

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Park (Including classification): Folsom Lake SRA
 Park Sub-classification: _____
 Trail Name: Pioneer Express Segments #47, #25, #22 and #44 & Pioneer Access Trl #5, and Sterling Point Connector Trail 1
 Location in Unit: NF Arm Folsom Lake - Sterling Pointe to Rattlesnake Bar
 Current Use Designation(s): Equestrian, pedestrian
 Proposed Use Type Change: add bikes
 Use Change Initiated By: FATRAC, Mtn Bike Focus Group
 Evaluation Date: Sterling Pointe to Horseshoe Bar on June 26, 2015; and Horseshoe Bar to Rattlesnake Bar on March 23, 2016

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, 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		
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 and the other trail design challenges identified below.
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 trail segments being evaluated it could provide connectivity to Auburn SRA for bikes where it currently does not exist.
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?		X		The first half of this section from Sterling Pointe to Horseshoe Bar has relatively gentle topography, does not require many trail modifications and trail safety could be readily maintained. The second half of the segment from Horseshoe Bar to Rattlesnake Bar has numerous stretches of entrenchment and other challenges requiring substantial trail modifications. Even with re-routes, due to the narrow public land base the re-route options are limited and there may be 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



Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?		X		The first half of this section from Sterling Pointe to Horseshoe Bar has relatively gentle topography and does not require many trail modifications. The second half of the segment from Horseshoe Bar to Rattlesnake Bar has numerous stretches of entrenchment and other challenges requiring substantial trail modifications. The trail sustainability can 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.
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 natural and cultural resources can be avoided. Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would help avoid or minimize avoid 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			It is possible that the CIU could create an additional substantial work load in order to enforce rules, resolve and respond to conflicts and to maintain the trail in a sustainable manner.

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		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.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



<p>Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures</p>		<p>X</p>	<p>Wet weather closures may be desirable and along with trail modifications could improve sustainability. Other management options may be possible to implement, such as alternating days of use, but enforcement would be difficult. These management options could not be effectively implemented and enforced with existing staffing levels.</p>
<p>Recommend that the CIU be put on hold</p>		<p>X</p>	

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Final Comments/Determinations

This section of the Pioneer Express Trail runs from the intersection with the Sterling Pointe Connector Trail to the Rattlesnake Bar Day Use Area. The CIU for this section of the Pioneer Express Trail is being considered along with CIU evaluations for other segments of the trail. If all of the segments of the Pioneer Express Trail between Beeks Bight (Granite Bay) and Auburn SRA were approved, the connection between Granite Bay in FLSRA and Auburn SRA would be a substantial improvement in circulation, access and connectivity for bikes. However, the CIU Evaluation Team has recommended not to approve the CIU for the adjoining segment of trail to the south (Beeks Bight to Sterling Pointe). On its own, this CIU would provide very little circulation enhancement for bikes.

The first half of this section of trail, from Sterling Pointe to Horseshoe Bar Road, is along gentler grades and is in relatively sustainable existing condition requiring few trail modifications. The second half of the segment from Horseshoe Bar Road to Rattlesnake Bar has a number of areas of serious entrenchment which would require many trail modifications, including reroutes, for trail safety and sustainability.

The public land base along this segment of trail is a narrow strip along the lakeshore 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 has many sections of severe entrenchment and other areas where sight distances are limited due to topography. Safe passing of different users, including options to move off the trail, could be a challenge along portions of this second half of the trail segment due to narrow tread width and challenging terrain.

While approving the CIU would create an additional trail opportunity for mountain bikes, portions of this segment are challenging to successfully implement the CIU. Due to the narrow public land base, it is not possible to reroute the trail to provide the optimal alignment for trail sustainability or for trail safety in all locations. In the past there have been conflicts and complaints in the area from illegal mountain bike use of this trail segment. However, this segment of trail sees far fewer illegal cyclists compared to other trails within FLSRA. If the CIU were implemented, addressing user conflicts and enforcing trail rules could create a substantial increase in the staff time required to successfully implement the CIU. 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 a portion of this section of trail. This non-system route, or in places routes, 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.

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 trail segment connects to the Rattlesnake Bar Staging Area within FLSRA and to Sterling Pointe, a County operated trailhead.
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			Not as high use as portions of the Pioneer Express closer to Granite Bay.
2.2	Is there evidence of unauthorized use?	X			There is some evidence of unauthorized bike use along this segment, but not much as other portions of the park unit.
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, though it is debatable whether or not this is adequate. There is no mtn bike trail access north of Beeks Bight within FLSRA. The adjacent Placer County trails in the vicinity of the Sterling Pointe Equestrian Staging Area are multi-use and allow 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			The County indicates that all of their trails are multi-use including those in the Sterling Pointe area. 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, also at Rattlesnake Bar.
2.7	Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU?	X			Some user conflicts would be anticipated.
Part 2	Based on above considerations, will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses and services?		X		The facilities could be managed or modified to be compatible with the CIU, but conflicts with existing users (equestrian trail users) would be likely.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
#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 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.
3.2	Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occurring in the unit?	X			Though we did not see evidence of much illegal mtn bike use on the trail, staff have heard of mtn bike use on this segment.
3.3	Provide a connection to adjacent land agency that allows similar use?	X			Andy Fisher of Placer County indicates Sterling Pointe Trails are multi-use even though they are marked "no Bikes" at Sterling Pointe.
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			
Part 3	Based on above criteria, will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation for the new use type?	X			The CIU will provide additional access and trail opportunities for bikes, but this segment alone will provide somewhat limited circulation enhancement.

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		Not for this specific trail segment. 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			
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.
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			Generally there is adequate space to users to retreat to the downhill side of the trail, except for a few locations where there are steep drop offs.
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 yes, except a few locations of steep drop offs.
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?	X			Some.
4.6	Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations?	X			CIU may result in increased trail user conflicts and increased staff time to address conflicts. Implementing the CIU would reduce the need to enforce prohibition against bikes.
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		
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		Generally not, but might be one or two locations where pinch points might be useful.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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.
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. Additionally this strategy may not be effective as many users are seeking an out and back trail experience.
4.13	Installation of new signage	X			
4.14	Other (Describe)				
Part 4			X		Due to the limited public land base, implementing effective reroutes, including those needed for trail safety, is a challenge. There are locations where sight distances are minimal and/or providing for safe passing will be limited due to rock outcrops and steep topography.
Based on the above considerations, would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?					
#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		Generally, the first half of the trail from Sterling Pointe to Horseshoe Bar drains ok, but the second half from Horseshoe Bar to Rattlesnake Bar has many wet and muddy sections of trail. 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		See above, 2nd half of trail has many muddy sections.
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?		X		Not in the 1st half of trail to Horseshoe Bar, the 2nd half to Rattlesnake Bar has a number of abrupt changes in grade.
5.4	Is the fill slope stable?			X	Not many fill slopes, full bench construction.
5.5	Is the back slope/cut bank stable?	X			

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
5.6	Does the trail tread remain firm and stable in wet conditions?		X		In the first half, mostly firm and stable, there are one of two isolated muddy areas and some sandy stretches in low areas of the trail where sediments is transported down the trail. The 2nd half has many muddy sections.
Supporting data from trail log					
5.7	Number of water breaks (water bars, dips, etc.) required for proper drainage	74			23 water breaks; 31 dips; 5 12" culverts; 1 18" culvert; 3 24" culvert; 1 36" culvert; 1 "other" culvert; 9 drain outlets; 1 ditch out - all recorded in condition assessment.
5.8	Linear footage of berms	760			760 lineal feet of berm recorded in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches				2 ditches recorded in condition assessment, but no lineal footage provided.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts	1981			1137 lineal ft of rills and 844 lineal ft of gully recorded in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail	9,678			9,678 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				
5.14	Full Soil Profile	X			2nd half of trail segment.
5.15	Partial Soil Profile/Sandy	X			1st half of trail segment.
5.16	Sandy				
5.17	Based on these considerations is the trail currently sustainable?		X		The first half of this segment, from Sterling Pointe to Horseshoe Bar is in much better shape than the second half of this segments, from Horseshoe Bar to Rattlesnake Bar - which is currently unsustainable.
5.18	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU without management or design options (as recommended)?		X		Trio maintenance needed, pull berms in several areas and a number of re-routes around severely entrenched areas. Lots of work needed to make the trail sustainable.
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			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		
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			Sterling Pointe Connector Trail would require retaining walls on switchbacks needed for trail re-alignment.
5.25	Additional or upgraded turnpikes or causeways?	X			Yes, in several wet/muddy areas.
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-route/major re-engineering of Sterling Pointe Connector Trail and in a number of locations along the 2nd half of the trail from Horseshoe Bar to Rattlesnake Bar.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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		Not alone, design options needed to ensure sustainability.
5.39	Can other mangement options be implemented to improve trail sustainability? If so, please describe.		X		But coordinate with Placer County for the County to make improvements to their trails at Sterling Pointe which connect to State Park trails.
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 sustainability can be improved with substaintial trail modifications, including: a number of major and minor reroutes, drainage dips, armored crossings, drainage lens or causeways. However, due to the limited public land base, implementing effective reroutes required to fully provide for trail sustainability is a challenge.
#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		

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. 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.
6.9	Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?		X		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		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 natural and 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			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 to improve drainage, wet weather closures may be desirable for trail sustainability. Also, 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			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		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.
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			The CIU would potentially create a significant ongoing maintenance or operational work load.