

**FOLSOM LAKE STATE RECREATION AREA (FLSRA) AND FOLSOM POWERHOUSE STATE HISTORIC PARK (FPSHP) ROAD AND TRAIL MANAGEMENT PLAN (RTMP)  
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARKS' RESPONSES**

Received via email and through the interactive online comment tool.

The following is a summary of all comments received during the Public Draft FLSRA and FPSHP RTMP review period (May 23, 2022 to June 30, 2022). These comments summarize individual comments and, in some circumstances, do not represent the exact language of the original comment due to comment length or complexity. Requests to obtain specific original comments can be made by emailing [trails@parks.ca.gov](mailto:trails@parks.ca.gov). California State Parks will be responding to comments received during the CEQA Draft review and public comment period, which will occur following the release of the Draft RTMP and IS/ND in late-September.

| <b>COMMENT SUMMARY</b>   |
|--|
| The overview states the water projects were developed in the 1860's, but the Natoma water canal and North Fork Ditch were built in the 1850s. Both were finished by 1855.  |
| The Chinese did have a real presence, at least along the North Fork of the American River. It would be nice to note their presence in some historical footnote.  |
| There may be an early water ditch, Frey and Colby, that runs from Mormon Ravine to Rattlesnake Bar. This ditch might be a historical point of interest as part of the trail from Rattlesnake Bar to Avery's Pond. historical points of interest.   |
| As a way to recognize Native American presence and history, maybe provide kiosks with Native American information or renaming some of the park sites to Native American names. Perhaps, if the reverence Native Americans have for the land is somehow conveyed to park visitors, maybe, some of the visitors would take better care of the park property. |
| While creating a new channel at Lake Natoma for enhanced opportunities for paddle craft would be really nice, how is that not considered environmental or resource damage?   |

The ability to drive down to the edge of the lake is one of the last great differentiators between Folsom Lake and other area lakes. The ability to back a car up to the water is easily one of the best parts of the entire recreation area. Please reconsider this proposal, as it would be a great loss to the region.

Please specifically allow electric motor assisted devices (e.g. ebikes, PEV's, onewheels) on the entire FLSRA property where bikes are permitted. The current policy is not clear. The onewheel trail riding community in the area absolutely loves Granite Bay and Lake Natoma and taking care of the park is very important to us. Please understand that a onewheel has a wide tire, limited power and regenerative braking. Because of this, they tend to flatten trails like a steamroller, do not leave ruts, and absolutely do not leave braking bumps (as bikes do). As PEV's and e-bikes continue to explode in popularity, this will be an increasingly important topic.

The upper shady trail has a dead and fallen tree that is resting on another dead tree that crosses the trail - it's getting lower and lower to the point of a "widow maker." Also, there is a lot of brush covering various parts of the upper and lower trail paths that are a fire and tripping hazard.

Please create/manage trails for biking use. A quick glance at the parking lots will tell you that most trail users are on bikes. Please create biking specific trails and features - jumps, berms, rock gardens, wooden features. The public can help as well - trail workdays, helping with construction, etc.

I feel there appears to be a lacking in involving the Sacramento County Regional Parks and the SCRPs rangers, as well as other American River Coalition stakeholders, particularly in areas contiguous with their jurisdiction. I believe the region would be equally well-served by a greater uniformity of the existing paved bicycle trails in terms of trail design, signage and etiquette standards.

A safety patrol like the American River Bike Patrol would be a wise and prudent addition to this plan. Please consider allowing the ARBP to patrol along this expanded parkway.

Three focus groups in 2014 for equestrians, bicyclists or hikers, I have not seen one public notice for the focus groups. Where and when were they posted for hikers? Where and when were they posted for equestrian riders? Where were they posted for the disabled population? With 2,099,996 visitors from 2019 to 2020, the number of surveys collected was not enough (1,500). There is a lack of robust representation of park users. Only .07% of park users were reached.

How were the over 24 miles of non-system trails, which I assume are social trails, developed? Within the last five years more and more vandalism has occurred to the no-bike signs, and the multitude of social trails indicates that the Beals Point/Granite Bay is not being maintained or patrolled and the public has taken over the park. The social trails are very unsafe in areas where they cross the ped/equestrian-only trails. The Slow down, say hello program being put out by CDPR is a good start but just a drop in the bucket for what needs to be done for education at Folsom Lake SRA. Calls to the District Ranger regarding this issue are not being returned.

On the overview of the RTMP (page 17), it mentions exploring a bike park concession or partnership, but this is not mentioned anywhere else in the plan. It is evident by the user created features in the park (that were bulldozed in 2021) that a bike park is desired, and more effort should be put into creating one. Folsom Lake Park is a State Recreation Area that is perfect for a bike park and bike specific features on trails. Auburn SRA has a motocross park at China Bar; a bike park is not a foreign concept in a Recreation Area. If Parks continues to ignore this user group, kids and other trails users are likely to continue their creative efforts.

FLSRA succeeded in providing quality trail experiences during the early days of mountain biking, but as mountain biking has increased in popularity over the past 20 years, State Parks has failed to keep up with the times or meet surging demand for experiences. Being that this RTMP is for a state recreation area, this is the correct place to embrace new ideas and activate new parks stakeholders, especially young people who are looking for trail features and skill building, as well as more experienced riders looking for longer and more difficult routes.

In addition to our previous comments, FATRAC suggests promoting Poppy Passes to volunteers by rewarding regular volunteers with complimentary parking passes or similar. This will both discourage use of informal parking areas and encourage stewardship. Low water routes should be clarified in the final RTMP as hiking only under the current order, meaning that currently neither horseback riding or biking is officially sanctioned. Therefore, clarifying that any change to multi-use is additional access “gained” for both equestrians and cyclists. Or change to hiker/equestrian only, which helps readers understand it as such. FLSRA needs to develop a plan to address, in the short term, facilitating basic trail maintenance and minor reroutes whose primary goal is to minimize reduce risk, surprise encounters, reduce trail erosion, improve sustainability, and protect nearby watersheds. With the recent and continuing growth in trail use in FLSRA, immediate trail maintenance issues must be prioritized—including consulting local cyclists and allowing FATRAC to assist with volunteer workdays.

FLSRA includes many examples that would benefit from both a sustainability and user experience standpoint from an updated Trails Handbook.

|   |
|---|
| <p>There are several concerns with state parks and their management of federal lands.</p>   |
| <p>Expand the parking lot at end of Horseshoe Bar Rd to accommodate users from outside the immediate neighborhoods.</p>   |
| <p>Allow bicycles along the entire section of trail up to Auburn State Recreation Area. The ability to bicycle and connect up to Auburn/Cool without riding on heavily trafficked vehicle roads would greatly enhance the recreational opportunities in the region.</p>   |
| <p>I am a paddle boarder and use lake Natoma often. Access in the Mississippi Bar area is not needed for paddle boarders because we have the Aquatic Center and Black Miners Bar. Part of the joy of paddling here being able to access this area by paddling to it. Parking is sufficient and we do not need another entry spot for paddle boarders.</p>   |
| <p>I am not sure why parking improvements are needed at Snowberry Trailhead. Parking is sufficient in this area. The dirt lot next to Shadow Glen, on the street and next to the trail heads is sufficient for the weekend visitors to this area. The rest of the week, the lots are barely used by regulars.</p>   |
| <p>What could be done to the very large parking lot at Black Miners Bar that would make it better? It is easy to access and is close to multiple trail heads, the bike trail and Lake Natoma. I've ridden on the bike trail past this lot without any issue for years. We do not need a better bike trail crossing to this lot; it is already available. Save the tax dollars here and spend them on the other improvements in this plan.</p> |
| <p>I vote no vote for vehicle access at Nimbus Shoals. Let people walk down to explore this area. Walking is healthier. Parking facilities and clean up are costly to state budgets. Keep it distinctively natural.</p>   |
| <p>The Lake Overlook Trailhead is fine the way it is. Not every trail head needs to be formalized. To taxpayers "formalized" just means more taxes and government waste on things that are unnecessary and subject to vandals.</p>  |
| <p>No to new parking access at Mississippi Bar. Keep it distinctively natural. Don't ruin the natural setting with more car access. Let folks access the lagoon as they currently do from across the lake at Nimbus Flat or Willow creek.</p>   |
| <p>Willow Creek is a multi-use area with a bike trail and granite path alongside for hikers and equestrians. Additional parking should include spaces for horse trailers.</p>   |

I support improvements to Falcon Crest Trailhead, but if you are going to charge a user fee to park there, then I prefer it be left alone. I don't support a fee-for-beautification.

ATA supports the following recommendations:

- Improve and develop formalized parking to provide additional trail and shoreline access along Doton's Point Road and at Doton's Point.
- Improve and develop trailhead parking, restrooms, and other amenities along Old County Road.
- Improvements to address demand and user input at the Granite Bay Horse Assembly area.
- Developing a small trailhead parking and trail access facility on DPR property at the end of Horseshoe Bar Road when demand and need dictate.
- Improve and expand staging area, parking, facilities, and trail connections at the Rattlesnake Bar Equestrian Staging Area.

I agree that the trails which go up on the bluffs at Lake Natoma could be a lot better but eliminating them entirely is not a good idea. Being up on the bluffs has some nice views and the connections are necessary for the people who live in those neighborhoods. This area needs improvements, but please don't cut it off for cyclists.

Mississippi Bar is such an interesting area and I love riding large cobbles on my MTB. The trail network in there is ponderous and inefficient, but there is tremendous potential. Since the area is largely un-natural, it should be developed with a well-designed stacked loop-based trail system that can accommodate MTB beginners and kids, with outer trails for more mature/adventurous riders.

The Middle Ridge Trail is one of the best MTB trails in the Lake Natoma area. Please don't take it away or completely sanitize it. Yes, it is too narrow in spots and is likely not sustainable. Please try and keep the character of the trail and allow cyclists to continue to use it.

It is a great idea to authorize multi-use on the low water routes. These trails already exist, have great sightlines, and are fun to MTB. Officially opening them to bikes will have minimal or no environmental impacts since they hopefully

will be getting flooded annually! There are a couple of swampy crossings along the way that could be improved with simple reroutes, bridges and in some cases paver stones or raised DG trail.

There is a lot of confusion about where State Parks ends and Sac County Regional Parks begins. Please work with Sac County to improve mountain bike access on the upper end of their territory, especially Sailor Bar, Sunrise and Hazel areas.

In general, I support all changes of use which allow MTBs on dirt surface trails. The goal should be a bike and even hike friendly loop around Folsom Lake. Peninsula Campground is underutilized, and a circumnavigation trail can really help by getting people out on bikes on the Peninsula. The campground could be better set up for group camping by cyclists. The best time of year at Peninsula is the spring, when it is green, and the flowers are out. If the campground was modified and improved, and open earlier in the spring (and early in the winter) I think cyclists would pay more to use it and State Parks could justify it being open. Building the North Fork peninsula trail connecting to Cool and Salmon Falls Ranch, opening Brown's Ravine to bikes, and adding a well-designed stacked loop trail system surrounding the campground would make this a world class mountain biking venue and bike packing venue.

I hope the trail reroutes at Beeks Bight doesn't mean sanitizing some of the more interesting trail features in this zone, especially the rocky areas. These are important for skill building. A system of trail rating using the familiar green dot-blue square-black diamond - as used by ski areas - would clarify what folks are getting into.

Allowing motorized vehicles at Brown's Ravine, trails that are designed for horse and foot traffic is a recipe for disaster. Riding is inerrant to accident by their very nature. Do not add to the possibility of another danger factor for either of the users. Do not allow motorized vehicles on these trails.

State Parks should create parallel trails and "trail corridors" within Folsom Lake SRA, to provide slow moving trail users and fast-moving trail users (i.e., bikes) each with their own trails, designed to better meet "diverse trail users recreational needs" (a goal of the California State Parks Trail Policy). Mountain bikers want challenging single-track trails, not "sanitized" flat multi-use trails. Creation of separate parallel trails dedicated to specific user groups is a far superior way to provide more trail riding opportunities for mountain bikes within Folsom Lake SRA, and is a way to increase the safety and enjoyment of ALL trail users. State Parks should give serious consideration to adding parallel trails as part of the proposed RTMP.

I am an avid mountain biker who rides in the granite bay area and would appreciate a legal, fun, non-decomposed granite trail network that consists of rocky, rooty, natural based features. Using the trails year-round would be ideal but would require a little bit of analysis of proper drainage techniques in order to avoid possible erosion by water flowing down trails. It is important to maintain natural features to reduce cost, maintain a more scenic view, and provide a challenging terrain network.

Converting the rolling fire road along the lake shore between Beals point and the dikes to a paved trail with gravel shoulders may be suboptimal because the extremely steep terrain may not be conducive to such a wide path. Such a project could also be extremely expensive. I suggest constructing a paved trail around one side or the other of the junior high school, so the paved trail will connect from the dikes to streets in Granite Bay. Another option would be to pave the fire road without shoulders, and then convert an informal trail running parallel to the paved trail between it and the high-water line into a system trail for mountain bikers and equestrians.

The RTMP states, "Mountain biking and other unpaved-surface cycling has increased in popularity over the past several decades, driving a need and desire for additional non paved surface and single-track biking opportunities" but it doesn't sound like anywhere in the plan there is mention of building Mountain Bike Specific Trails. Places like Downieville CA, Knoxville TN, and Bentonville AK, have seen tremendous economic benefits by creating these types of trail systems and I hope CA State Parks can do the same.

The sections of pedestrian/bike trail at Nimbus Dam between Nimbus Dam access Road and the maintenance area/Rangers residence is rough and really needs re-paving, particularly the section closest to the residence area just before the right turn at the ballard. This section is prone to developing dangerous potholes for cyclists that are difficult to avoid when trying to navigate safely when other cyclists and/or pedestrians are present. Permanent repair to this section needs to be performed.

I support a multi-use North Fork ditch trail. New trails are needed so badly as our area's population continues to increase with no end in sight, but the amount of trail availability has relatively not changed at all (notable exceptions the South Fork American River Trail, and the even newer Salmon Falls Ranch area).

I would so very much love to see a Cool / Auburn bridge constructed! This would open such amazing routes to explore for people on both sides of the proposed bridge! A multi-use bridge across would greatly lessen the flow of bikes on Hwy 49 into the confluence, because they would be able to cross right here. Also, trail runners on the western side would be able to access the Cool trail network (Olmstead Loop).

State Parks should work with the stable to have employees help maintain the trails they use for their business. Constant trips through the trail systems create erosion, new trails, dust and fecal matter on trails that are used by others. Horseback riders navigate around downed trees and obstacles making new trails with no regard to degradation to vegetation and wildlife habitat. The stable also marks trails with pieces of ribbon creating an unnatural look and litter.

Developing a North Fork Trail would bring a much-needed corridor (besides salmon falls road) to connect neighboring trail systems. This could potentially reduce chance encounters with cars and expand additional ride opportunities thereby reducing crowding.

Please keep allowing bikes on the Shady Trail.

I am in favor of the development at Brown's Ravine.

It would be great to see Mormon Island trails connect to Folsom trails.

I recommend prioritizing both the Darrington Trail segment reconstruction and the connections to the Salmon Falls Ranch Trail System.

Trails around the Granite Bay area are getting very sandy. making it very slippery and dangerous for mountain biking (Especially around corners). Even at low speed, turning is becoming difficult since the wheels are losing traction. While it may not be feasible to take care of the whole trails, somehow taking care of the corners alone would be sufficient for now.

There is too much horse poop on trails.

It's my understanding that if I park my horse trailer at salmon fall bridge, we can only ride the Acorn Trail to Cronan. We cannot cross the SMR and ride the Folsom trails. But there are bikes demanding they get access to these same trails so they can park/ride the Folsom trails from SMR bridge. If that is the case, why are equestrians being excluded? I can park at Falcon Crest but am not able to ride towards SMR bridge, and I can't use the lot off SMR to ride the Folsom trail. The lot at Falcon Crest with the rocks isn't easy place to park any horse trailers.

All trails should be available for multi-use including bikes, equestrian, and pedestrian.



The section of the trail north of the Nimbus Dam (between 38.637416, -121.221191 and 38.638321, -121.219260) is narrow and full of blind curves. Bikes come through at speeds exceeding 20mph, and they often swing wide into the wrong lane on the curves.

Do not close the trails on the bluffs. Leave as is or improve

Agree with adopting and reconstructing the American Canyon Drive Access Trail, however, do not use DG or aggregate. Keep it distinctively natural using native soils.

Paving over the gravel service road from Beal to Granite Bay may cause issues. This will encourage more road bikers in the park, but FLSRA is not necessarily road bike friendly as the park roads are currently narrow. While connectivity for this user group would be appreciated, the gravel service road is heavily used by both hikers, joggers and mountain bikers and occasionally equestrians. Paving the service road would change and possibly ruin the distinctively natural look and feel of that side of the lake forever. Unless the park roads will be widened all the way to Beeks, I'm not sure that encouraging more road bike visitors is a good idea until the roads can better accommodate bike use that does not impede or block vehicle traffic.

Yes, to adding new multi-use trails as long as they are not made of DG.

The decomposed granite jogging/walking trail adjacent to the paved bike trail is poorly maintained and even absent in areas, and often impacted by overgrowth in the segment from Hazel Ave to Beal's Point and around Lake Natomas. This forces walkers and joggers onto the paved trail without any option to step off the pavement resulting in undue crowding on the pavement. Particularly, on river left (south of Lake Natomas), there are many tight blind curves. Trailside decomposed jogging/walking paths should be of a consistent design and standard with those of the American River Parkway, so there is a unified continuous pathway from Discovery Park to Beals Point.

The paved and gravel roadways from Beals Point to the area adjacent to Cavitt Junior high could be redeveloped to include a paved bike trail that connects to paved city roadways.

The bike trail and hiker/equestrian trail connection is very, very dangerous in the Beeks Bight Area. Many times, there will be mountain bikers riding downhill as fast as they can down the parallel trail that intersects (by large granite rocks) and do not pay any attention to other users at the intersection. The intersection needs to be removed. In addition, the trail needs to be reworked to remove the significant erosion.

Create more single-track mountain bike trails.

FLSRA is so large it is unmanageable for the current staffing. To augment this lack of staff several levels of volunteers can fill this void. Advanced riders can help maintain the course. General volunteers would either walk the course and report any issues or remove trash and debris from the course. Mountain bike patrols who are trained to ride under any conditions and provide first aid, could report any activities that require law enforcement or fire services.

FATRAC strongly supports moving ahead with the creation of a North Fork trail connecting the Peninsula campground/boat launch area with the Olmstead trails network as expeditiously as possible. Also, cyclist use of the low-water trail from Beek's Bight to Horseshoe Bar and the many new bike connections in the Granite Bay trail network, and the Sweetwater Creek crossing improvements.

FATRAC appreciates Parks's commitment in the draft RTMP to reach out to the bike community before systemizing or decommissioning existing user-built non-system trails. Also, the references in the draft RTMP regarding trail design considerations potentially including natural obstacles, technical challenges, etc. We hope that this idea of working with the bike community whenever non-system trails are reviewed extends throughout FLSRA and continues in the future.

FATRAC is also very supportive of efforts to improve the trail network around Peninsula Campground. In general, Peninsula Campground is underutilized. Making the surrounding area more attractive to mountain bikers will go a long way toward activating this underutilized area and making the campground more self-sustaining. Once Brown's Ravine is open to bikes, Peninsula Campground also has incredible potential as a bikepacking destination.

Once the Northfork/Peninsula trail is planned and built, and the CIU process for Brown's Ravine complete, the missing link for providing a complete loop around Folsom Lake will be Horseshoe Bar to Auburn, and when the water is high, Beek's Bight to Auburn. We would like the RTMP to acknowledge the need for the trail circling the lake and propose solutions. Specifically, FATRAC requests the RTMP contain an evaluation of alternating days or other opportunities for shared use of regional connector trails, specifically the Pioneer Express Trail between Beeks Bight and the Auburn State Recreation Area. Development of the circumnavigation route and improvements in the Peninsula Campground area could make FLSRA a world-class destination for the mountain biking, bikepacking, backpacking, and horsepacking communities and should be prioritized in the final RTMP.

The North Granite Bay/Hoffman Property has potential for making bike-specific/potentially downhill/one-way trails that are not currently explored in the draft RTMP. This is a good space for these kinds of trails, as well as building trails from the ground up as purpose-built mountain bike trails/flow trails. These ideas should be incorporated into the final RTMP. Again, these are the types of trails, features, and activities that should be found in a state recreation area like FLSRA.

The Overlook trails that descend to the paved bike trail will be difficult to close to hikers and bikers if alternatives are not available. We suggest improving trail conditions to prevent erosion, also adding bike features to the lower dirt trail that parallels the paved trail from Nimbus Dam to the bottom of Shady Trail to encourage bikes to take that route instead of climbing up the steep fall line trails.

FATRAC believes that better interconnection of trails and ultimately the completion of a comprehensive system of trails circumnavigating Folsom and Natomas Lakes—in addition to creating greater recreation opportunities for all—could reduce greenhouse gas and particulate emissions and increase safety by reducing necessary road connections, by bike users being able to ride on trails to more areas as opposed to driving to various trailheads. Most of the trails are already in place to do this. In fact, the only location those trails do not currently exist is on the east shore of the North Fork between the Peninsula area and the Olmstead area—plus the necessary bridge crossing. It is unsatisfactory that Parks has denied the CIUs necessary—and not suggested alternatives—to make this visionary idea happen.

FATRAC supports the Auburn to Cool Bridge and looks forward to providing input and assisting with development of a trail plan associated with the crossing. FATRAC strongly encourages development of the trail plan before bridge construction.

FATRAC supports the multi-use designation of a low-water access route between Beeks Bight and Horseshoe Bar. However, the draft RTMP leaves hanging the idea of being able to ride between Auburn and Granite Bay on dirt. Despite FATRAC's suggestions of a parallel trail or, and very specifically, the idea of alternating days, the draft RTMP and Appendix 7.9 (Change-in-Use Requests Summary Report) do not address these ideas at all. Moreover, all of the CIU evaluations for these sections (Appendix 7.9, pp. 16-19) discuss trail sustainability and appear to mostly be discussing deferred maintenance that must be performed anyway. The CIU evaluations all discuss the fact that these sections are only lightly used by all user groups and all admit that these trail segments would provide meaningful recreation opportunity for cyclists, but Parks appears to be primarily concerned about devoting additional maintenance resources to this section of trail that may simply need to be caught up on deferred maintenance.

Further, on the Rattlesnake Bar to Auburn section, the CIU evaluation states, “On its own, this CIU for the Pioneer Express Trail from Rattlesnake Bar to Auburn SRA would provide some additional trail access and opportunity for bikes, but no real loop options or connectivity to other portions of the Pioneer Express Trail within Folsom Lake SRA.” This statement is under-appreciative of the fact that that trail segment would provide connectivity to ASRA and, eventually, the Peninsula area if the bridge at China Bar is built and the connector on the other side of the North Fork is finalized. All-in-all, these CIU denials are unsupported by Parks own proffered rationale.

FATRAC requests FLSRA consider a new multiuse dirt trail between Folsom Point and Dike 7, with a loop around Folsom Point to help complete the dirt trail circumnavigating Folsom Lake with connections to paved bike trails as necessary. Prior to creation of the haul road such a narrow natural surface trail existed and is even shown on some historical maps.

FATRAC strongly supports the construction of a new paved trail connection from Folsom Point to Johnny Cash Bridge.

FATRAC supports re-engineering the beginning of the Darrington Trail to improve drainage and sustainability. However, we do not support routing around the rock outcropping that provides an excellent technical trail riding experience. FATRAC suggests additional signage to direct trail users to the upper trail based on ability and the type of trail experience being sought.

FATRAC supports the proposed trail and facility improvements and looks forward to assisting in their implementation.

The RTMP appears to propose extending the paved trail to the Douglas entrance, using the rolling fire road along the shore of the lake. It sounds like the fire road would be converted to a 12 foot wide paved trail with 2 or 3 foot wide gravel shoulders. That's a huge footprint and will require huge amounts of excavation. Many riders like it the way it is. In some areas, there are informal parallel singletrack trail between the fire road and the waters edge, which may be workable as a multi-use trail. It might also be possible to route the paved trail around one side or the other of the junior high school and connect into streets in Granite Bay that way. FATRAC supports completing the proposed paved trail. However, we suggest that a parallel dirt trail be developed, to the extent practical, in lieu of the proposed unpaved “shoulders”. This will provide a better user experience for those seeking both the paved trail and dirt trails, will make it more reasonable to maintain natural shade along both trails, and will spread out users to minimize the sensation of crowding.

With California being the birthplace of mountain biking, I hope California State Parks will adopt a more progressive mountain bike policy that looks to build mountain bike specific trails from the ground up with features that make them more enjoyable to ride. Building beginner to advanced mountain bike specific trails will encourage more people to get out and exercise in nature. FLSRA is a great place to build something for every type of bike rider.

In order to make Mountain Biking Better in Folsom Lake SRA and turn it into the world-class bicycle recreation area that it could be, please incorporate these items into the RTMP:

1. Build (at least) a 2 mile long mountain bike specific trail, similar to Culvert Trail or Hoot Trail. Possible location could be Pioneer Express Trail from Historical Truss Bridge to Folsom Lake Crossing.
2. Add features to existing trails that make riding them on a mountain bike more enjoyable - berms, rollers, wood bridges, etc. Sections of Pioneer Express Trail would be a great option for these features, as well as the trails around Lake Natoma. Mississippi Bar is large enough to add this type of trail utilizing rock tailings with a wood "boardwalk" to make it flow, and still have equestrian-only trails.
3. Adopt and improve non system MTB trails in North Granite Bay area
4. Set aside a minimum of 10 acres for a bike park with technical riding features. The low cost of building a bike park enables the option to have multiple locations across FLSRA. Possible locations include the meadow across from the outlet stores, Granite Bay, Beals Point, Mississippi Bar and the Peninsula.

As an avid hiker, trail runner, and mountain biker, I use the Folsom SRA quite a bit. I've also recreated at many other State Parks. I'd like to applaud FSRA for its efforts to go through with the Change in Use of the Browns Ravine trail. It's a step in the right direction for balancing the growing needs of the region to share the trails and maximize the amount of recreation that can be had with our finite park land. This RTMP is a great opportunity to continue to invest in what parks are really for which is providing outdoor experiences to the local population. And a great way to do that is to cater to a growing healthy habit of hiking, trail running and mountain biking. Due to the fact that all three activities draw a full spectrum of socioeconomic statuses, this is the time to create revenue streams from the park tourists while creating local opportunities for the disadvantaged. By creating more multi-use trail, nurturing partnerships with local organizations willing to provide free maintenance, and creating a sustainable trail system, the value of the parks and benefit to the region will tremendously increase.

I encourage State Parks to preserve trails that are separate, meaning bikes have their own trails and accordingly so do equestrians and hikers. I appreciate that State Parks is expanding the use of the Snipes Pershing Ravine Trail to allow equestrians. I also support the improvements mentioned in the Plan to Equestrian Staging areas. Currently, I prefer riding Browns Ravine Trails because I feel safer, since my horse and I are not worried about running into bikes. Unfortunately, State Parks is considering a Change in Use to allow bikes there, too.

Fixing bridges is a priority after they are 15/20 years old. New York Creek Bridge is about that age and needs confirmation of the structural safety. If you look at the bridge, it has lots of rotting wood that needs to be replaced.

State Parks is recommending developing a plan to extend the paved trail from Beals Point to Granite Bay. I oppose a paved trail from Beals to Granite Bay because it would cause destruction of wildlife habitat; it would be expensive and would create pollution that would run off into the Lake. Why add another paved trail? Bikes already ride the trails without pavement and horses and hikers don't need it.

Why not create a larger area than the Monte Vista trail network for a no-bike trail loop for hikers and equestrians?

While I appreciate the effort to provide additional miles of trails, I particularly appreciate the connectivity proposed in the draft to improve access to the Darrington Trail and South Fork Trails. Thanks generally for renewing this effort and working to ensure you obtained public comment.

ATA supports the following parts of the RTMP:

- Adopting non-system trails to provide multi-use trail access to North Granite Bay area at full pool.
- Developing a plan for adopting and/or eliminating non-system routes at the Hoffman Property.
- Rerouting the segment of Pioneer Express Trail to create separation from the Granite Bay Multi-use Trail in the Beeks Bight Area. We appreciate the advance planning (CEQA/NEPA) for reroutes and new trail connections which will improve trail safety for all user groups.
- Authorizing multiuse of the low-water route along the North Fork Arm between Beeks Bight and the Horseshoe Bar Road Access to the Pioneer Express Trail.

- Accommodating a future bridge over the American River, if and when the plans for an Auburn to Cool Trail bridge are further developed.
- Developing a new multiuse trail between Peninsula and the Olmstead Loop at ASRA along the east side of the North Fork arm of Folsom Lake.
- Adoption of 20 miles of trails for bikes and adoption of 2 miles of non-system trails, with additional site-specific planning to potentially add additional trails: We are generally appreciative and support this overall direction.

That said, we also want to encourage that the RTMP increase trail access in proportion with the populations using the trails, and specifically acknowledge the tremendous growth in use of Folsom SRA trails by trail runners, hikers and cyclists. We believe that the trails in use by, and important for, equestrians should be maintained and preserved. We also believe the Folsom RTMP should attempt to preserve as many of the user-built, non-sanctioned trails as possible for all trail users in order to increase new trail mileage, especially for bike use. We believe this will help spread trail users out, which will improve trail experience and maintain trail safety.

The ATA urges the Folsom SRA RTMP to consider adding the following to its plan:

non-interrupted access for cyclists between Granite Bay to Auburn along the west side of Folsom Lake/American River (specifically, Horseshoe Bar Road to Auburn and from Beek's Bight to Auburn during high water). We are appreciative of the proposal to transition segments of the Pioneer Express Trail to multi-use (and bikes specifically), and we are also appreciative of the recommendation to establish a North Fork Trail on the eastern side of the lake/river. However, the main corridor of travel and primary access to trails remains on the western side of the lake and river (along Auburn Folsom Road). The Pioneer Express Trail is an under-utilized trail. We urge State Parks to engage with multi-user groups to consider options for continuous trail access along Pioneer Express Trail, including options for widening/re-routing/improving sight lines, establishing parallel route options in some areas, or considering odd/even trail use.

We believe the Folsom SRA and Auburn SRA RTMPs should jointly work towards a vision of a multi-use trail that continuously circumvents Folsom Lake through Folsom and Auburn SRA (as well as BLM land). Such a vision aligns with, and complements the efforts of, the Placer County Trails Master Plan and Auburn Endurance Capital of the

World. It would bring equestrians, runners and cyclists to the area to engage in endurance-type events, building upon the existing base of events already in this area (i.e. AR 50, Western States Endurance Run, etc.). The Pioneer Express Trail is a critical link to achieve this vision.

While the Auburn Bike Park can meet some of the local demand, they cannot accommodate the significant growth of cycling among the greater Sacramento-Folsom-Roseville metropolitan area and desire for bike-specific amenities. Importantly, ATA believes it's critical for State Parks to embrace youth-oriented interests by building youth-specific and family-friendly amenities that encourage outdoor recreation and improve children's mental health. Bicycling is also one of the most popular forms of recreation for youth and is growing in popularity for young and old according to national studies. Bicycling is an activity that families can enjoy together and encourages outdoor play. A bike park, and bike-specific flow trails, provides opportunities for families to ride together, and is accessible to families of all socio-economic levels given the relatively low cost of a bike and a helmet.

The Jedediah Smith Memorial Trail and other connections need signage for cyclists to slow down when pedestrians and children are present, and it should be enforced.

While interpretive signs along the American River Bike Path are nice, they manage to get vandalized soon after installation then become blight along the trail. Just share the rich history on your website for people learn more about such historic features. Don't waste state funds on interpretive signs you don't intend to protect or maintain.

Both Park or Folsom Police have failed to protect the Rainbow Bridge and natural rock surfaces from graffiti vandals and litter bugs. Please don't waste any more state funds on interpretive signs. They will just get vandalized and make the area look disregarded and neglected.

The North Fork Trail should connect to the campground and amphitheater on the west end and will need a connection to the Cool trail network on the upper or east end.

For activating the Peninsula Campground for cool season use by the MTB community, some group camps and bike specific facilities (i.e. locking racks, washing station, etc.) will get people really excited about camping at Peninsula; it is so beautiful there in the spring, but the campground often is not open. Good facilities, maybe even charging stations for weedwhackers to enable volunteer maintenance, could help a lot.

Maybe have a special facility here where we can hold horse-bike desensitization events.



|  |
|--|
| <p>Would love touchless water bottle fill sites along the trails.</p>  |
| <p>A bathroom would be helpful at the Snowberry Trailhead. But implement only if the state has funds to properly protect and maintain it.</p>  |
| <p>FATRAC supports the proposed trail and facility improvements at Old Salmon Falls Trailhead and looks forward to assisting in their implementation.</p>  |
| <p>FATRAC supports encouraging use of the underutilized Salmon Falls Raft take-out lot. The best way to encourage additional use by trail users instead of the informal turnout by the bridge would be to build a multi-use trail from this lot to the Salmon Falls Bridge along or slightly above the high-water line to make this a more desirable place to park.</p>  |
| <p>The Plan calls for developing a small trailhead parking and trail access facility at Horseshoe Bar Road. When developing this access, please consider including horse trailer parking so equestrians can access this area.</p>  |
| <p>While FLSRA administration is considering a bike park with a concessionaire, why not consider a riding stable with a concessionaire on the west side of the North Fork of the lake to assure for the opportunities of youth and adults alike the joyous experience of riding a horse along a trail in our beautiful park.</p>   |
| <p>Improve trail access and add new facilities, including parking, signage, restrooms, and other potential facilities at West Rattlesnake Bar.</p>   |
| <p>I support aspects of this plan that increase access to sustainably built mountain bike trails. Access to high-quality, sanctioned trails limits use of unauthorized trails.</p>   |
| <p>There are too many trails in Folsom Lake SRA that are infrequently used by equestrians and hikers, which remain off-limits to mountain bikers. Opening these trail systems to mountain bikes through official changes-in-use will result in more people using them and will place part of the burden of maintenance on local mountain-bike advocacy groups, such as FATRAC and Mother Lode Trail Stewardship.</p> |
| <p>I fully support making all of our trails multi-use. Bikes should not be disallowed from our trails.</p>   |
| <p>Bikes ok on all the dirt trails. Stop the discrimination.</p>   |

Please don't prevent any group's trail use. Cyclists and hikers can share the trail together. Don't limit either please.

I support changes-in-use that allow bicycles on more trails. I would love to see the area become more kid- and bicycle-friendly.

Restricting trail access to specific users is unfair. We all pay to support these trails.

There is no reason why our trail system can't be enjoyed and shared by cyclists, hikers and equestrians. As a mountain biker I follow and respect the rules on the trail. I understand that not everyone out there has that same respect, but that is not limited to just mountain bikers. I see equestrians and hikers alike completely disregarding trail etiquette. We need to learn to live harmoniously and stop putting labels on groups of people because of the actions of small select few. Please take this into consideration when making your decision.

I favor of designating more trails for bicycle use. There has been an explosion of bicycle riding trail users, so the need is there. There are plenty of examples where hikers and cyclists are able to use trails in harmony.

Making all trails multi-use will help to make the outdoors open for everyone to enjoy.

Folsom Lake SRA is becoming more and more crowded and trails that are closed to certain users leads to congestion on the limited number of multi-use trails that do exist, creating dangerous situations. Spreading the crowds among more trails by designating them multi-use will lead to more enjoyable trail experiences for the majority of users.

With more and more people recreating on bikes the number of trails that are multi-use needs to be increased as well to accommodate all users. Please open these trails to all user groups.

Mountain bikes cause far less damage and erosion to trails than horses.

As interest in mountain biking continues to grow, especially among local youth, please consider allowing mountain bikes to share trails that are not currently open to them.

I travel to many states and ride my bike. California can learn a lot from other states. Instead of banning cycling on some trails, use your resources to educate people on how to properly share the trail. This present management has created a culture of adversity among trail users. I ask you to stop spreading division and instead choose education.

|   |
|---|
| <p>Improve signage regarding proper trail use. Work with the groups to foster appropriate etiquette. I love the parks as a cyclist, hiker, and horseback rider. I want to see all the groups get along.</p> |
| <p>This trail should be usable by the whole public. Just remind folks of the typical yielding practices.</p>  |
| <p>With a little education and consideration, we can all enjoy these without excluding other user groups.</p>   |
| <p>Please do more to educate mountain bikers about how to be safe around other users, including the “Slow and Say Hello” campaign that has been started.</p>  |
| <p>Advise bikers to put bells on the bikers to alert other users that they may be riding past them.</p>   |
| <p>“Trail etiquette education” of an ever-changing user population has not historically been effective in other parks facing the same situation because it is not possible.</p>                             |
| <p>Please install trail courtesy / etiquette signage at trailheads to and along all multi-use trails.</p>   |
| <p>State parks is extremely slow to repair or replace damaged and/or vandalized signs conveying trail rules and uses. Perhaps installing more and/or larger signs would help.</p>                           |
| <p>Trails should be available to as many uses as possible with clearly posted rules about best practices for sharing the trails.</p>  |
| <p>Multi-use trails should feature properly displayed signage such as yield signs as well as trail direction arrows.</p>  |
| <p>Please keep the trail wayfinding signs up-to-date and replace the signs that have been vandalized.</p>   |
| <p>Safety is the number one reason these trail changes-in-use should not take place.</p>  |
| <p>Speeding mountain bikes and e-bikes are incompatible with slow-moving trail users.</p>   |
| <p>I am an equestrian as well as a cyclist. Speaking for the equestrian trail riding community, speeding bikes are the biggest concern for us.</p>  |

Adding fast-moving bikes and e-bikes to existing equestrian/pedestrian trails introduces a significant public safety hazard by increasing the potential for injury to trail users, which will reduce public use and enjoyment of those trails. This is contradictory to state parks' mission of promoting greater use and enjoyment of parks.

Multi-use trails create stress and anxiety among slow-moving trail users, especially seniors, nature lovers and families with small children. The wonderful, peaceful, relaxing experience of ambling down a single-track trail, "de-stressing" and enjoying nature, becomes a dangerously different experience when trails are converted to "multi-use." When trails become "multi-use" everyone has to be on constant alert, anxious and stressed out. The park's recommendation to change existing single-track trails to "multi-use" will cause trail users to be concerned for their safety, leaving them with a negative park experience and reducing their desire to return. This is contradictory to Director Armando Quintero's statement that parks "provide safe havens for those who need to de-stress."

As an older adult who likes to walk the trails I'm not as nimble nor well hearing to dodge bikes on the trail. It is nice to have trails where I do not have to worry about dodging bikes and can relax on the walk... which is the idea. There are trails for bikes and multiuse trails aplenty.

Many e-bikes go too fast for conditions and line-of-sight, which is a serious safety concern. Since state parks will not be enforcing speed limits on trails, how does state parks propose to control and monitor e-bike speeds on multi-use trails.

Cyclists should be encouraged to attach bells to their bikes and to use them to alert other cyclists and slow-moving users of their presence.

State parks has long characterized the concerns of non-bike trail users vs. bike trail users as "conflict over not wanting to share the trails. The real problem is not about trail sharing. It's about the difference in speed between fast-moving bikes and slow-moving trail users on the same trail. It's not a trail sharing problem. It's a trail safety problem.

Any state park plans to modify existing trails for multi-use cannot solve the problem of the fundamental difference in user speeds between fast-moving bikes and slow-moving horses/peds. These uses are incompatible and unsafe together on single-track trails and converging such trails to multi-use actually increases the risk of injury and reduces public safety.

Care should be taken to assure that park-friendly and highly trained trail patrollers are employed as part of the park's plan to establish a multi-user volunteer trail patrol.

The department's Trails Handbook and its Trail Policy Guidelines clearly recognize and acknowledges the importance of "balancing public access and the recreational needs or desires" of "diverse trail users" while considering "user compatibility" and maintaining "public safety". The proposed RTMP for Folsom Lake SRA misses the mark in achieving this policy goal. The issues of public safety and user compatibility are inadequately addressed in the RTMP.

While everyone understands the desire of State Parks to increase trail access and to provide bike riders with more trail riding opportunities within Folsom Lake SRA, the proposed solution of converting numerous existing pedestrian/equestrian trails to "multi-use trails" is not the best or only solution. The "one size fits all" idea behind multi-use trails is actually contrary to the stated State Parks Trail Policy.

State Parks' stated reliance in the RTMP and in the Browns Ravine CIU on "self-enforcement" by user groups is not a realistic way to deal with the safety hazards created by speeding mountain bikers on "multi-use trails". Individual trail users and user groups have absolutely no enforcement authority, and the speeding bikers who have no regard for other trail users know this. The RTPM and Trail Evaluation Study for the Browns Ravine Trail CIU specifically state "no additional enforcement" effort will be required by State Parks to implement "multi-use trails." This along with State Park manager's publicly stated policy that there will be "no enforcement of speed limits and park regulations on trails", along with opening more trails to speeding bikes, simply increases the public's anxiety and concerns over trail user safety.

State parks does not want dirt bikes on trails, yet e-bikes are allowed. E-bikes, which can easily be retrofitted to achieve higher speeds, should be limited to paved trails.

E-bikes should be restricted because the skill of those operating these vehicles seldom matches their speed capabilities.

E-bikes should be allowed on all trails.

Why can't railroad ties be installed, about 4' apart, in some areas to slow cyclists down?

I understand that state parks does not have the manpower to enforce trail rules. Therefore, before changing a trail's use designation from equestrian/pedestrian to multi-use, I suggest you make necessary modifications to ensure trail users' safety.

I would appreciate more enforcement of trail rules and regulations.

Please increase patrols and ranger presence on the trails.

Please have the Rangers return users' phone calls.

I am an equestrian and have just about given up riding at Granite Bay. The mountain bike community has taken over the trails; even those designated equestrian/pedestrian are always full of cyclists, many of whom are not familiar with equines and do not follow safety precautions. As such, it is not safe to ride my horse there anymore. The signage is there, but state parks does not enforce the rules. I don't feel the park system care about equestrians.

I ride with the Folsom Lake SRA mounted trail patrol unit, so I know firsthand how many already ride illegally on the wrong trails. Even though we document and report our findings, there is no paper trail. It is rumored that the reports we make get thrown in the trash and are never documented in an incident report file. Folsom Lake SRA turns a blind eye to trail abusers. Perhaps allowing your volunteer trail patrol riders to issue citations or written warnings would help.

Ticket trail users who do not follow the rules.

The changes proposed in this draft RTMP will increase opportunities for cyclists, while at the same time limiting opportunities and enjoyment for more timid trail user groups, including senior citizens and children. This will drive many of these individuals off the trails, as illegal bicycle use and lack of trail designation enforcement already have.

I do not think that designating certain trails for horses and others for bicycles will work. I see violations of this all the time. Alternating use days would be a great compromise and more people would buy into it and uphold it.

Parallel trails in Folsom Lake SRA are not a new idea. They were first proposed 19 years ago by a consultant hired by the park. This idea was widely supported by the "Trail Stakeholders" group assembled by state parks, and it was strongly preferred over "multi-use" trails. Fortunately, Folsom Lake SRA has plenty of land area to implement parallel

trails. In fact, there are currently many unsanctioned, user-created bike trails within the SRA which prove this solution is possible.

Parallel trails present a great opportunity for state parks to take an innovative approach to solving long-standing trail access and safety problems. It's a win-win solution that provides all Folsom Lake SRA visitors a safer and more enjoyable trail experience, and [it's even more important if AB 1909 becomes law](#).

The solution to the problem of trail conflict between cyclist and equestrians is to make trails for cyclists only. This would prevent the possibility of collisions with hikers or equestrians.

There are four ways to ensure equitable access to dirt trails for various user groups in general proportion to each group's number of users: 1) by building new trails; 2) by expanding existing trails; 3) by change in use (CIU) designations for specific trail segments; and 4) by implementing alternate day usage for specific trails. Number four offers the best chance at moving the needle on trail use equity within our lifetimes. Why not give it a try and see how it works?

Why doesn't the RTMP include any discussion about or consideration of the idea of parallel trails? This option is not even mentioned in the RMTP, even though Folsom Lake SRA has plenty of space within its boundaries to offer this as a viable solution for providing bikers with many more trail miles within the State Park.

In 2003, as part of the Trail Stakeholder meetings held by Folsom Lake State Park managers and facilitated by Superintendent Scott Nakaji, State Parks' own consultant recommended the creation of parallel trails within Folsom Lake SRA, to provide slow-moving trail users and fast-moving trail users each with their own trails, designed to better meet the "diverse trail users recreational needs."

Mountain bikers want challenging single-track trails with sinuous features and undulations, free from obstacles such as horses and pedestrians, not "sanitized," flat multi-use trails. They supported the parallel trails idea back in 2003.

Parallel trails offer three main advantages over multi-use trails: 1) The incompatibility of user speeds and the resultant public concern for trail user safety is virtually eliminated, 2) The cost per mile to add "bike trail miles" to the park is substantially less than the costs associated with converting existing trails into "multi-use" trails meeting park standards. The bike lobby/community has even regularly volunteered to do considerable trail work in order to gain additional access within Folsom Lake SRA and 3) The design of "bike only" trails can be better suited to specifically

meet bikers' desired trail experience. Bikers would not have to be looking for or stopping for pedestrians and equestrians. The trails could be designed and built to better meet their "recreational needs or desires," a goal stated in the Trail Policy "Guidelines."

Creation of separate, parallel trails dedicated to specific user groups is a far superior way to safely provide more trail riding opportunities for mountain bikes within Folsom Lake SRA and to increase the safety and enjoyment of all trail users within Folsom Lake State Park. This is one of the main reasons so many "user created trails" and trail jumps have appeared within Folsom Lake SRA in recent years. These trails have almost all been created by bikers, not pedestrians or equestrians.

Ask yourself these questions: As an equestrian/pedestrian, would I rather be on a serene State Park trail with users of my own type and speed, or would I rather be on a trail where hikers, seniors, equestrians, families with children have to constantly be on alert, anxious and watching for speeding bikes on the trail? As a biker, would I rather ride on a trail with skills features designed to provide a fun and challenging mountain biking experience, or one that resembles riding on a flat sidewalk and having to slow down and stop when encountering pedestrians and equestrians on the trail? Which is the better trail experience for each trail user?

Both the park and its trails have become increasingly popular over the last 10- to 20-years, leading to an increased number of users. This in turn leads to complaints around trail etiquette and competition for the same space on trails. Associated requests include new trails, parallel trails for separate user types of users and increased recognition of some groups of trail users. So, the Draft RTMP clearly identifies there are many more visitors of ALL user groups, yet the plan is to force all users onto one trail to make things easier for State Park administration whether users do not enjoy/fear interface with the faster moving cyclist groups now including e-bikes or not?

With the rapid population growth and expansion of Folsom and El Dorado Hills, both north and south of Highway 50 along with other multiple communities, trail users on the south side of Folsom Lake deserve to have the choice of a trail experience in nature without the interference of fast-paced mechanization. The last remaining section of trail in this area with a pedestrian/equestrian only use designation, the Brown's Ravine Trail, has not been protected by our State Park administration, encouraging illegal bicycle use and skewed data. The need for a parallel trail here is important to ensure a safe, enjoyable and "high-quality recreation" user experience for all user groups.

The draft plan states that creating a continuous loop trail around Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma is a parkwide objective but provides no plan or blueprint for accomplishing it. If such a plan is a risk to completing the RTMP as



planned, then we suggest at least outlining a process in which a plan would be developed, with stakeholders, that would address the goal of providing for a continuous loop trail around our lakes.

If all but the most difficult sections (i.e., identified as a section of Pioneer Express Trail) of a loop trail around the lake utilizing our current trail system are to be open to the faster paced mechanization of bicycles, including e-bikes, then there needs to be parallel trail where trail Users not comfortable with that interface can have their “High-Quality Recreational Experience,” purported to be the Mission of California State Parks.

Folsom Lake State Recreation Area has many multi-use trails (intended for bikers) in its jurisdiction and there are very few trails designated for equestrians and hikers only. Please save trails for hikers and equestrians, so we can have trails in the system that are safe for equestrians without worrying about colliding with a bike. Please do not put us at risk of injury to our horses and ourselves by opening up more trails to bikers.

I am an equestrian that uses the trails around Folsom Lake frequently. It has come to my attention that you are considering allowing bikes to use more of the trails than they already do. Horse trails are already being eliminated and/or used by bicyclists. There are tons of places for bicyclists to ride outside of the lake trails. Horse trails are limited more and more as cities and other developments continue to expand. Equestrians should have access to safe trails and not be worried about getting seriously injured because of too much bike traffic for the area.

Bikers use the Browns Ravine Trail and those at Falconcrest/Monte Vista despite these trails being equestrian / pedestrian only. Signs indicating that bikes are prohibited on these trails are all too frequently removed and vandalized. This allows newcomer cyclists who know-not to proceed and use them anyhow. It is quite unsafe for those who ride horses expecting a bike-free area. The trails dedicated for pedestrians and equestrian only must remain bike-free, as there are not many that remain in this area that can be relied upon for biker-free safety zones.

The draft RTMP CIU recommendations are based on 8- to 9-year-old trail user surveys, which are outdated and no longer valid. The RTMP is based on faulty, old data. New surveys should be conducted.

The reported number of incidents between equestrians and cyclists is inaccurate. Many times, there are no rangers available to report unsafe trail activity and accidents to.

I did not once see an announcement for survey participation for this plan. Nor did I see any pop-up events to gather surveys. I question again how robust the outreach was to all user groups including the horse owners in Shadow Glen.

Did you approach any riders? For a reliable survey, you cannot just go down to the most populated areas (e.g., Granite Bay, Beals Point) when there are biking events going on.

I have been using the Folsom Area State Parks since 1976 and have never seen any information about change-in-use Requests. No information has been posted about how to go about doing this. The CIU appears to be something new and the information about how to make a CIU request has not been distributed to all user groups. Since the CIUs mentioned address only mountain bikers, I deduct that not all user groups have been treated equally. What is the system for requesting an CIU evaluation? What stakeholder groups have been approached to participate?

Please provide a more robust survey of the park users, including hikers, equestrian users and the disabled – not just the mountain bikers.

Sadly, not all user groups have vocal, paid-for-lobbyists like IMBA, but does that mean our State Park should not take all other user groups recreational experience into serious account? It is surely their responsibility.

I am an avid mountain biker who rides in the Granite Bay Area. I would appreciate a legal, fun, non-decomposed granite trail network that consists of rocky, rooty, natural based features. Using the trails year-round would be ideal but would require a little bit of analysis of proper drainage techniques in order to avoid possible erosion by water flowing down trails. It is important to maintain natural features to reduce cost, maintain a more scenic view, and provide a challenging terrain network.

The damage that mountain bikers have done to the natural landscape by constructing an illegal obstacle course at Granite Bay is unbelievable. It seems Folsom Lake SRA is tired of dealing with rogue mountain bikers, so they just let them do whatever they want.

I support the proposed changes-in-use for Beals Point / Granite Bay to allow bicycles.

The one proposed recommendation in the draft RTMP for equestrian users was BPG#5, which stated that improvements need to be made to the well-used Horse Assembly Area; however, no suggestions were provided. And the recommendations were to survey the trail users.

Adopt all non-system trails in the Lakeridge Oaks area as system trails. If any reconstruction is needed no not use DG. It does not fit with the natural character of the park nor is it a safe or a sustainable substrate for bike use.

Any new interpretive trails developed for the Mormon Island Wetlands Natural Preserve area should be designated for bike use. Any existing non-paved, non-system trails should be adopted and maintained as needed.

Cyclists have been safely sharing this trail with other users “as is” for decades. Connectivity and immediate approval of this CIU is logical. Approve “as is,” then maintain as needed or allow volunteers to maintain annually.

Mountain bikers have been safely sharing this segment of the Pioneer Express Trail, from the San Juan Water District office to the Beals Point Entrance Road, for decades on native soil. There is no justification for denying the CIU to allow bikes.

On the segment of the Pioneer Express Trail from the San Juan water treatment plant to Beals Point I have noticed many blind turns and spots where you cannot see very far ahead due to rocks, trees or other barriers. This is potentially where bike / equestrian collisions may happen. Please reconsider this CIU.

Mountain bikers have been safely sharing these segments of the Los Lagos trail with other users for decades. Approve this CIU "as is" along the entirety of the trail then maintain as needed or allow volunteers to maintain annually.

I am adamantly opposed to allowing bikes on the Los Lagos Trail. This area is very dangerous and lacks appropriate signage.

State parks should completely close the Los Lagos Trail. Social trails are being made in its vicinity, near the 38.5-mile marker of the Pioneer Express Trail. Bikers will top the social trail, then hit the decline going in excess of 10 mph. I have observed this over 10 times. It's an accident waiting to happen.

Cyclists have been permitted to take over the Los Lagos Trail without regard for the safety of other trail users.

The Los Lagos Trail and those in its vicinity need to be patrolled by state park rangers who will issue citations to those who use these trails illegally.

The Shady Trail CIU / LLN #13 Issue statement falsely states that “there is no single-track access and connection for bikes along the northwest side of Lake Natoma.” In fact, there are a wide variety of single-track, dirt trails throughout

Mississippi Bar that connect to Lake Natoma. They are designated as non-system routes but do exist and are viable alternatives to the Shady Trail.

Need connection for mountain bikers across north side of Lake Natoma. Would like access to both the Shady and Middle Ridge trails.

Approving the Shady Trail CIU would be akin to rewarding bad behavior. The biking community shows no respect for existing rules that prohibit bikes on this trail. They deface and destroy “no bike” signage, illegally build technical terrain features, including ramps and jumps off-trail, and speed through the forest as if it’s their own personal playground. I have had many near collisions with bikers who refuse to yield. When I tell them bikes aren’t allowed on the trail, their reactions vary from disbelief to open hostility.

Bikers create an unsafe environment for walkers, joggers, equestrians, dogs and wildlife and damage the fragile environment around the trail. Please do not approve the Shady Trail change-in-use to allow more of this.

The Shady Trail is a relatively short segment of trail that is popular with families, equestrians, hikers and trail runners. It can and should be a place where people can walk and ride horses in peace. Mountain bikes are not compatible with these uses. I can’t believe such an ill-advised CIU would be considered.

I live close by the Shady Trail and ride it every week, sometimes with my kids and their friends who are elementary school age. It should definitely be open to bikes. It’s a great trail for beginner bike riders, it connects to other trails, and it could also be used as a model to help educate youth on important things like trail stewardship.

The Shady Trail should be open to all trail users. Mountain biking is a great, low-impact form of exercise that should not be excluded from this trail.

Multiple public trail systems have success with multi-use trails. There is no reason to believe the Shady Trail would be an exception.

I support the change-in-use to allow bikes on the Shady Trail, which provides a safe place for my child to learn how to ride that's free from cars.

As a regular off-road bike rider, I'm supportive of increased access to the Shady Trail and other dirt trails in the area. Limiting these trails to equestrians unfairly limits the number of people that are able to enjoy all parts of the parks, as well as seeming inherently classist. Bicycles cause no more damage to the trail than horse hooves (and droppings).

I don't see why cyclists have been disallowed on the Shady Trail. I hike and mountain bike and I feel that better signage reminding people of proper trail etiquette would be a much better solution. If the trail was made multi-use and well-marked everybody would be more cautious of the potential of encountering a variety of trail users.

Allow bicycle use on the Shady Trail. This trail is maintained by hikers and cyclists for enjoyment and use.

Constant heavy use on the Shady Trail by horses and damage from wood reduction work in the past year has made the trail susceptible to standing water and erosion.

The Shady Trail has recently clear cut to improve both fire potential and sight lines for multiple users. I can see this trail being a good option for a multitude of users.

Mountain bike access to the Shady Trail is essential. Mountain bikers are a key user group that invest their time and money to improving trails if allowed by FLSRA management. We continuously strive to be inclusive of hiker and equestrian access and bring revenue to local businesses that serve food, drink, and offer accommodations. Please do not make this trail exclusive just to one user type.

Please allow bikes access to the Shady Trail. There are many existing examples of trail sharing on single track trails working out just fine for all involved. Bikes need more access points and trails to use. Let's share the trail and allow the respectful biking community to ride there, too.

The new lines of site along the Shady Trail make it much more conducive to multi-use.

The Shady Trail is a good trail for family mountain bike rides, as it helps connect the American River trail with the nearby Fair Oaks Bike Park.

I support the Shady Trail CIU. With mountain bicycling appearing to be greatly gaining in use and popularity, the trail system should reflect the public's recreation/exercise choices for these public trail systems.

Please allow mountain bikes to access the Shady Trail. If not, please cut a parallel trail so that all users can enjoy this area.

I'm a person of color, and the Shady Trail should be accessible to all. Discrimination and entitlement are not OK.

I support the Shady Trail CIU. My family uses the trail often for walking/hiking and we rarely encounter equestrian users. When we do it is easy enough to pull off the trail to give them right-of-way.

Allowing mountain bikers to access the Shady Trail would greatly expand my children's options for exercise and family bonding activities.

I support the Shady Trail being opened up to bikes as long as signs are posted which indicate the order of yielding needed.

The Shady Trail is wide enough to be designated multi-use.

Designating the Shady Trail as multi-use will allow more people to safely enjoy the sport of mountain biking in a great environment under the oak trees on hot days in the summer.

Mountain bikers use the Shady Trail as much as hikers and equestrians. Make it legal so we can all smile at each other instead of arguing over who belongs or not.

Approving the Shady Trail CIU to allow bikes would create a more cohesive network of mountain biking trails around the lake and provide more options for cyclists of all ages.

Approving the Shady Trail CIU creates an opportunity for appropriate maintenance and environmental mitigation for a section of the trail that already sees bicycle usage.

A small subset of trail users want to continue to be exclusionary by opposing the Shady Trail CIU. It's almost as if their main goal is to have the trails to themselves.

There is plenty of room on the Shady Trail for all users to have safe and pleasant interactions and passing.

The Shady Trail CIU request was submitted in 2014. Bikes have been safely using the trail with other users for decades. There is no justification for further delays. Approve Shady Trail change-in-use "as is" but then maintain as needed.

I strongly oppose the proposed CIU for the Shady Trail. There is a gravel road that is a few feet away from the Shady Trail that can be used by mountain bikes to connect from the bike trail to the Mississippi Bar trail system.

Adding mountain bike use to the single-track Shady Trail is unsafe. If a change-in-use to allow bikes on the Shady Trail is going to be implemented, the trail needs to be dual track, and blind curves / overgrown vegetation must be removed to improve lines of sight.

Nothing in the draft RTMP mentions the illegal bike jumps that have been present along the Shady Trail for at least the last 5 years, as well as the "no bike" signs that have been vandalized. For the safety of all who use this trail, these jumps must be removed before they become bigger.

Pedestrians/equestrians are scared to use the Shady Trail because of safety issues posed by illegal mountain bikers. Occasional trail patrols will not even come close to addressing the conflicts between equestrians/pedestrians and the mountain bikers who use this trail illegally. What will prevent mountain bikers from taking over the Shady Trail, making it unsafe for pedestrians and equestrians?

This is a great trail to be considered for multi-use. I live close by and ride it every week without ever having negative encounters with other trail users. It's also a great trail for beginner riders.

Allow bicycles to use the Snowberry Creek Trail. This trail is similar to other bicycle accessible trails in the SRA and a change-in-use can be successfully accomplished with user education and vegetation maintenance by the Parks.

The Snowberry Creek Trail is heavily overgrown with vegetation and contains several large, downed trees. This lack of maintenance has created blind corners and narrow spots on the trail that would hamper multi-use.

I support the Snowberry Creek Trail CIU. My family uses the trail often for walking/hiking and we rarely encounter equestrian users. When we do it is easy enough to pull off the trail to give them right-of-way.

Allowing mountain bikers to access the Snowberry Creek would greatly expand my children's options for exercise and family bonding activities.

The Snowberry Creek Trail CIU request was submitted in 2014. Bikes have been safely using the trail with other users for decades. There is no justification for further delays. Approve the Snowberry Creek Trail change-in-use "as is" but then maintain as needed.

The Middle Ridge Trail was not recommended for a CIU to allow bikes and I hope this could be reconsidered. It's a fun, intermediate-level trail that gives riders a more challenging experience than the Shady Trail and Snowberry Creek Trail below it. I have personally conducted a trail-use survey over the last three weeks and counted 689 pedestrians, 158 bikes and 2 equestrians. It is a single-track trail, which requires one users to step off the trail to let the other user pass. I have never had an issue passing other trail users.

The Middle Ridge and Upper Ridge Trails do not make sense for equestrian use. They have too many areas that feature tight turns, steep gradient changes, exposed roots and similar obstacles, which render them impractical for equestrian use. Because of the narrowness of the trails, there are not areas where equestrian users can safely pass or cross the paths of other users, such as pedestrians. The trails in these areas do make sense for pedestrian and bicycle use.

I am an avid equestrian who rides competitively in cross-country, hunter/jumper and other similar events that involve extensive trail and extreme condition riding. I have witnessed many equestrians try to ride on the upper Middle Ridge trails, with significantly adverse impacts on the horse, rider and environment. I am also a cyclist.

Please allow bikes on the Middle Ridge Trail.

I am disappointed that with the reconstructed Middle Ridge Trail that it will not also be reclassified as a multi-use trail for a higher skill alternative to the Shady Trail for mountain bikes. I spend a lot of time on the Middle Ridge Trail on the weekday evenings and see very few fellow hikers and have only ever seen maybe four equestrians in the past 10 years.

If the mid-slope of the Middle Ridge Trail could be rebuilt and reclassified as a multi-use trail, it would give intermediate and advanced mountain bikers the opportunity to work on their technical climbing and have a nice flowy trail to safely enjoy with the hikers who also use that trail.



Mountain bikes have been safely sharing the Middle Ridge Trail with hikers for decades. You have no justification for denying the change-in-use request.

The Middle Ridge Trail is a popular trail that helps connect the state park to neighborhoods and local parks. We agree that the Middle Ridge Trail is narrow. If it is too narrow for bikes, it is certainly too narrow for horses.

Some of the user-created bluff trails off of the Middle Ridge Trail are poorly constructed and too steep to be sustainable. However, the Middle Ridge Trail and many of the trails in the area a valuable recreational resource for Orangevale residents, and it will be extremely difficult to prevent continued access from those neighborhoods. Therefore, a more comprehensive review of the trails in this area should be incorporated into the RTMP and the concept of re-routes and improvements should be left open at this time to ensure that more thought can be given to this matter to develop a coherent trail network that accommodates all user groups.

Approve the Middle Ridge Trail CIU to allow Bikes. The Middle Ridge Trail is arguably the best intermediate mountain bike trail within close proximity to Sacramento, enabling ease of access for riders who are looking to improve their skills.

Though poorly constructed and unsustainable, many of the non-system fall line trails in the area of Orangevale Bluffs represent a valuable recreational resource for Orangevale residents, and it will be extremely difficult to prevent continued access from those neighborhoods. Therefore, a more comprehensive review of the trails in this area should be incorporated into the RTMP and the concept of re-routes and improvements should be left open at this time to ensure that more thought can be given to this matter to develop a coherent trail network that accommodates all user groups.

I am concerned about the safety consequences of the Brown's Ravine Trail Change-in-Use where that trail overlaps with existing equestrian/pedestrian trails within the Monte Vista trail network. Many portions of that trail network include blind turns combined with slopes and narrow paths, which could pose significant dangers to equestrians and cyclists if both are allowed on the same trail. It would be much safer to keep mountain biking trails and equestrian/pedestrian trails separate.

I would love to see new trails in this area as well as bicycle access from this area to existing system trails. Cyclists and hikers work year-round to maintain these trails, removing fallen woody material and keeping them open and accessible. Equestrian use in Mississippi Bar is excessive and is highly damaging to the trails. Horseback riders ride

the trails year-round creating ruts and damaging trails. Not to mention the riders and the stables do nothing to maintain the trails. Instead, they will ride their horses around obstacles, making new trails and damaging vegetation and animal habitat. Heavy and harm causing effects are also noticeable from horses alongside the existing paved trail. Large groups of riders from the stables with constant trips in the area create congestion, dust and fill the trails with fecal matter.

Mountain bikers have been safely sharing the Mississippi Bar non-system trails with other trail users for decades. There is no clear justification for excluding mountain bikes on any trails within Mississippi Bar now or in the future.

Coordination with Sacramento County Parks is vital to providing the public full access and enjoyment of the area and its features.

Work with Sacramento County to allow change in use of all non-paved paths from Hazel to Fair Oaks and beyond.

The Black Miners Bar Shoreline Trail should be designated for pedestrian and bike use.

Allow bicycle use on the Pioneer Express Trail from the Snipes-Pershing Ravine Outlet to the Historic Truss Bridge. The trail is low-use and will provide connections to areas where bicycles are allowed, improving usability of the system by the public.

The Pioneer Express Trail from the Snipes-Pershing Ravine Outlet to the Historic Truss Bridge trail is somewhat uneven and overgrown, but regular maintenance by parks could make this trail more appealing and useable by the adjacent neighborhood and users of the bluff trails and paved trail.

Mountain bikers use the Pioneer Express Trail from Snipes-Pershing Ravine Outlet to the Historic Truss Bridge trail as much as hikers and equestrians. Make it legal so we can all smile at each other instead of arguing over who belongs or not.

Mountain bikers have safely shared the Pioneer Express Trail from the Snipes-Pershing Ravine Outlet to the Historic Truss Bridge with other trail users for many years. You have no justification to deny CIU request to allow bikes. Approve the CIU for bikes "as is" and maintain the trail as needed or allow volunteers to brush annually.

Allow bicycle use on the Snipes-Pershing Ravine Trail. The trail is low-use and will provide connections to areas where bicycles are allowed, improving usability of the system by the public.

The Snipes-Pershing Ravine Trail is somewhat uneven and overgrown, but regular maintenance by parks could make this trail more appealing and useable by the adjacent neighborhood and users of the bluff trails and paved trail.

Keep the Snipes-Pershing Ravine Trail for pedestrians only. It is a narrow, curvy trail and should have a single use. There are plenty of other trails that are multi-use in the area.

Thank you for recommending a CIU for this section of the Pioneer Express Trail, from the Folsom Historic Truss Bridge to Folsom Lake Crossing, since it's already routinely ridden by bikes and seldom ridden by horses.

Mountain bikers have been safely sharing this section of the Pioneer Express Trail, from the Folsom Historic Truss Bridge to Folsom Lake Crossing, with other users for decades "as is." You have no justification to deny the CIU for bikes. Approve "As Is" and maintain as needed.

If any reconstruction of the Pioneer Express Trail from the Folsom Historic Truss Bridge to Folsom Lake Crossing is planned, rework or use native soils or materials only. Do not use any DG.

Allow bicycles on the Pioneer Express Trail from Granite Bay to Cool/Auburn SRA. The ability to bicycle and connect up to Auburn/Cool without riding on heavily trafficked vehicle roads would greatly enhance recreational opportunities in the region.

Please make a greater effort to provide a multi-use trail along the entire north side of the north arm of the lake, thereby completing a multi-user trail that circumnavigates the lake. A change-in-use for the Pioneer Express Trail to allow mountain bikes should be considered, or an alternate route could be developed. For example, from Horseshoe Bar to Auburn, the old flume/ditch is above the high-water line and could be used as a potential trail alignment.

Consider allowing mountain bikers to use the Pioneer Express Trail on alternate days.

Is this area the historical "North Fork Ditch" trail that is sometimes underwater and parallels the non-bike legal Pioneer Express? If it is I was always under the assumption that the North Fork Ditch trail was always multi-use, but of course the Pioneer Express is not. Please continue (or start if I'm mistaken in my assumption above) multi-use access on the

low-water trail (i.e., North Fork Ditch Trail). It's a valuable resource to allow MTB'ers and gravel cyclists opportunity to visit these beautiful upper reaches of Folsom Lake that they wouldn't otherwise be allowed to see. It has good sight lines and it's very easy to allow multi-use here. The water is nearly always underwater anyway, so I wouldn't think that 'erosion' concerns with increased use & traffic would be a concern.

Bike jump trails in the area may not be desired, but please accommodate all levels of riders. Having trail features such as various styles of berms and jumps is quite fun for a more experienced rider. Having different styles of trails such as beginner, one-way, technical, fast, steep, flow or even "table" style jump trails will keep bikers off of other trails that may be preferred for horse/hikers or beginner riders. This will also reduce the creation of non-system trails.

Please consider creating and designating trails specifically for bikes, adding features like berms, rollers, jumps and drops.

Bikes should not be allowed on the Falconcrest/Monte Vista trail network. Leave these trails for hikers and equestrians!

The need for a parallel trail (for cyclists??) within the Falconcrest/Monte Vista area is needed to ensure a safe, fair, inspirational and enjoyable user experience.

The draft RTMP states that a majority of survey respondents were white, middle-aged, relatively affluent males. What attempts were made to reach out to other demographic groups?