

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Park (Including classification): Folsom Lake SRA

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

Trail Name: Shady Trail

Location in Unit: Lake Natoma

Current Use Designation(s): Equestrian, pedestrian

Proposed Use Type Change: add bikes

Use Change Initiated By: FATRAC, Mtn Bike Focus Group

Evaluation Date: May 21, 2015

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

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

Cara Allen, Environmental Scientist

Mike Green, State Park Ranger

Steve Hilton, State Archaeologist

**Draft Field Evaluation 10/20/15, Final 3/23/22**

*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		
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			

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



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			The CIU can be compatible with existing uses, facilities and services. The Snowberry TH has reasonable parking capacity and many users are accessing the trail from the local community. Mountain bikes currently use the trail illegally on a regular basis. This is a fact on the ground and is not a dermining factor in this CIU decision. The Shadow Glenn concessionaire indicates his rides do utilize this route. Other trails in the area will remain pedestrian/equestrian providing alternate opportunities for equestrians providing a different experience for these users.
Part 3	Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation?	X			Bikes currently have alternate access along the paved bike trail and its shoulders. However implementing this CIU does provide a single track connection for bikes where it currently does not exist. Implementing this CIU along with the Snowberry Trail CIU will provide bikes a single track connection across the Mississippi Bar area.
Part 4	Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety?	X			There is one deeply entrenched blind turn at the southern terminus of the trail that need to be modified as part of this CIU. Maintenance brushing can provide reasonable sight distance on this trail. The District will further assess the need for pinch points or other measures to control speed. The area around the Shady Trail recnetly underwent thinning and fuel clearance as part of a forest resiliency project. The area is much more open than previously and sight distance is much improved.

# 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 trail is along relatively level terrain and is primarily sustainable currently with regular trail maintenance. There are a few trail modifications/repairs that will be need to nbe completed as part of the CIU for trail sustainability.
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	Site specific environmental review and analysis of the proposed design options and physical modifications to the trail will be conducted prior to implementation to determine any potential impacts to natural or cultural resources. Implementation of the CIU will utilize standard project conditions and best practices which will prevent any significant negative impacts.
Part 7	Will implementation of the CIU with management and design options create a significant on-going maintenance or operational workload?		X	Implementation of the CIU will not create significant ongoing operation or maintenance burdens. The trail is already regularly used by bikes and what the trail primarily needs is maintenance.

## 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 is being considered 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			See explanation of determination below.
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

Currently there is no single-track access and connection for bikes along the north/west side of Lake Natoma. Bikes do currently have access along the paved bike trail and its shoulders. However, implementing this CIU along with the Snowberry Trail CIU and other CIUs will provide bikes a single-track connection where it currently does not exist across the Mississippi Bar area and the north/west side of Lake Natoma. Other trails in the area, such as the Middle Ridge Trail, will remain pedestrian/equestrian providing alternate opportunities for equestrians and pedestrians for a different trail experience. The Shady Trail is currently used by all types of trail users and is regularly ridden illegally by bikes. This unauthorized bike use is a fact on the ground and not a determining factor in this CIU decision.

The Shady Trail is on relatively gentle topography and with brushing will have good line of sight distances. Several trail modifications are needed in order to implement the CIU including: a re-route/reconstruction of the southern end of the trail to eliminate a deep gully with a blind turn and abrupt grade change; reconstruction of a rutted section of trail along with an adjacent causeway/drain lens to address drainage and erosion problems. With these modifications, trail safety and trail sustainability can be maintained. The District will provide occasional patrols of the trail with parks staff and/or volunteers and will install signing and implement other educational programs promoting trail etiquette and safety. The Shadow Glen Stables concessionaire indicates his rides do utilize this trail and the District is coordinating with the Shadow Glen Stables concessionaire to avoid potential conflicts between their operation and the implementation of this CIU.

Portions of the trail may be within a large historic mining site. Site-specific analysis, including any required additional studies, will be conducted to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed physical modifications of the trail on natural or cultural resources. Implementation of the CIU will utilize standard project conditions and best practices which will prevent any significant negative impacts on natural or cultural resources.

**The recommendation for this trail is to approve the CIU with conditions.**

*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		
1.2	ADA Accessible Route of Travel		X		
1.3	Connection to a trail head or other accessible facility?	X			Trail connects to Snowberry Trailhead. The trailhead is not a fully accessible facility.
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 Administration	X			
1.10	Fire Break				
1.11	Motorized Recreation				
1.12	Non-Motorized Recreation				
1.13	Road used as trail route				
1.14					
<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			
2.2	Is there evidence of unauthorized use?	X			Bikes can be observed regularly using the trail and bike tracks are very evident. This existing unauthorized use is not a determining factor in this 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, but there is no single track trail along the North/West side of Lake Natoma that provides connectivity for mtn bikes.

# 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 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 Shady Trail does connect to the Snowberry Trailhead which is adjacent to the Shadow Glen Stables, a DPR concession at Mississippi Bar. State Parks has met with the concessionaire and through information and signage conflicts with the stables can be minimized and managed. In addition to the Shadow Glen Stables, there are a trailhead and staging area that serve the area and this trail and use also comes from the paved bike path and the surrounding community.
2.7	Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU?		X		
<b>Part 2</b>	<b>Based on above considerations, will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses and services?</b>	X			If the CIU is coordinated with the stable concession and adequate information is provided to the public regarding the proposed CIU.
<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, along with others being considered, including Pioneer Express sections and Snowberry Trail, would provide single track trail access and connectivity for mtn bikes across the Mississippi Bar area and along the north/west side of Lake Natoma. The paved bike path already provides connectivity, but not for a single track experience.
3.2	Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occurring in the unit?	X			There is unauthorized bike use on the trail currently. Additionally bike jumps have been constructed on trail at times. The existing unauthorized bike use is a fact on the ground and not a determining factor in this CIU decision. Illegal bike jumps will continue to need to be removed regardless of CIU.

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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			The CIU will improve circulation for mtn bikes. It is possible this CIU will have some small effect in relieving congestion at other high use trails, such as Granite Bay. This CIU in combination with the Snowberry and Pioneer Express Trail (Snipes Outlet to Truss Bridge) will provide a single track experience and single track connectivity for bikes on this side of Lake Natoma.
3.5	Create the potential need for use changes on adjacent or connecting trails or facilities?	X			The CIU evaluation for this segment of the Pioneer Express is being evaluated along with CIU surveys for other connected trail segments including: Snipes Pershing Trl, Snowberry Trail, Shady Trl and Middle Ridge Trl.
3.6	Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts?		X		Currently it appears that a portion of the trail has captured the drainage in the area. The proposed trail modifications for this CIU should repair or improve drainage along trail. Wet weather closures could help with trail sustainability. Such closures would likely be implemented park wide and could be considered in the RTMP.
3.7	If yes, will seasonal closures disrupt circulation patterns?			X	No seasonal closures proposed.
<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>			This CIU will enhance single track connection and circulation for bikes.
<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			
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			

# Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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	Trail widths are not that narrow and trail is on relatively level ground.
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?		X		Some sinuosity, but not a lot and it may not serve to slow users.
4.6	Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations?		X		It is not expected to significantly increase the need for enforcement over the current situation.
<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	Not needed nor proposed.
4.8	Increase sight distances through re-routing or removal of visual obstructions			X	Not needed nor proposed.
4.9	Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space			X	Not needed nor proposed.
4.10	Install speed control devices such as pinch points or tread texturing	X			This is something that should be considered as trail modifications for the CIU are further developed and refined.
<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		
4.12	One-way directional usage		X		
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>	<b>X</b>			
<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		Some parts of trail are draining to natural topographic features, other portions of the trail have captured run-off.
5.2	Is the trail tread firm and stable?	X			
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?	X			Most the trail is along relatively gentle topography. At the southern end of the trail there is one abrupt grade change where the trail ties into the gravel road.
5.4	Is the fill slope stable?			X	Mostly level ground
5.5	Is the back slope/cut bank stable?			X	Mostly level ground



# 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			It appears to - but would need to confirm in wet conditions.
Supporting data from trail log					
5.7	Number of water breaks (water bars, dips, etc.) required for proper drainage		17		17 dips documented in condition assessment.
5.8	Linear footage of berms		101		101 ft of berms documented in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches		56		56 ft of ditches identified in condition assessment.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts		60		60 ft of rills and gullies documented in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail		2607		2,607 ft of entrenched trail documented in condition assessment. Total length of this segment is 5,192 ft.
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		Trail is sustainable except two sections where re-route and reconstruction are proposed for CIU.
5.18	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU without management or design options (as recommended)?		X		
<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 crossings 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 construction standards?		X		
5.24	Fill slope or cut bank retaining walls?		X		
5.25	Additional or upgraded turnpikes or causeways?	X			Causeway or drain lens is proposed for low area where trail intersects drainage.

# 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			Proposed reconstruction of section of trail will help address rutting in this section.
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			A minor re-route is proposed for southern end of trail to eliminate abrupt grade change and gully.
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		
<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			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 Based on the above considerations, will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?</b>		X			
<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		
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			Portions of trail may be within recorded historic mining site. Site specific environmental review will be required to determine impacts of proposed physical modifications to trail on any cultural resources present.
6.7	A sensitive palaeontological feature?		X		
6.8	Is the trail a historic feature?		X		
6.9	Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits?	X			For re-route, may need to consult with USFWS regarding VELB. The trail may cross onto federal land, if so the 106 process, compliance with NHPA and consultation with SHPO will be required.
<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		While portions of the trail may be within a large historic mining site, it is not anticipated that the proposed physical modifications to the trail would have significant impacts. Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would also serve to avoid significant 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			Adding mtn bikes to trail use may require more frequent maintenance.
7.3	Require additional management practices to maintain user compliance?		X		Bike jumps have currently been constructed along trail. CIU will not change the need to get rid of jumps quickly and to monitor trail to prevent these jumps from becoming established. The District will implement occassional patrols with staff or volunteers and provide trail safety and etiquette signing and programs.
7.4	Require additional staff time to address compliance requirements of the management or design options?	X			Some additional staff time may be required for trail modifications and maintenance 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.

# 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 occasionally 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. Volunteer groups assist with patrol of trails and reporting problems, but don't get involved in enforcement.
<b>Part 7</b>	<b>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?</b>		X		