of trail appears to be lightly used by all trail uses currently.

On its own, this CIU for the Pioneer Express Trail from Rattlesnake Bar to Auburn SRA would provide some additional trail access and opportunity for bikes, but no real loop options or connectivity to other portions of the Pioneer Express Trail within Folsom Lake SRA. Other sections of the Pioneer Express from Granite Bay to Rattlesnake Bar are not recommended for CIU approval. At ASRA, the trail connects with the Oregon Bar access road which would provide connectivity to other ASRA trails. Not approving this change in use does preserve a non-bike trail experience and meets the FLSRA trail system goals of providing diverse trail opportunities.

There are portions of this trail where the trail tread is currently narrow and there are steep side slopes with limited options to get off the trail to allow for passing. The trail is in need of regular maintenance. In order to implement a CIU and provide for trail safety, some trail modifications would be required including re-routes and tread widening.

Generally, the trail appears to be sustainable currently and the trail modifications required for a CIU would help improve sustainability. A CIU would likely generate increased use of this trail which would require the need for greater maintenance of the trail.

Given the limited connectivity that this CIU for this segment of trail would provide and taking into consideration the other factors of trail safety and sustainability, **the recommendation is to not approve a Change in Use for this segment of trail.**

*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		Except the short stretch that the trail route utilizes the PG&E access road to the Newcastle Power Plant at Mormon Ravine.
1.2	ADA Accessible Route of Travel		X		
1.3	Connection to a trail head or other accessible facility?	X			The trail segment connects to the Rattlesnake Bar Staging Area within FLSRA and to Oregon Bar Access at ASRA - neither of these facilities is fully ADA accessible.
1.4	What is the trail's current classification?	I			<i>Enter the trail class (I, II, III, or IV)</i>
<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				
1.11	Fire Break				
1.12	Motorized Recreation				
1.13	Non-Motorized Recreation	X			
1.14	Road used as trail route	X			Just the short stretch on the PG&E road.
<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		Trail segment seemed relatively lightly used. Leaf and other organic litter on the tread. Section of trail from Rattlesnake Bar to Averys Pond appears more heavily used than the rest of the trail.
2.2	Is there evidence of unauthorized use?		X		Only at the very end near ASRA where trail intersects with a major non-system road/trail.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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, it is questionable whether or not this is adequate access. There is no bike trail access north of Beeks Bight within FLSRA.
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			There could be conflicts and capacity issues at the Rattlesnake Bar Staging Area if single vehicles filled the parking area without leaving room for horse trailers. It is possible to keep the staging area parking for trailers only and have others park at the nearby Vista Parking area at Rattlesnake Bar. Could be capacity problems at Oregon Bar which might create conflicts - limited parking at the bottom of the Oregon Bar access road. Could require trail users to park at Oregon Hill where there is much more parking and reserve the parking at the end of the Oregon Bar Access Road for short term parking/river access (pick-up drop off boats)
2.7	Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU?	X			Some user conflicts would be anticipated, although the trail is currently appears to be lightly used. If CIU implemented, trail could become very popular with mtn bikes.
<b>Part 2</b>	<b>Based on above considerations, will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses and services?</b>	X			There may be conflicts with equestrian trail users and bikes if the CIU were approved and implemented. The narrow public land base may constrain the ability to implement proposed reroutes effectively. However, this segment of the Pioneer Express Trail requires fewer trail modifications than the adjacent segments and is currently lightly used.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<b>#3 Effects to Circulation Patterns</b>					
Does the CIU:					
3.1	Provide a loop, semi-loop, or other connection for the CIU user group?	X			This CIU is being evaluated with others as part of the RTMP, including other segments of the Pioneer Express. 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. If this segment were approved alone, it would provide a connection between Rattlesnake Bar and ASRA.
3.2	Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occurring in the unit?	X			We only saw limited evidence of much illegal mtn bike use at the end of the trail near ASRA.
3.3	Provide a connection to adjacent land agency that allows similar use?	X			The trail connects to trails in Auburn SRA, the same agency, but a different park unit. Some of the trails and roads this trail connects to allow bike use.
3.4	Improve circulation or relieve congestion on other high-use trails?	X			If significant portions of Pioneer Express were opened to mtn bike use, this could relieve congestion on other high use trails.
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. However, this segment as trailhead access points at either end and could be considered for the CIU separate from the recommendations for adjoining trail segments.
3.6	Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts?		X		Not necessarily required, but seasonal closures could benefit trail sustainability. Trail was wet and muddy in many locations. The design options (trail modifications) would help with proper drainage.
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>	<b>X</b>			The CIU will provide additional access and trail opportunities for bikes and would provide a connection to Auburn SRA.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<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		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			This trail segment needs brushing. With adequate maintenance brushing for the most part there is adequate sight line distance.
4.2	With standard cyclical slough and berm removal, is there adequate tread width for safe passage of trail users with the CIU?	X			There are a few locations where needed berm removal is greater than trio maintenance level. There are also re-routes needed for entrenched sections of trail to provide for safe passage. Slough and berm removal will help reclaim the full width of the trail.
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		There are many stretches along the trail where there are steep side slopes with limited space for users to retreat to the downhill side of the trail.
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		Generally the fill slopes are firm, but the downhill side of the trail is steep in some locations.
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?		X		Not much.
4.6	Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations?	X			Implementing the CIU may result in increased staff time to address conflicts and enforce park rules and regulations.
<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		
4.9	Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space	X			In some locations this would be beneficial.
4.10	Install speed control devices such as pinch points or tread texturing		X		There might be one or two locations where pinch points might be useful.



# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<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		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.
4.12	One-way directional usage		X		Possible to implement a one way directional usage option, but with current staffing levels such a management option could not be effectively enforced or managed. Also, bicycles would likely want to ride this trail segment as an out and back.
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			Generally yes. A few re-routes and widening of trail in some sections are recommended and the whole trail needs trio maintenance. Even with these modifications, there will still be some areas where there are steep side slopes with limited ability to move off the trail.
<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			Generally, ok, some entrenchment may capture some of the run off and re-routes will help fix those problem areas. Trio maintenance needed on the entire trail segment.
5.2	Is the trail tread firm and stable?	X			For the most part.
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?	X			A couple of re-routes will address abrupt grade changes in a few locations. There are a number of areas of abrupt grade changes.
5.4	Is the fill slope stable?	X			Generally yes, a few locations where fill slope is sliding.
5.5	Is the back slope/cut bank stable?	X			
5.6	Does the trail tread remain firm and stable in wet conditions?	X			Generally yes, a few locations near drainages appear to remain muddy for some time.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
Supporting data from trail log					
5.7	Number of water breaks (water bars, dips, etc.) required for proper drainage	51			6 water breaks; 41 dips; 4 12" culverts all recorded in condition assessment.
5.8	Linear footage of berms	1103			1103 lineal feet of berm recorded in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches	23			23 lineal feet of ditches recorded in condition assessment and 14 ditch outs.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts	1306			1092 lineal ft of rills and 214 lineal ft of gully recorded in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail	8,557			8,557 lineal feet 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			
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			With the current light use, trail appears sustainable.
5.18	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU without management or design options (as recommended)?		X		Higher level os use anticipated with CIU. Therefore trio maintenance needed, pull berms in several areas and a couple of re-routes around entrenched areas.
<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 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		Yes, drainage dips, other features needed.
5.22	Additional bridges and puncheons/boardwalks to facilitate dry crossings necessary to reduce erosion and impacts to waterways?	X			At least one new puncheon needed.
5.23	Reconstruction or replacement of bridges and puncheons to comply with equestrian constuction standards?	X			At least one existing puncheon to be replaced.
5.24	Fill slope or cut bank retaining walls?		X		
5.25	Additional or upgraded turnpikes or causeways?		X		

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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		Re-routes needed on this section are not major reroutes..
<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		Not alone, trail modifications would be needed to ensure sustainability. Wet weather closures could help with trail sustainability. Such closures would likely be implemented park wide and could be considered in 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>			

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
<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		
6.2	Significant geologic features?		X		
6.3	Sensitive wildlife habitat?		X		
6.4	Sensitive plant habitat?		X		Significant impacts not anticipated, however sensitive species in the area include Brandegee's clarkia.
6.5	A wetland, riparian or stream zone?		X		Significant impacts not anticipated, however the trail and a few proposed drainage features do cross wetland and riparian areas.
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. Given that there are only a few physical modifications recommended as part of this CIU it is not anticipated that the CIU would create significant impacts. However, 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

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
6.9	Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?	X			Section 106 and consultation with SHPO would be required as part of the federal agency review and approval. CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement may be needed for some of the work.
<b>Part 6</b>	<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		Overall it is not anticipated that the CIU would create significant negative impacts on historical cultural resources. However, 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.
<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		
7.2	Require additional maintenance?	X			Currently very little maintenance done on this trail.
7.3	Require additional management practices to maintain user compliance?	X			It is possible that even with design options implemented, wet weather closures may be helpful for trail sustainability. However, compared to previous segments of the Pioneer Express Trail, this trail appears to be more sustainable.
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.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
7.7	Can necessary management strategies be enforced?		X		Adequate patrol and enforcement could be a challenge at current staffing 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.
<b>Based on the above considerations, will implementation of the CIU Part 7 with management and design options (as recommended) create a significant on-going maintenance or operational workload?</b>			X		There will be some additional staff time if the CIU were implemented, but this should be at a manageable level and not significantly greater than the maintenance that should be occurring on this trail segment. If the CIU were implemented and the trail became extremely popular and heavily used there will be additional staff time required for trail maintenance, patrol and education, which could rise to a significant level.