

REVISED TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN A TRAIL'S USES (CHECKLIST)

Trail Name: **Panorama Trail (narrow segment)**, Park: **Mission Peak Regional Preserve**, Location: **Northern Section of Preserve**, Date Reviewed: **August 6, 2007**

Describe the existing condition of the trail, including user types, use patterns and natural resources: The Panorama Trail is located in the northern edge of Mission Peak Regional Preserve in the City of Fremont. The entire Panorama Trail is 1.62 miles in length and consists of a wide, multi-use segment open to hikers, equestrians and cyclists and a 0.86-mile narrow section that is closed to bicycles. The request seeks to open the narrow trail segment to bicycle traffic.

The northern side of the Preserve does not experience as much use as the southern because it is remote. In addition, there is a fee for nearby vehicle parking in the Ohlone College Staging area and the Panorama Trail is not conveniently accessible to the staging area. Based on staff observations the narrow segment of the Panorama Trail is seldom used by hikers or equestrians, with about 10 total visitors a week; Volunteer Trail Safety Patrol trail use surveys have not recorded any users on the trail during survey periods. There are no records of emergency or non-emergency user complaints, conflicts or accidents on the Panorama Trail. The Public Safety Department has not issued citations and dispatch has not received telephone calls on this trail. The Panorama Trail traverses oak woodland and open grassland and no protected plants or animals or sensitive habitat are known to occur along the trail corridor.

Describe the proposed trail use change, including its general benefits and the physical changes to the existing trail needed to accommodate the proposed new use: The trail use change seeks to allow bicyclists as an additional user group on the narrow segment of the Panorama Trail, now designated for hiking and equestrian use. Mission Peak Regional Preserve has almost 27 miles of trail. Seven miles of trail are narrow, of which less than three miles are open to bicycle traffic. Currently, no narrow trails are open to bicycle traffic in the northern section of the Preserve where the Panorama Trail is located. Implementation of the proposed trail use change request would provide cyclists more recreational opportunities, as well as access to the northern margin of the Preserve, by allowing them to complete a desirable loop connection between the multi-use portion of the Panorama Trail and the Dry Creek Trail.

No new trail would need to be developed to implement this request. Proposed trail improvements to accommodate multi-use include: widening the trail within an oak woodland with steep cross-slopes; moving an existing barbed-wire fence away from this section of trail to increase passing room and minimize safety hazards; abandoning and restoring a dead-end trail at the eastern end of the oak woodland; improving the trail through a short stretch of open grassland to better define the trail alignment; and installing appropriate signs. Additionally, because a local entry to the northwest side of the Preserve would improve public access to this now remote area, the District proposes to install a pedestrian gate at the Preserve boundary at the terminus of Witherly Lane northeast of the Ohlone College parking lot. Installation of the gate should be an independent project and pursued regardless of the outcome of the trail use change request.

Name: Raphael Breines Position: Senior Park Planner, Unit: Planning & Stewardship, Phone: 510-544-2325, E-mail: rbreines@ebparks.org

District Staff will use this checklist: to: (1). Determine the feasibility and appropriateness of proposed changes in allowed uses for an existing trail. (2). Determine if Planning or CEQA is needed. (3). Determine the appropriateness of amendments to Ordinance #38 for regulating uses on an existing trail. The addition of new trails will be considered during the development of a park's Land Use/CEQA document and not through this checklist process.

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
CIRCULATION			
1. Would the proposed change affect trail use circulation?	✓		Use change would provide bicyclists with a loop opportunity on the northern side of the Preserve, connecting multi-use portions of the Panorama Trail to multi-use Dry Creek Trail
2. Would the proposed change provide a loop connection for an existing group of unauthorized trail users to a multi-use trail, or connection to an adjacent park?	✓		Use change would provide bicyclists with a loop connection to multi-use trails
3. Would the proposed change provide the only alternative for achieving a desirable trail connection for a specific user group?	✓		Trail use change would provide bicycle access to the northern edge of the Preserve
4. Would the proposed change allow trail access to areas that are not connected or to serve staging areas or other trail heads?		✓	
5. Would the proposed change improve circulation and/or relieve congestion on other high use trails?	✓		Use change would improve circulation for cyclists by opening up a trail segment that would make a logical connection between multi-use trails
6. Would the proposed change require a closure of the trail on either a temporary or permanent basis during wet season conditions?		✓	
7. Describe any other circulation impacts of proposed changes not covered above.			Public access to the northern part of the Preserve is poor and could be improved with installation of a pedestrian gate at the terminus of Witherly Lane next to the Ohlone College parking lot

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
NATURAL RESOURCES AND VALUES			
8. Would the proposed trail use change benefit natural resources near the trail or generally in the park?		✓	
9. Would the proposed change contribute to unacceptable breakdown of trail shoulders, or any form of irreparable trail damage?		✓	
10. Would the proposed change eliminate a use that is currently causing unacceptable breakdown of trail shoulders, or any form of irreparable trail damage?		✓	
11. Would the proposed change cause trail tread rutting, impairment of trail drainage, or cause significant erosion?		✓	
12. Would the proposed change eliminate a use that is currently causing trail tread rutting, impairment of trail drainage, or cause significant erosion?		✓	
13. Would the proposed change result in geological instability, landslides or other similar serious safety impacts?		✓	
14. Would the proposed change eliminate a use or need for maintenance that contributes to geological instability?		✓	
15. Would the proposed change introduce a new use that would impact or disturb sensitive listed native plants, animals, or their habitat?		✓	There are no known protected plants or animals or sensitive habitat in the immediate area
16. Would the proposed change require construction or maintenance that would impact or disturb sensitive listed native plants, animals, or their habitat?		✓	Use change would involve routine trail improvements, which would not adversely affect sensitive plants, animals or habitat
17. Would the proposed change require construction or maintenance that would impact or disturb sensitive archaeological or historic resources?		✓	The immediate area does not contain known archaeological resources
18. Would the proposed change trigger regulatory review or permit requirements with a requirement for mitigation?		✓	
19. Describe any other resource impacts or benefits of the proposed trail use change not covered above			

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
TRAIL USER SAFETY			
20. Will a change in existing trail use require staff to make substantial changes in design and maintenance procedures for the trail regarding:			
a. Steepness		✓	Use change would involve improving the trail alignment on a hillside through a short stretch of open grassland
b. Outslopes		✓	Regular maintenance would improve drainage
c. Visibility or line of sight		✓	
d. Turn outs or Pull outs		✓	
e. Emergency response		✓	The District proposes to move an existing barbed-wire fence away from the trail to increase passing room and minimize safety hazards. The narrow segment of the Panorama Trail is accessible to emergency vehicles by fire roads on either end
f. Police enforcement		✓	Installing appropriate signs would clarify the trail alignment and reinforce park use etiquette and regulations
g. Exposing trail users to additional major road crossings		✓	
21. Would the proposed change invite undesired off trail use adjacent to the trail?		✓	
COMPATIBILITY OF USES			
22. Would the proposed change in use be compatible with current trail width to allow multiple trail user groups to safely pass each other?	✓		The trail has adequate sight lines and passing room to accommodate multiple use. The proposal includes moving an existing barbed-wire fence off of the trail and widening the trail within an oak woodland to increase passing room
23. Would the proposed changed use conflict with circulation at facilities such as a stable, interpretive facility, nature study area, other? If yes please describe potential conflicts		✓	
24. Would the proposed changed use be located in a high use area that can't handle more use? (ie: limited staging, few trails, etc.)		✓	This is not a high use area and the trail has capacity for additional use
25. Would the proposed changed use be in an area that already experiences documented trail user conflict?		✓	There are no known user conflicts or accidents that have occurred here nor have any citations been issued by District police officers
26. Would the proposed changed use significantly affect the experience of existing trail users?		✓	This section of trail is seldom used by hikers or equestrians, and with a change in trail use interactions among user groups should continue to be low in frequency, duration and intensity; therefore, use change would not significantly affect the conditions for existing trail users
27. Describe any other compatibility issues related to the proposed change in trail use			

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
TRAIL MAINTENANCE			
28. Would the proposed change require additional annual or ongoing brush clearing or vegetation management?	✓		To accommodate multiple use, the District would implement minor trail improvements, including trail widening, as well as periodic routine maintenance to maintain trail width
29. Would the proposed change require additional drainage improvements or annual or ongoing drainage maintenance?		✓	
30. Would the proposed change require additional and/or ongoing trail stabilization or trail surface maintenance?		✓	
31. Would the proposed change require additional retaining walls or structures be constructed and require ongoing maintenance?		✓	
32. Describe any changes in maintenance related to the proposed change not covered above			
CONSTRUCTION			
33. Describe any construction that would be required on the trail to accommodate the proposed trail use change			Trail improvements include widening a short section of trail; moving an existing barbed-wire fence away from the trail; abandoning and restoring a dead-end trail; improving the trail through a short stretch of open grassland; and installing a pedestrian gate at the terminus of Witherly Lane adjacent to the Ohlone College parking lot to improve access
34. Would the proposed change require an increase or reduction in funding for construction? If yes describe how much?	✓		Proposed trail improvements would cost about \$4,000 including up to \$2,500 for trail improvements and \$1,500 to install a pedestrian gate. The District will seek volunteer help
35. Would the proposed trail use change require that the District complete a construction project that is not on its current work list or plan?	✓		Installing a pedestrian gate at the terminus of Witherly Lane would require a work order
36. Would the construction to accommodate the new proposed trail use be handled by someone other than the District? If yes please describe		✓	Moving the barbed-wire fence would be done by Park staff and perhaps with volunteer help

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
PLANNING/CEQA			
37. Would the proposed trail use change require additional land tenure, a new maintenance/operating agreement? If yes please describe.		✓	
38. Would the proposed trail use change occur in an area that has a history of litigation or create any unusual legal exposure for the District? If yes please describe.		✓	
39. Would CEQA review be required (as determined by CEQA Planner in Planning/Stewardship Dept.)?		✓	
40. Would the proposed change require an amendment to an existing LUP (realignment of an existing trail or a new trail)?		✓	
DISTRICT STAFF EVALUATION SUMMARY			
Category:	Note any unresolved major issues		
Circulation	To improve access to the northern side of the Preserve, trail signs and a pedestrian gate should be installed at the terminus of Witherly Lane, adjacent to the Ohlone College parking lot. Though Ohlone College has not been receptive to the District's interests in the past, staff should pursue this project regardless of the outcome of the trail use change request		
Resources			
Trail User Safety			
Compatibility			
Maintenance			
Construction			
Planning/CEQA			
Construction Costs: <u>\$4,000 (The District will seek the help of volunteers)</u> , Annual Park Operation Costs: <u>\$0</u> , Annual Maintenance Costs: <u>Nominal</u> , Annual Public Safety Costs: <u>\$0</u>			
EBRPD Staff Team Members: Kelly Barrington, Park Supervisor; Raphael Breines, Planning; Dave Dubowy, Public Safety; Paul Ferrario, Risk/Safety; Jon Gatti, Park Ranger; Terry Noonan and Jamie Perkins, Regional Trails			