

California State Recreational Trail Plan Forum

11.19.2024

Attendees:

- Michael Anzalone
- Susie Murphy
- Jake Bayless
- Steve Messer
- Deborah Young
- Sabrina Bell
- Mark Wilkinson
- Larry Gosselin
- Tom Boss
- Eric Wolterding
- Jim Hasenauer
- Neil Hamada
- Anitra Kass
- Gabriel Tiller

Power Point presentation:

- Goals – Tonight focus on:
 - **Trail Accessibility**
 - E-bikes and e-adaptive mountain bikes allow more range and a certain degree of challenge,
 - Mountain Bikers (including those with disabilities) don't want to feel blocked or inhibited from challenging rides. Recommend that when we think of accessible trails – not thinking of easy experience.
 - Question – What exactly do we mean by “Accessibility” for different modes of trail use?
 - Noelle – 20 years ago, accessibility meant something different. We are open to ideas on how this has been addressed among the groups.
 - Had a conversation with an advocate for people with disabilities -- there are no considerations for people with disabilities that want to recreate on public lands. Many people with disabilities were once able bodied and want to recreate in a way that allows them to have near similar experiences.
 - In Alameda County accessibility is addressed through priorities – priority #1 is reaching out to people with disabilities as well as minority groups to feel welcome.
 - Accessible trails are also for youth/young people – we're missing discussing accessible trails as also for little kids. MTB is a growing sport and youth accessibility needs to be a part of the discussion.
 - Proposed standards for accessibility could be presented in a matrix of what other agencies define and regulate to be “accessible”. Standards across multiple agencies can be confusing.
 - Federal standards for trails, you either comply with them or you need to apply for an exemption (challenging and not likely).
 - Can ADA be compacted terrain or does it have to be paved? Nuts and bolts can be confusing across jurisdictions.
 - Geographical constraints should be incorporated in the plan. Access to trails in urban areas or for kids/people from urban areas is important part.
 - Noelle – access means different things to different people; Parks will explore geographic access as a potential separate goal.
 - In accordance we federal rules we also need to need to meet the ABA (Architectural Barriers Act) standards which apply to facilities designed, built, altered or leased with federal funds. Universal ADA/ABA standards documents exist.
 - BLM has accessibility maps that show accessible characteristics at sites.

- Other states like Colorado and Utah are starting to allow e-bikes in areas where they weren't allowed before via permits issued to recreators with mobility challenges.
- **Multi-use trail cooperation**
 - Questions about what is being asked in regard to "multi-use trail"
 - Looking for best practices
 - 3 Es – education / engineering / enforcement –design trailheads in the right way with signage and educate people that come (rules and etiquette), enforcement is essential to ensuring that the trail system works, especially when other elements aren't as effective.
 - We should address the misperception using data tools – when it comes to assessing and addressing this – speaking in absolute terms to tell the tale of what's happening on trails.
 - We also need to note that there are challenges based on volumes of users. Standards may not be universal in all places/situations. Leaning on the community to realize an experience/have a positive experience / rider behavior and the examples they said for others is also important. (Education)
 - Conflicts on trails (Sonoma Co) is not an issue but is in Marin. Suggest places where there are conflicts and also look at places where there aren't issues. The issue may be cultural or specific to the communities. Discussing what those differences are may help with understanding standards for trails.
 - Echo sentiment - important to look at different areas and look at places where there doesn't seem to be much conflict and understand what the factors are.
 - One of the things to think about is the framing of the problem is 20 years old and assumes that there is going to be conflict – state parks has given lip service to "shared-use trails" in the past but there have been strides in the right direction.
 - A majority of the trails are restricted from MTBs. Large unmet demand – most trails should by default be shared use and then effort should be spent identifying what trails shouldn't be shared use. Recommend framing as a vision for how trail systems should work.
 - View of user conflict is probably not as real as it used to be.
- **Funding**
 - Is prop 4 funding going to support trails? Getting work done in the field is hard and getting grant funding to do the work is problematic.
 - Ag community is driving a regional trails program in Sonoma/Napa. Collaboration with CDFW to restore landscapes while also including trails systems is having a big impact. Securing easements for a trail is much cheaper than acquiring large parcels for trails.
 - Need to be opportunistic and hook trail funding into other priorities like wildfire management (fire breaks), great example in San Bernardino Forest new Big Bear – fire management zone able to build a long multi-use trail that cleared as a fire break.
 - Lay out how trail connectivity may be done and identify how trails were designed and built that weren't specifically "trail dollars." Creative funding.
 - Need to do more private-public partnerships – especially with health corporations. Outdoor recreation and trails are essential to human health.
- **Private Property Owners**
 - **Skipped for time**