

| Park (Including classification): | Evaluation |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| Park Sub-classification | Team Members |
| Trail Name: | |
| Location in Unit: | |
| Current Use Designation(s): | |
| Proposed Use Type Change: | |
| Use Change Initiated By: | |
| Evaluation Date: | |

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.

| Prelin | ninary 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? | | | | |
| 0.2 | Is the proposed CIU on a trail that passes through more than one unit or sub-unit? | | | | |
| 0.3 | Is there an approved general plan? | | | | |
| 0.4 | Is there an approved road and trail management plan? | | | | |
| 0.5 | Is there an approved area management plan? | | | | |
| 0.6 | If there is an approved and relevant planning document, is the proposed CIU consistent with planning recommendations? | | | | |
| 0.7 | Has a previous CIU request been made and evaluated for this trail? | | | | |
| 8.0 | Is the proposed CIU located on a non-system (volunteer trail)? | | | | |
| 0.9 | Is the proposed CIU on a facility designated as a trail or road? This form cannot be used to consider a CIU for non-designated facilities such as a beach or desert wash. | | | | |
| 0.10 | Based on the preliminary considerations, should the CIU be further evaluated? If yes, continue to the next page. If no, please explain. | | | | |

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.

| | io diodionio volcioni, the rodatto nin transfer datomatically. | Yes | No | NA | Comments |
|--------|---|-----|----|----|----------|
| Part 2 | Will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses, facilities, and services? | | | | |
| Part 3 | Will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation? | | | | |
| Part 4 | Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety? | | | | |
| Part 5 | Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended)? | | | | |
| Part 6 | Would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) create significant negative impacts to the natural or cultural resources? | | | | |
| Part 7 | Will implementation of the CIU with management and design options create a significant on-going maintenance or operational workload? | | | | |

Recommendation Based on Evaluation Considerations

Recommend that the park's general plan or road and trail management plan be developed or amended to evaluate the CIU

Recommend that the CIU be approved with no design or management modifications.

Recommend that the CIU-be approved with design options such a major or minor re-route or minor re-construction.

Recommend that the CIU be approved with management options such as alternating days of use, one way travel, and/or seasonal closures

Recommend that the CIU be put on hold

Final Comments/Determinations



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.

| Evaluation | Evaluation Considerations | | No | NA | Comments | |
|------------|--|-----|-------------------|----|--|--|
| Part 1 Ex | kisting Conditions | | | | Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed CUI and any other details related to proposal evaluation. | |
| 1.1 | Is the trail a controlled access road? | | | | | |
| 1.2 | ADA Accessible Route of Travel | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Connection to a trail head or other accessible facility? | | | | | |
| 1.4 | What is the trail's current classification? | | | | Enter the trail class (I, II, III, or IV) | |
| | Trail or road surface type: | | heck A oplicab | | Comments | |
| 1.5 | Asphalt | | | | | |
| 1.6 | Concrete | | | | | |
| 1.7 | Gravel | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Native Material | | | | | |
| | Trail and road facility use type | | | | | |
| 1.9 | Public | | | | | |
| 1.10 | Administration | | | | | |
| 1.11 | Fire Break | | | | | |
| 1.12 | Motorized Recreation | | | | | |
| 1.13 | Non-Motorized Recreation | | | | | |
| 1.14 | Road used as trail route | | | | | |
| | Current trail uses allowed | Yes | No | NA | | |
| 1.15 | Pedestrian | | | | | |
| 1.16 | Mountain Bike | | | | | |
| 1.17 | Equestrian | | | | | |
| 1.18 | Other - specify in comment box | | | | | |



| Evaluati | on Considerations | Yes | No | NA | Comments |
|-----------------|--|-----|----|----|----------|
| Part 2 C | ompatibility with Existing Visitor Uses, Facilities, and Services | Yes | No | NA | |
| Existing | Conditions | | | | |
| 2.1 | Is the trail high-use or in a high use area? | | | | |
| 2.2 | Is there evidence of unauthorized use? | | | | |
| 2.3 | Does the proposed use currently exist in the park? | | | | |
| 2.4 | Are there other routes in the unit or on nearby public land that adequately accommodate the type of use proposed? | | | | |
| 2.5 | Is there documented survey or statistical information that identifies a need/desire for the CIU? | | | | |
| 2.6 | Would the CIU create conflicts with existing facilities connected or adjacent to the trail (trail heads, stables, campgrounds etc.)? | | | | |
| 2.7 | Would significant user conflict be anticipated with implementation of the CIU? | | | | |
| Part 2 | Based on above considerations, will the CIU be compatible with existing visitor uses and services? | | | | |
| #3 Effec | ts to Circulation Patterns | Yes | No | NA | |
| | Does the CIU: | | | | |
| 3.1 | Provide a loop, semi-loop, or other connection for the CIU user | | | | |
| 3.2 | Legalize or legitimize unauthorized trail use currently occurring in the unit? | | | | |
| 3.3 | Provide a connection to adjacent land agency that allows similar use? | | | | |
| 3.4 | Improve circulation or relieve congestion on other high-use trails? | | | | |
| 3.5 | Create the potential need for use changes on adjacent or connecting trails or facilities? | | | | |
| 3.6 | Require a seasonal closure to mitigate resource impacts? | | | | |
| 3.7 | If yes, will seasonal closures disrupt circulation patterns? | | | | |
| Part 3 | Based on above criteria, will implementation of the CIU enhance circulation for the new use type? | _ | | _ | |



| Evaluati | on Considerations | Yes | No | NA | Comments |
|-----------------|---|-----|----|----|----------|
| #4 Effec | ts to Trail Safety | Yes | No | NA | |
| Existing | Conditions | | | | |
| 4.0 | Are there documented safety concerns resulting from interactions between different user groups at the requested CIU location(s)? | | | | |
| 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? | | | | |
| 4.2 | With standard cyclical slough and berm removal, is there adequate tread width for safe passage of trail users with the CIU? | | | | |
| 4.3 | With equestrian users is there adequate space for non-equestrian users to retreat to the downhill side of trail for safe passage? | | | | |
| 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? | | | | |
| 4.5 | Does the trail have sinuosity that slows trail users? | | | | |
| 4.6 | Would the CIU increase the need for enforcement of park rules and regulations? | | | | |
| Design (| Options to Improve Safety | | | | |
| | Check those design options that could be implemented to improve trail safety with the CIU | | | | |
| 4.7 | Increase sinuosity through re-routing or re-construction | | | | |
| 4.8 | Increase sight distances through re-routing or removal of visual obstructions | | | | |
| 4.9 | Widening of the trail tread to provide adequate passing space | | | | |
| 4.10 | Install speed control devices such as pinch points or tread texturing | | | | |
| Manage | ment Options to Improve Safety | | | | |
| | Check those management options that could be implemented to improve trail safety with the CIU | | | | |
| 4.11 | Alternating days of use | | | | |
| 4.12 | One-way directional usage | | | | |
| 4.13 | Installation of new signage | | | | |
| 4.14 | Other (Describe) | | | | |
| Part 4 | Based on the above considerations, would implementation of the CIU with management and design options (as recommended) maintain trail safety? | | | | |



| Evaluation | on Considerations | Yes | No | NA | Comments |
|------------------------------------|---|-----|----|----|----------|
| #5 Effects on Trail Sustainability | | Yes | No | NA | |
| Existina | Conditions | | | | |
| J 3 | Is the trail draining to natural topographic drainage features, such as | | | | |
| 5.1 | creeks and swales or natural sheet flow, and not being captured and | | | | |
| | concentrated to the man-made drainage structures? | | | | |
| 5.2 | Is the trail tread firm and stable? | | | | |
| 5.3 | Are there abrupt changes in trail running grade? | | | | |
| 5.4 | Is the fill slope stable? | | | | |
| 5.5 | Is the back slope/cut bank stable? | | | | |
| 5.6 | Does the trail tread remain firm and stable in wet conditions? | | | | |
| | Supporting data from trail log | | | | |
| | Number of water breaks (water bars, dips, etc.) required for proper | | | | |
| 5.7 | drainage | | | | |
| 5.8 | Linear footage of berms | | | | |
| 5.9 | Linear footage of ditches | | | | |
| 5.10 | Linear footage rills and ruts | | | | |
| 5.11 | Linear footage log entrenched trail | | | | |
| | 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 | | | | |
| 5.15 | Partial Soil Profile/Sandy | | | | |
| 5.16 | Sandy | | | | |
| 5.17 | Based on these considerations is the trail currently sustainable? | | | | |
| 5.40 | Will the trail be sustainable following implementation of the CIU without | | | | |
| 5.18 | management or design options (as recommended)? | | | | |
| Design C | Options to Improve Sustainability | | | | |
| | If not sustainable, can any of the following measures be implemented to | | | | |
| | make the trail sustainable for the CIU? | | | | |
| F 00 | Armoring of wet drainage crossings to reduce erosion and impacts | | | | |
| 5.20 | to waterways? | | | | |
| E 04 | Additional drainage structures (e.g. grade reversals, water bars, | | | | |
| 5.21 | rolling grade dips, etc.) to manage increased mechanical wear? | | | | |
| 5.22 | Additional bridges and puncheons/boardwalks to facilitate dry | | | | |
| 0.22 | crossings necessary to reduce erosion and impacts to waterways? | | | | |
| 5.23 | Reconstruction or replacement of bridges and puncheons to comply | | | | |
| | with equestrian construction standards? | | | | |
| 5.24 | Fill slope or cut bank retaining walls? | | | | |



| Evaluati | on Considerations | Yes | No | NA | Comments |
|----------|---|-----|----|----|----------|
| 5.25 | Additional or upgraded turnpikes or causeways? | | | | |
| | Minor reconstruction of trail tread would: | | | | |
| 5.26 | Correct lack of outslope | | | | |
| 5.27 | Stabilize abrupt grade changes | | | | |
| 5.28 | Stabilize cut bank | | | | |
| 5.29 | Stabilize fill slope | | | | |
| 5.30 | Correct rilling and rutting | | | | |
| 5.31 | Provide for firm and stable surfaces | | | | |
| | Minor realignment/re-route of trail within the immediate proximity of the | | | | |
| | existing trail would: | | | | |
| 5.32 | Stabilize cut bank | | | | |
| 5.33 | Stabilize fill slope | | | | |
| 5.34 | Eliminate abrupt grade changes | | | | |
| 5.35 | Correct unsustainable grades | | | | |
| 5.36 | Correct lack of sinuosity | | | | |
| 5.37 | Would a major reroute be required to establish/maintain sustainability? | | | | |
| Managei | ment Options to Improve Sustainability | | | | |
| | If not sustainable, can any of the following measures be implemented to | | | | |
| | make the trail more sustainable for the CIU? | | | | |
| 5.38 | Wet weather closures establish or maintain sustainability? | | | | |
| 5.39 | Other management options be implemented to improve trail | | | | |
| 5.39 | sustainability? If so, please describe. | | | | |
| | Based on the above considerations, will the trail be sustainable | | | | |
| Part 5 | following implementation of the CIU with management and design | | | | |
| | options (as recommended)? | | | | |



| Evaluati | on Considerations | Yes | No | NA | Comments |
|-----------------|--|-----|----|----|----------|
| #6 Effec | #6 Effects or Impacts to the Natural or Cultural Resources | | | NA | |
| | Would the CIU and/or needed modifications have the potential to significantly impact: | | | | |
| 6.1 | Erosion of existing trail tread and sedimentation of adjacent streams? | | | | |
| 6.2 | Significant geologic features? | | | | |
| 6.3 | Sensitive wildlife habitat? | | | | |
| 6.4 | Sensitive plant habitat? | | | | |
| 6.5 | A wetland, riparian or stream zone? | | | | |
| 6.6 | A sensitive cultural feature? | | | | |
| 6.7 | A sensitive paleontological feature? | | | | |
| 6.8 | Is the trail a historic feature? | | | | |
| 6.9 | Would required trail modifications trigger outside agency permits? | | | | |
| 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? | | | | |
| #7 Effec | ts or Impacts to Maintenance and Operations | Yes | No | NA | |
| | Would the CIU and/or needed modifications: | | | | |
| 7.1 | Change the classification of the trail? | | | | |
| 7.2 | Require additional maintenance? | | | | |
| 7.3 | Require additional management practices to maintain user compliance? | | | | |
| 7.4 | Require additional staff time to address compliance requirements of the management or design options? | | | | |
| 7.5 | Could the proposed modifications be completed by non-department work forces? | | | | |
| 7.6 | Could the proposed modifications be maintained by non-department work forces with minimal cost to the State? | | | | |
| 7.7 | Can necessary management strategies be enforced? | | | | |
| 7.8 | If not, is there a volunteer group or partner agency that can assist with 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? | | | | |