

ITDS: Core Questions Attributes Considered But Dropped or Deferred

Core Questions and Attributes Considered, but Dropped or Deferred for Further Consideration

Discussion record and rationale for those Core Questions, Attributes and concepts that were considered in detail, but dropped from further consideration as Interagency Core Trails Data Standards; and for those items deferred for possible consideration/development in the future.

Core Questions Considered but Dropped		
(Concept was considered in detail, but dropped from further consideration as indicated by text marked with a red strikethrough)		
Core Question	Rationale	
General Questions for All System Trails (including NSTs and NHTs)		
Basic Information	What is the trail width? (average, max, min)	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the trail depth? (average, max, min)	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the trail elevation? (average, max, min)	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What are the basic characteristics of the trail?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the trail width?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the trail grade? (average, maximum)	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the trail cross slope?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the landform-prevailing side slope?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
Management & Use	Maintenance histories	Interagency relevance? Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Maintenance requirements	Interagency relevance? Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What hazards exist on the trail?	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the safety rating?	Difficult to consistently define and quantify at interagency level. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Capacity (trails, associated developed sites, weight limits)	Difficult to quantify at interagency level: No interagency standardized capacity classification system exists Too specific/detailed for tracking at interagency level*
	Available (open and available?)	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Season-of-use	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Volunteers	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
Integrity & Setting	What is the protection status of the trail? (protected, threatened, unprotected)	Difficult to consistently define and quantify at interagency level, considering individual agency missions (i.e.. multiple use)
	How protected is the trail?	Difficult to consistently define and quantify at interagency level, considering individual agency missions (i.e.. multiple use)
	What is the ROS class?	Classification system not used by all 3 agencies. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the VRM class? (view shed)	Difficult to quantify at interagency level: No interagency standardized visual classification system exists. Too specific/detailed for tracking at interagency level
	What is the visual integrity of the trail viewshed?	Difficult to quantify at interagency level: No interagency standardized visual classification system exists. Too specific/detailed for tracking at interagency level
	What is the Landscape setting? (meadow, forest, farm land) i.e. Bailey/Keuchler classification system for wilderness	Difficult to quantify at interagency level: No interagency standardized setting classification system exists. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
Heritage Resources	Is cultural/paleo clearance needed for maintenance?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Are cultural/paleo features present?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Historic sites	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level, although may have some interagency applicability for NSTs and NHTs*
	What documentation/historical research is available? (NHT)	Information available at local level. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
Adjacent Natural Resources	What is the prevailing land use?	Interagency relevance? Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What is the ecosystem? (Ecology)	Interagency relevance? Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Are there Threatened and Endangered species?	Duplicative: Tracked in other resource databases. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Geological features/resources (oil, fossils, minerals)	Duplicative: Tracked in other resource databases. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Forest resources	Duplicative: Tracked in other resource databases. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Natural resources	Duplicative: Tracked in other resource databases. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
"Things" Along the Trail	Where are the "things" on the trail (i.e., waterbars, dips, bridges, viewpoints, etc.)?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What structures are along the trail?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What features are monitored along the trail?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What facilities are available along the trail?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What constructed features exist along the trail?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Signage	Interagency relevance? Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Markers and monuments (survey, historical)	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What coincident features exist along the trail?	Interagency relevance? Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What things does the trail cross (junctions, intersections) what things cross the trail?	Basic information available from existing sources (i.e.. Road layers, city locations)

ITDS: Core Questions Attributes Considered But Dropped or Deferred

Permits	Fees	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Permits	Interagency relevance? Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What agreements exist? (leases, easements, ROWs, certifications, MOUs)	Interagency relevance? Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
Visitor Info.	Visitors	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	Visitor facilities	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level, although may have some interagency applicability for NSTs and NHTs*
	Visitor use information (numbers, demographics)	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
Planning	What planning documents/decisions exist and how can they be obtained?	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level, although may have some interagency applicability for NSTs and NHTs (i.e. NST/NHT Comprehensive Plans)*
	What year was the planning decision document signed?	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level, although may have some interagency applicability for NSTs and NHTs (i.e. NST/NHT Comprehensive Plans)*
	What agency(ies) developed the plan?	Too site-specific and dynamic. Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level, although may have some interagency applicability for NSTs and NHTs (i.e. NST/NHT Comprehensive Plans)*
Misc.	What are the seasonal weather conditions?	Interagency relevance? Too site-specific and dynamic.
	How difficult is the trail?	Too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
	What social trails exist and what is their impact?	ITDS only apply to system, developed and/or managed trails. Tracking social trails considered too detailed, specific and/or costly for tracking at interagency level*
NHT-Specific Questions		
NHT-Specific	What is the potential for the visitor to view or experience the NHT route as it originally existed?	Does not meet interagency relevance or feasibility selection criteria.
	What is the area of the NHT associated site?	Does not meet interagency feasibility selection criteria
	What threats exist to the NHT?	Too broad and/or not consistently applicable under agency multiple-use objectives.
	What changes in land uses could impair or enhance the NHT?	Too broad, subjective, and difficult to define/quantify.
	What is the historic integrity of the NHT routes and sites?	Basic information available from existing sources (i.e., Road layers, city locations)
Core Questions Considered but Deferred (Deferred for potential future consideration)		
NST / NHT	NST & NHT Question: What visitor facilities exist along the NST or NHT?	Question pending validation/development of data standards by RecOneStop Team or subsequent ITDS effort.
NHT	NHT¹ & NHT² Question: How much does it cost to manage the NHT? (administration, planning, construction, maintenance) Question deferred for NHT ¹ & NHT ² for resolution at later date. (NHT ¹ included in Core Question 12.)	Important question, but resolution postponed because lack of readily available data, difficulty in consistently quantifying/answering between agencies (i.e. management of heritage resource sites), and current higher data priorities.

* Question too specific, difficult and/or costly to track, summarize and update at the interagency level (although may be valuable at the internal agency or trail-specific level for planning and management).

ITDS: Core Questions Attributes Considered But Dropped or Deferred

Attributes and/or Attribute Codes Considered but Dropped (Concept was considered in detail, but dropped from further consideration as indicated by text marked with red strikethrough)					
Attribute Name	Attribute Definition	Code	Code Definition	Notes	Rationale
ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY	Agency or entity responsible for the land where the trail or trail segment physically resides.				<i>Attribute determined to be unnecessarily redundant; the information can be derived from the ITDS attributes "Agency Data Source" and "Admin Org"</i>
ASSOCIATION WITH NHT	Type of affiliation between Visitor Center to the NHT.	THEMATIC GEOGRAPHIC ETC...			
DATE RECORD CREATED	The date that the basic trail record was created.	yyyy/mm/dd	(8-character numeric: year/month/day)	USFS = Created_Date (<i>Infra Trails: existing</i>) NPS=Day/Month/Year	<i>Covered by ITDS Metadata Protocols applicable to all data</i>
DATE RECORD UPDATED	The date that the basic trail record was last updated.	yyyy/mm/dd	(8-character numeric: year/month/day)	USFS = Modified_Date (<i>Infra Trails: existing</i>) NPS=Day/Month/Year	<i>Covered by ITDS Metadata Protocols applicable to all data</i>
DESIGNED USE	The intended use that controls the desired geometric design of the trail, and determines the subsequent maintenance parameters for the trail. (One Designed Use per trail or trail segment)	VIEWED-NHT VIEWED, NOT TRAVELED	Designed Use is viewing, observation or appreciation of historically used NHT remnant, rather than actual use as a current travelway.	Code applicable only to those portions of designated NHT's that were historically used segments, now preserved for viewing & education.	<i>Attribute will not be applied to NHT² (visible NHT remnants preserved for observation & appreciation, but not as a current travelway)</i>
HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE	The officially recognized historic significance of the trail segment.	INELIGIBLE NOT ELIGIBLE	Site has been evaluated and determined to <u>not</u> meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, with SHPO/ACHP concurrence.		<i>Replace "Ineligible" with "Not Eligible"</i>
HR AGE/PERIOD	Age or period of the NHT-associated heritage resource.				<i>Not needed at interagency level. Intent of this attribute can be generally derived from the NHT that the historic resource is associated with.</i>
HR FUNCTION	Function of the NHT-associated heritage resource.				<i>Standardized lists do not exist</i>
MANAGED USE	The mode(s) of travel that are actively managed and appropriate, considering the design and management of the trail. (One or more Managed Uses may be identified per trail or trail segment.)	VIEWED-NHT VIEWED, NOT TRAVELED	Managed Use is viewing, observation or appreciation of historically used NHT remnant, rather than actual use as a current travelway.	Code applicable only to those portions of designated NHT's that were historically used segments, now preserved for viewing & education.	<i>Attribute will not be applied to NHT² (visible NHT remnants preserved for observation & appreciation, but not as a current travelway)</i>
MANAGING AGENCY	Agency or entity that has long-term responsibility for management of the trail or trail segment.			No overlap allowed. In this context, "management" includes the planning, management, funding and the on-the-ground construction and maintenance of the trail. Managing Org usually is the same as Admin Org, but not always (as in the case of trails meandering across agency or unit boundaries, where an agreement has been established for one entity to take lead management responsibility for the trail). For NSTs and NHTs, this attribute represents the "trail manager" for that trail segment, and may or may not be the same as the NHT/NST Trail Administrator.	<i>Attribute determined to be unnecessarily redundant; the information can be derived from the ITDS attributes "Agency Data Source" and "Managing Org"</i>

ITDS: Core Questions Attributes Considered But Dropped or Deferred

MILEAGE-SOURCE	The source of the measure points recorded for the route segment.	ARC - Spatial Data			Covered by ITDS Metadata Protocols applicable to all data
PROXIMITY-TO-NHT	Proximity of the NHT-associated Visitor Center to the N	ON NEARBY ETC...		For NSTs and NHTs, this attribute represents the "trail manager" for that trail segment, and may or may not be the same as the NHT/NST Trail Administrator.	Considered to help answer the Core Question: What Visitor Centers are specifically associated with the NHT or NST? Dropped because of specificity and interagency relevance questions.
SPECIAL MGMT AREAS	Land area, that may be of special management concern or interest, through which the trail or trail segment crosses. (For specifics refer to official definitions for the Congressionally, Presidentially and/or Agency-designated areas listed.)	ERMA - EXTENSIVE RECREATION-MANAGEMENT AREA			These types of designated special management area are not widely applicable. Record under "Other" and enter specific management area name in "Remarks".
		NCMPRA - NATIONAL COOPERATIVE-MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION AREA			
		NPRA - NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE-AREA			
		SCK - SIGNIFICANT CAVE OR KARST			
		SMA - SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA			
		WWL - WATCHABLE WILDLIFE VIEWING AREA			
TRAIL-IDENTIFIER NUMBER	The official identifier for the trail.				Changed to TRAIL NUMBER
Attributes and/or Attribute Codes Deferred (for potential future consideration)					
TRAIL INTEGRITY or Adjacent Activity / Development ?	The status of the trail and immediate trail setting in terms of adjacent activities and /or development.	INTEGRITY INTACT	No adjacent activities or developments exist that conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		Difficult to consistently define and quantify at interagency level, considering individual agency missions (i.e.. multiple use).
		GRAZING - EXISTING, COMPATIBLE	Activity is present and does not conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		GRAZING - EXISTING, INCOMPATIBLE	Activity is present and does conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		GRAZING - PLANNED, COMPATIBLE	Activity is planned and does not conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		GRAZING - PLANNED, INCOMPATIBLE	Activity is planned and does conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		GRAZING - POTENTIAL, COMPATIBLE	Activity is possible and does not conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		GRAZING - POTENTIAL, INCOMPATIBLE	Activity is possible and does conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		TIMBER HARVEST - EXISTING, COMPATIBLE	Activity is present and does not conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		TIMBER HARVEST - EXISTING, INCOMPATIBLE	Activity is present and does conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		TIMBER HARVEST - PLANNED, COMPATIBLE	Activity is planned and does not conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		TIMBER HARVEST - PLANNED, INCOMPATIBLE	Activity is planned and does conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		TIMBER HARVEST - POTENTIAL, COMPATIBLE	Activity is possible and does not conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		TIMBER HARVEST - POTENTIAL, INCOMPATIBLE	Activity is possible and does conflict with the values for which the trail is being managed.		
		ROAD - (existing, planned, potential)			
UTILITIES - (existing, planned, potential)					
OTHER DEVELOPMENT - (existing, planned, potential)		(specify in Remarks)			
VISITOR FACILITY ACTIVITIES	Pending			Applicable to NST and NHT ³ . Optional for all other trails (information can be determined through other existing attributes.)	
VISITOR FACILITY CONTACT INFORMATION	Pending			Applicable to NST, NHT ¹ and NHT ³ .	Pending consideration, definition, development by RecOneStop Team.....
VISITOR FACILITY LOCATION	Pending			Applicable to NST, NHT ¹ and NHT ³ .	Pending consideration, definition, development by RecOneStop Team.....