

Proponent Completes

Trail Proposal Process

STEP 1

Initial Project Proposal Description

Date: 11/30/24

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete this form with as much information as possible, including that in the narrative, topographic maps, and photos. Although not required it will help in working through the review process and onto Step 2 and Step 3.

1. Proposal Submitted By

Full Name	Last: Adler	First: Randy		
Organization	City of Deadwood			
Address	108 Sherman Street	City: Deadwood	State: SD	Zip Code: 57732
Phone #	(605) 578-2082	E-mail Address	Randy@cityofdeadwood.com	

2. Proposal Overview

Project Proposal Name	Mt. Roosevelt Trail System
U.S. Forest Service Unit	Northern Hills Ranger District
Recreation Site or Trail	Mt. Roosevelt, Stage Run, and Hwy 85 areas.
Project Proposal Description Must include maps in electronic format, i.e. GIS Shapefile (.shp) or Google Earth KML (.kml)	Please see attached mapping files.

3. Type of Action*

Repair / Maintenance

Reroute Other _____

New Construction

*Check the box(es) best describing the type(s) of action(s).

4. Background & Need

Background Give a brief description of the events leading to the proposal.	<p>We are working with the NFS, BLM, and other stakeholders to continue our non-motorized trail work off of our recent Fuller Brothers and White Rocks projects and expand non-urban trail options that are easily accessible for visitors & residents in and around the northern Black Hills National Forest.</p> <p>This is a natural expansion offering to our current trail system and as an established and designated trail, would provide a multitude of positives. Including looping of the trail system(s), and offer connectivity to existing trail systems.</p>
--	--

Need

Describe the need for the project.

Increase the locations and amount of non-motorized, maintained, and well-signed trails in the Northern Black Hills.

We have shown success in the last few years of building, signing, and maintaining new non-motorized trail systems in and around the community of Deadwood.

5. Project Estimates

Estimated Date of Desired Completion (e.g. grant deadline, etc.)	<i>[Provide additional comments regarding project timeline.]</i> Open and operational by fall of 2025, pending NEPA study timeline and completion.
Implementation Strategy	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local entity, state, or federal agency <input type="checkbox"/> Partner <input type="checkbox"/> Grant <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ </p> <p> <i>[Explain further, such as if implementation will be accomplished through a combination of strategies.]</i> </p> <p> Below are the following groups/stakeholders that will be involved throughout the various implementation phases of the project. </p> <p> Permitting Phase -City of Deadwood -Deadwood Main Street Initiative -Bureau of Land Management -National Forest Service </p> <p> Signage/Mapping Phase -City of Deadwood -Deadwood Main Street Initiative -Bureau of Land Management -National Forest Service -K4 Trails </p> <p> Construction Phase -City of Deadwood -Deadwood Main Street Initiative -K4 Trails </p> <p> Operational Phase -City of Deadwood -Deadwood Main Street Initiative </p>
Anticipated Budgetary Needs	<p> NEPA Costs (\$50,000-100,000 depending on scope and scale) \$ <u>52,875</u> </p> <p> Implementation Costs \$ <u>78,250</u> </p> <p> Annual Operation and Maintenance Costs \$ <u>5,000</u> </p> <p> <i>[Provide additional comments including how the cost estimates were derived.]</i> </p> <p> NEPA: We have an executed study agreement from KLJ Engineering for the proposed area included in this application. </p> <p> Implementation Costs: Estimated with a \$5/LF cost of construction. -Mt. Roosevelt Section (ph.1) - 3,700ft x \$5 = \$18,250 -Stage Run Section (ph. 2) - 4,000ft x \$5 = \$20,000 -Lodge at Deadwood Section (ph. 3) - 5,000ft x \$5 = \$25,000 </p> <p> Signage & Wayfinding Costs: Estimated based on trail intersections and previous costs from trails we have completed in the last 2 years. -\$15,000 </p> <p> Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs: Much of this will be done by local trail organizations. However, the City of Deadwood is proposing 1 FTE starting in 2025 with direct responsibilities of trail operation and maintenance. </p>

Funding Source(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local entity, state, or federal agency <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partner <input type="checkbox"/> Grant <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	<i>[Explain further, such as if funding will be provided through allocated funds, CIP, grants/agreements, or a combination of sources.]</i> -City of Deadwood -Business Improvement District #8 -Possible RTP Grants
--------------------------	---	---

6. Additional Information

The following supporting documentation is attached to this proposal:

Photograph(s) _____
 Report(s) _____
 Other__

Stop Here - Official Use Only Beyond This Point

Signature

I do not support the proposal moving forward for further consideration.
 I endorse proceeding to Step 2 to further evaluate this proposal.

District Ranger: _____
Print
Signature
Date

Agency Completes Within 60 Days of Receipt

Trail Proposal Process

Proposal Reviewed for Consistency with Forest Plan and Ecological, Financial, and Social Sustainability

STEP 2

Date of Receipt:

Project Proposal Name:

*INSTRUCTIONS: Evaluate the proposal based upon its alignment with forest and program objectives, as well as its likelihood for sustainability. Items with **RED** shading indicate **critical items**, of which all must be positive, and items with **GREEN** shading must meet 80/20 rule of which 80% must be positive in order to move to Step 3.*

(-) Proposal does not appear to meet the intent of the measure.

(+) Proposal appears to meet intent of the measure.

A. MISSION, ROLE, AND DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS

Consistency with Black Hills National Forest Direction and Plans - Is trail proposal consistent with established Forest direction (e.g., regulation, directives), and other relevant planning documents (e.g., agency strategic plan goals)?

There appear to be some inconsistencies, and/or there is uncertainty as to whether the trail will be managed consistent with Forest direction and plans.

1

The proposed trail is consistent with established Forest direction.

Consistency with Neighboring Jurisdictions – Is the proposed trail consistent with local communities and other jurisdiction’s planning direction?

No priorities have been identified, and/or the local unit would not consider this a priority trail (even though there may be public interest and support).

2

This trail has been identified as a Forest priority (National Scenic Historic Trail) or has been identified as a priority through collaborative planning processes.

Local community or jurisdictions have not been involved, no interest has been expressed, and /or some concerns have been expressed by the local community about this trail proposal

3

Local community or jurisdictions have been involved, interest has been expressed and supported in writing, and some concerns have been expressed by the local community about this trail proposal.

Trail Uniqueness and Other Providers – Are there other possible providers in the area such as state or county parks, private providers, or other USFS sites that currently offer a similar opportunity or experience?

There are similar trail opportunities in the area (or is not easily accessed from population centers).

4

There are no other similar providers in the area (or is easily accessed from population centers).

The proposed trail’s primary function does not provide access to a destination (e.g. waterfall, scenic vista, etc.), and/or this trail does not offer unique opportunity.

5

The proposed trail’s primary function is to provide access to a destination (e.g. waterfall, scenic vista, etc.), and/or this trail will offer a unique opportunity.

Trail does not improve access (e.g. provides connectivity to other trails or trail systems).

6

Trail improves access (e.g. provides connectivity to other trails or trail systems).

Proposed trail requires access across private property (i.e. easement is required).

7

Proposed trail does not require access across private property (i.e. no easement required).

Trail Role and Purpose – Will this proposed trail provide a quality experience for a wide variety of users?

No – This proposed trail will only appeal to a limited user group (very limited targeted group such as experts only, private community, etc.)

8

Yes – This proposed trail will offer a variety of experiences either within user groups (beginner, intermediate, advanced) or between user groups (multi-use).

No – This proposed trail will not offer access and use yearlong or a large portion of the year. Seasonal closure will be necessary to accommodate resource concerns such as big game winter range, bat hibernacula, or wet soils.

9

Yes – this proposed trail will offer access and use yearlong or a large portion of the year. Seasonal closures will not be necessary to accommodate resource concerns such as big game winter range, bat hibernacula, or wet soils.

B. PROTECT NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Resources – Are there resource concerns with the proposed location of the new trail?

<input type="radio"/> Cultural resources are known to exist in the area, and it may be difficult to mitigate impacts.	10	<input type="radio"/> Cultural resource concerns are nonexistent or may exist in the area, but any impacts can be mitigated.
<input type="radio"/> Certain wildlife resources are known to exist in the area, and it may be difficult to mitigate impacts.	11	<input type="radio"/> Certain wildlife resources are nonexistent or may exist in the area, but any impacts can be mitigated.
<input type="radio"/> Certain botanical and/or hydrologic resources are known to exist in the area, and it may be difficult to mitigate impacts.	12	<input type="radio"/> Botanical and/or hydrologic resources are nonexistent or may exist in the area, but any impacts can be mitigated.
<input type="radio"/> Conflicts with livestock grazing are known to exist in the Area, and it may be difficult to mitigate impacts.	13	<input type="radio"/> Conflicts with livestock grazing are nonexistent or may exist in the area, but any impacts can be mitigated.

Location/Grade - Can this proposed trail meet sustainable location and grade (avg. 8 - 10%, on the contour, adequate cross slope, etc.)?

<input type="radio"/> The proposed trail can generally be located sustainably but will require constructed features to mitigate problem areas.	14	<input type="radio"/> The proposed trail can meet all best management practices and locally established design parameters.
--	-----------	--

Hydrology and Drainage – What are the impacts to the area hydrology and drainage?

<input type="radio"/> Proposed trail will require constructed features to mitigate hydrology and drainage impacts.	15	<input type="radio"/> Proposed trail will have minimal requirements for additional constructed features, and drainage can be managed with standard grade reversals or rolling grade dips.
--	-----------	---

Soil Suitability - What is known about the soils in the location identified for this proposed trail? (recognizing NEPA may not have occurred yet)?

<input type="radio"/> Soil suitability has not been considered for the trail, or the trail will be constructed on soils poorly suited for trail managed uses – special attention will be needed to address soil and water concerns.	16	<input type="radio"/> The trail is on a location where soils should be compatible with trail managed uses.
---	-----------	--

Water Crossings - How will this proposed trail impact water crossings?

<input type="radio"/> Proposed location requires water crossings which must be mitigated by structures.	17	<input type="radio"/> The proposed location doesn't require crossings, or crossings do not require structures.
---	-----------	--

Trail Tread – Will this proposed trail, its managed uses and use levels, require significant tread construction/reinforcement?

<input type="radio"/> Materials will have to be brought in to create an adequate trail surface due to the existing soils or predicted use and/or will require more than planned maintenance levels.	18	<input type="radio"/> The native tread materials should be able to support the intended use and capacity with only annual maintenance and/or minor use of materials.
---	-----------	--

Closure Protocol – Will this proposed trail need seasonal and/or wet weather closures?

<input type="radio"/> The proposed trail will need a seasonal or wet weather closure under certain conditions	19	<input type="radio"/> The trail will be designed to withstand wet weather issues except in extreme conditions.
---	-----------	--

Level of Use – Has the expected level of use been incorporated into the trail design?		
<input type="radio"/> The proposed trail design has been developed based on physical location without regard to expected levels of use.	20	<input type="radio"/> Level of use has been incorporated into the planning process and is appropriate for the expected use.
Trail Length – Is this proposed trail of sufficient length to provide a desired user experience (day use or multi-day)?		
<input type="radio"/> This proposed trail does not achieve the recommended length for the activity.	21	<input type="radio"/> The proposed trail meets the desired length and desired user experience (day use or multi-day).
User Experience – Does the proposed trail offer the appropriate mix of experiences and have an appropriate configuration (loops, connections) to provide a quality experience?		
<input type="radio"/> No—The proposed trail does not offer an appropriate configuration (long linear trails, short loops, etc.)	22	<input type="radio"/> Yes—The proposed trail offers an appropriate configuration of stacked loops, connections, etc., to provide a quality experience.
User Conflict – If the proposed trail is a multi-use trail, is it designed to minimize conflict between users?		
<input type="radio"/> Trail is designed mainly for one user group.	23	<input type="radio"/> Design should reduce the likelihood of user conflict.
Trailheads – Have trailheads been adequately planned/evaluated for this proposed trail project?		
<input type="radio"/> Trailhead(s) have not been planned as part of this project, and/or they are to be fully developed later.	24	<input type="radio"/> Trailhead(s) are planned to provide sustainable access, support trail capacity and take advantage of existing facilities. Existing trailheads meet expanded capacity needs.
<input type="radio"/> Trail proposal may require new facilities or infrastructure.	25	<input type="radio"/> Trail design plan does not propose to make other associated facilities and infrastructure necessary (e.g. toilets, parking areas, trailhead kiosks, etc.).
Accessibility to Users – Will this proposed trail likely to expand access on the forest for users with disabilities, children or senior citizens?		
<input type="radio"/> Proposed trail is not likely to expand access for persons with disabilities and/or attract users with small children or senior citizens.	26	<input type="radio"/> Proposed trail will provide access for persons with disabilities and/or add other features likely to attract users with small children or senior citizens.
D. FINANCIALLY SUSTAINABLE		
Volunteer Partner Group – Is this proposed trail supported by a local trail or volunteer group?		
<input type="radio"/> There is no support group for this specific trail.	27	<input type="radio"/> There is an active and well-established volunteer or partner group ready and willing to support long-term maintenance, or Adopt-A-Trail.
Trail Design and Layout – Has the proposed trail been designed and laid out to maximize sustainability and user experience by professionals or highly skilled people with a proven track record?		
<input type="radio"/> Unsure of the qualifications of the person who designed and laid out the trail.	28	<input type="radio"/> Trail was designed and laid out by a professional trail builder, engineering or trail tech, or trail volunteer with a solid track record of designing and laying out sustainable trails.
Constructed Trail Features - Will this proposed trail require new constructed features valued over 20% of the total cost of the trail construction (boardwalks, bridges, hardened surfaces, steps, etc.)?		
<input type="radio"/> Yes – They are necessary for resource protection.	29	<input type="radio"/> No – Cost does not exceed 20% of total budget.

NEPA and Implementation – How likely is it that this project can/will be funded with a grant to complete NEPA and implement project?		
<input type="radio"/> There is a low probability or no firm commitment that a substantial amount of funding can be secured to complete NEPA for the project.	30	<input type="radio"/> There is a high probability or a firm commitment that a substantial amount of funding can be secured to complete NEPA for the project.
<input type="radio"/> There is a low probability or no firm commitment that a substantial amount of funding can be received to implement the project.	31	<input type="radio"/> There is a high probability or a firm commitment that a substantial amount of funding can be received to implement the project.
Annual Maintenance Costs - How will the trail affect long-term annual maintenance costs?		
<input type="radio"/> The project will add long-term annual maintenance costs (inspections, repairs, etc.).	32	<input type="radio"/> The trail has financial commitments through fees, partners, community support, etc., that will cover the costs of long-term annual maintenance.

Notes/Comments		
Summary	Negative	Positive
Red		
Green		

Stop Here – Official Use Only Beyond This Point

Signature		
<input type="checkbox"/>	I do not support the proposal moving forward for further consideration. This document shall be submitted to the proponent, under a cover letter explaining rationale for returning their proposal.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I endorse the proposal. Proceed.	
District Ranger:	_____	_____
	<i>Print</i>	<i>Signature</i>
		<i>Date</i>

Agency Completes

Trail Proposal Process

STEP 3

Forest "Open Season" Review

Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Forest Recreation Staff Officer, District Recreation Staff, and District Trails specialists convene to review all proposals received forest wide:

1. *To consider the merits of each trail relative to other proposals, and*
2. *Determine whether to recommend further action to move proposal forward.*

	1997 FEIS Table II-21	Status of FP Trails as of 2017
Bearlodge	16.0	35.2
Hell Canyon	10.0	6.2
Mystic	14.0	0.0
Northern Hills	26.6	44.5
Unnamed Trails	100.0	53.9
FOREST TOTAL	166.6	85.9

	Hiking/Running		Horseback		Biking	
	2017	Proposed	2017	Proposed	2017	Proposed
Bearlodge	2		61		4	
Hell Canyon	8		50		0	
Mystic	20		74		0	
Northern Hills	7		102		0	
FOREST TOTAL	37		287		4	

	Hiking/Running		Horseback		Biking	
	2017	Proposed	2017	Proposed	2017	Proposed
Bearlodge	67		61		67	
Hell Canyon	58		52		8	
Mystic	93		74		75	
Northern Hills	109		102		102	
FOREST TOTAL	327		289		252	
"Good Days"	33 – 327		14 – 26		12 – 42	
Hiking = 1 – 10 miles Running = 6 – 15 miles Horseback = 11 – 20+ miles Biking = 6 – 20 miles	44		19		13	

CRITICAL ITEMS FROM STEP 2

Trail Project Proposal Name	Step 2 Question 1	Step 2 Question 7	Step 2 Questions 30, 31, 32

Trail Project Proposal Name	Move Forward to Step 4	Rationale
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Stop Here – Official Use Only Beyond This Point

Signature

- I do not support the proposal moving forward for further consideration. This document shall be submitted to the proponent, under a cover letter explaining rationale for denial of their proposal.
- I endorse the proposal. Proceed.

Forest Recreation Group: _____
Print *Signature* *Date*

Signature

- I do not support the proposal moving forward for further consideration. This document shall be submitted to the proponent, under a cover letter explaining rationale for denial of their proposal.
- I endorse the proposal, with stipulations. Proceed.

District Ranger: _____
Print *Signature* *Date*

Proponent Completes

Trail Proposal Process

STEP 4

Business Plan Summary

Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Project proponent from Step 1 summarizes costs from a business plan developed for this project. Costs must be pulled from business plan and inserted here with business plan submitted with this step as background.

1. NEPA Projected Costs

2. Project Implementation Costs

Project Implementation Costs identify some of the critical costs to completing the NEPA analysis business plan. These listed below are not all encompassing costs but do identify some of the critical costs to completing the implementation of the construction.

NOTE: Any improvements or infrastructure become property of the Black Hills National Forest, unless such improvements are authorized under another authority.

	Estimated Costs
Public Scoping (mailing cost)	\$
Alternative Development/Analysis	\$
Supplies and Materials	\$
Document in a CE, EA, or EIS	\$
Construction	\$
Inherently Governmental: Consultation with USF&W and SHPO (Reports)	\$
Signage, education plan, etc.	\$
Inherently Governmental: Decision Document	\$
Major Infrastructure Components	\$
Mail decision to those who participated in public scoping (mailing cost)	\$
TOTAL COST	\$

3. Annual and Long-Term Maintenance Costs

Long-Term Maintenance Costs – These estimates must be supported by an in-depth business plan. These listed below are not all encompassing costs but do identify some of the critical costs to completing the implementation of the construction.
NOTE: Any improvements, infrastructure or infrastructure become property of the Black Hills National Forest, unless such improvements are authorized under another authority.

	Estimated Costs
Estimated Annual Maintenance Cost	\$
Tread Maintenance to Standard	
Trail Clearing to Standard	
Supplies and Materials	\$
Signage, etc.	\$
Other	\$
Projected Replacement Cost	\$
Tread & Clearing	\$
Major Infrastructure Components	\$
Other	\$
Projected Removal and Restoration Cost	\$
Tread	
Major Infrastructure Components	\$
Other	\$
Total Estimated Other Costs	\$
TOTAL COST	\$

Stop Here – Official Use Only Beyond This Point

Signature

I do not support the proposal moving forward for further consideration.

I endorse proceeding to Step 5 to further evaluate this proposal.

District Ranger: _____
Print *Signature* *Date*

Agency Completes

Trail Proposal Process

STEP 5

District Final Review and Forest Supervisor Briefing

Date: _____

Instructions: District Ranger will review all five steps with District Recreation Staff and brief Forest Supervisor on recommendations to move to NEPA and potentially add to trail system.

Project Proposal Name: _____

Type of NEPA Action:

Reject

CE or EA

EIS

Potential issues:

MANAGE EFFECTIVELY

Consistency with Black Hills National Forest Direction and Plans

- Is trail proposal consistent with established Forest direction (e.g., regulation, directives), and other relevant planning documents (e.g., agency strategic plan goals)?

There appear to be some inconsistencies and/or there is uncertainty as to whether the trail will be managed consistent with Forest direction and plans.

1

The proposed trail is consistent with established Forest direction.

Trail Uniqueness and Other Providers – Are there other possible providers in the area such as state or county parks, private providers, or other USFS sites that currently offer a similar opportunity or experience?

Proposed trail requires access across private property (i.e. easement is required).

7

Proposed trail does not require access across private property (i.e. no easement required).

NEPA and Implementation – How likely is it that this project can/will be funded with a grant to complete NEPA and implement project?

There is a low probability or no firm commitment that a substantial amount of funding can be secured to **complete NEPA for the project.**

30

There is a high probability or a firm commitment that a substantial amount of funding can be secured to **complete NEPA for the project.**

There is a low probability or no firm commitment that a substantial amount

31

There is a high probability or a firm

of funding can be received to implement the project.		commitment that a substantial amount of funding can be received to implement the project.
Annual Maintenance Costs - How will the trail affect long-term annual maintenance costs?		
The project will add long-term annual maintenance costs (inspections, repairs, etc.).	32	The trail has financial commitments through fees, partners, community support, etc., that will cover the costs of long-term annual maintenance.

Stop Here – Official Use Only Beyond This Point

Signature		
<input type="checkbox"/>	I do not support the proposal moving forward for further consideration. This document shall be submitted to the proponent, under a cover letter explaining rationale for denial of their proposal.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I endorse the proposal. Proceed.	
District Ranger: _____		
<i>Print</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>

Signature		
<input type="checkbox"/>	I do not support the proposal moving forward for further consideration. This document shall be submitted to the proponent, under a cover letter explaining rationale for denial of their proposal.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I endorse the proposal, with stipulations. Proceed.	
Forest Supervisor: _____		
<i>Print</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>