

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Park (Including classification): Folsom Lake SRA
 Park Sub-classification: _____
 Trail Name: Snowberry Trail Segment #'s 2, 3, 4
 Location in Unit: Lake Natoma
 Current Use Designation(s): Pedestrian, equestrian
 Proposed Use Type Change: add bikes
 Use Change Initiated By: FATRAC, Mtn Bike Focus Group
 Evaluation Date: May 18, 2015

Evaluation Jim Micheaels, Sr Park & Rec Specialist (Trails Coord.)
Team Members Greg Wells, Park & Rec Spec. (Trails specialist)
Cara Allen, Environmental Scientist
Scott Modeste, State Park Ranger/Peace Officer
Steve Hilton, State Archaeologist
Initial Field Evaluation 10/19/15, final April/May 2022

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. There was greater evidence of bike use than equestrian use. 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 Shady 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			Maintenance brushing can provide reasonable sight distance on this trail. The District will further assess the need for pinch points to control speed.
Part 5	Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)?	X			The trail is primarily sustainable currently with regular trail maintenance. There are a few trail modifications that will be needed to improve trail sustainability.

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	There are historic resources along the trail. There are few physical modifications to the trail proposed as part of the CIU. Project level studies and evaluation are needed in order to determine if any impacts would be significant. Implementation of the CIU will utilize standard project conditions and best practices which will prevent any significant negative impacts. 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	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 completed as part of the FLSRA RTMP.
Recommend that the CIU be approved		X	Recommend approval of CIU with proposed design/management options.
Recommend that the CIU-be approved with design options such a major or minor re-route or minor re-construction.	X		Reconstruction of one climbing turn is the only proposed re-construction for the CIU.
Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures	X		Installation of new signs is only management recommendation.
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 mountain 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 Shady Trail CIU and CIUs on other connected trails, will provide bikes a single-track connection across the Mississippi Bar area and the north/west side of Lake Natoma where it currently does not exist.

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). There was greater evidence of bike use than equestrian use. The Shadow Glen concessionaire indicates his rides do utilize this route and the District is coordinating with the concessionaire to avoid potential conflicts between their operation and the implementation of this CIU. Other trails in the area will remain pedestrian/equestrian providing alternate opportunities for equestrians and pedestrians with a different trail experience.

The trail is primary sustainable currently with regular trail maintenance. There are a few trail modifications needed to improve trail sustainability. Maintenance brushing can provide reasonable sight distance on this trail. The district will further assess the need for signs, pinch points or other measures to control speed.

The trail is within or near a large recorded historic mining site and there are historic features along the trail. Additional studies and evaluation may be required at the project level planning and environmental review for the trail's necessary modifications in order to determine the effects of the CIU on cultural resources. Implementation of the CIU will utilize Standard Project Conditions and best practices which will prevent any significant negative impacts to natural and cultural resources.

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 regular maintenance.

This recommendation for this trail is to approve this CIU with conditions. This recommendation excludes Snowberry Trail Segment #1, which is an access spur to the Shadow Glen Stables facility, which will remain pedestrian/equestrian.

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			Connects to Snowberry Trailhead and Shadow Glen Stables, a concession within the park unit.
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				
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			
2.2	Is there evidence of unauthorized use?	X			Bikes currently use this trail. they can be seen on the trail and there are many tire tracks and wear areas on the trail where bike use is evident. This is a fact on the ground and 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		The Snowberry Trail does connect to the Shadow Glen Stables, a DPR concession at Mississippi Bar. However, the CIU is not being considered for Snowberry Crk Trl-segment 1, which is the spur which connects to the stable. That spur will need to be appropriately signed to prevent bikes from using the spur to the stables.
2.7	Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU?		X		The trail is currently regularly ridden by mtn bikes. It isn't anticipated that there will be a significant increase in user conflicts. The current unauthorized bike use is not a determining factor in this CIU decision.
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			This CIU, along with others being considered, including the Shady Trail, would provide a single track trail experience and connectivity for mtn bikes along the north/west side of Lake Natoma.
3.2	Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occurring in the unit?	X			The trail is currently regularly ridden by mtn bikes. The current unauthorized bike use is not a determining factor in this CIU decision.
3.3	Provide a connection to adjacent land agency that allows similar use?		X		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
3.4	Improve circulation or relieve congestion on other high-use trails?	X			Along with the other trail CIUs being evaluated for the north/west side of Lake Natoma, this CIU will improve single track access and circulation for mtn bikes and may relieve congestion of high use areas such as Granite Bay.
3.5	Create the potential need for use changes on adjacent or connecting trails or facilities?	X			The CIU evaluation for the Snowberry Trail is being evaluated along with CIU surveys for other connected trail segments including: Snipes Pershing Trl, Shady Trl and Pioneer Express Trail.
3.6	Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts?		X		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	
Part 3	Based on above criteria, will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation for the new use type?	X			This CIU will enhance single track access, connection and circulation for bikes.
#4 Effects to Trail Safety					
Existing Conditions					
4.0	Are there documented safety concerns resulting from interactions between different user groups?		X		The park unit has looked at documented trail accidents at the park unit over the past 10 years (from 2022), the vast majority of accidents are solo accidents.
4.1	With standard cyclical trail brushing (as determined by vegetation type), is there adequate-sight distance to address safety concerns resulting from the CIU?	X			
4.2	With standard cyclical slough and berm removal, is there adequate tread width for safe passage of trail users with the CIU?	X			
4.3	With equestrian users is there adequate space for non-equestrian users to retreat to the downhill side of trail for safe passage?	X			
4.4	If tread widths are narrow, are the fill slopes gentle, firm, and stable for users to retreat to the downhill side of trail for safe passage?	X			
4.5	Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users?	X			The trail has some sinuosity.
4.6	Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations?		X		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
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		Existing sinuosity is ok, as trail modifications are further developed and refined, pinch points might be considered to slow bike speeds.
4.8	Increase sight distances through re-routing or removal of visual obstructions			X	With maintenance brushing, sight distances are good.
4.9	Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space			X	With regular maintenance, the existing passing space is adequate for the most part.
4.10	Install speed control devices such as pinch points or tread texturing	X			Pinch points could be considered.
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		
4.12	One-way directional usage		X		
4.13	Installation of new signage	X			
4.14	Other (Describe)	X			State Parks staff and volunteers may patrol the trail segment occasionally and provide education to visitors on trail safety and trail etiquette.
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			Mostly firm and stable, there are a couple of isolated muddy spots.
5.3	Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade?	X			Only one abrupt grade change.
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			Generally yes, except for the isolated muddy spot noted above.

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	33			33 dips, culverts and waterbreaks documented in condition assessment.
5.8	Linear footage of berms	none			0 ft of berms documented in condition assessment.
5.9	Linear footage of ditches	none			No ditches identified in condition assessment.
5.10	Linear footage rills and ruts	230			230 ft of rills documented in condition assessment.
5.11	Linear footage log entrenched trail	5986			5986 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			Some portions of trail mixed rocky/partial soil profiles, some are full soil profile.
5.14	Full Soil Profile	X			see above
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		Only recommended management and design options are reconstruction of one climbing turn and installation of new signs.
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	
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			Separate from this CIU, a new bridge was constructed along the trail and the old and damaged culvert and mortared rock wall crossing was being removed. The bridge is designed and constructed for mutli-use.
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	Not needed
5.25	Additional or upgraded turnpikes or causeways?	X			possible for a couple of muddy spots
Minor reconstruction of trail tread would:					
5.26	Correct lack of outslope			X	Not needed
5.27	Stabilize abrupt grade changes	X			Proposed short reconstruction of climbing turn will help stablize abrupt grade change.

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
5.28	Stabilize cut bank			X	Not needed
5.29	Stabilize fill slope			X	Not needed
5.30	Correct rilling and rutting	X			Proposed short reconstruction of climbing turn will help correct rutting on climbing turn.
5.31	Provide for firm and stable surfaces			X	Not needed
Minor realignment/re-route of trail within the immediate proximity of the existing trail would:					
5.32	Stabilize cut bank				Not needed
5.33	Stabilize fill slope				Not needed
5.34	Eliminate abrupt grade changes				Not needed
5.35	Correct unsustainable grades				Not needed
5.36	Correct lack of sinuosity				Not needed
5.37	Should a major reroute be considered to establish sustainability?		X		
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			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 management 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		

Trail Change-in-Use Proposal Evaluation



Evaluation Considerations		Yes	No	NA	Comments
6.6	A sensitive cultural feature?		X		There are historic resources and features located along and adjacent to the trail, including tailings, a water conveyance ditch, a material borrow pit, 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. Project level studies and evaluation will be required in order to make this determination. Implementing the standard project conditions and best management practices would also serve to avoid significant 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.
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 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 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			Increased use by mtn bikes may result in some increased maintenance frequency.
7.3	Require additional management practices to maintain user compliance?		X		District/Sector staff may patrol the trail segment occassionally to educate visitors on trail safety and etiquette. Volunteers may patrol as well. Neither of these is a requirement for the CIU. New education signs regarding trail eitquette and other trails safety messages will be installed.
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 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.
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 will educate visitors on safe trail use and trail etiquette through signs, roving intepretation and other methods.
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.
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		