



Public Works
Alternative Transportation
401 Vernon Street
Roseville, California 95678-2600

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail Planning & Feasibility Stakeholders Representative Group Meeting

February 19, 2009

6:00 p.m.

Staff in Attendance:

Gladys Cornell, Aim Consulting; Tony Powers, Alta Planning; Mike Dour, COR PW-AT; Mike Wixon, COR PW-AT; Elizabeth Haydu COR PW-AT (Note-taker);

Stakeholders in Attendance:

Joe Orsini, Hillcrest Neighborhood Assn.; Keith Hallsten, Hillcrest Neighborhood Assn.; David Allen, Biking Roseville; Jim Williams, Meadow Oaks Neighborhood Assn.; Dallas Kipp, Meadow Oaks Neighborhood Assn.; Scott Reid, Maidu Neighborhood Assn.; Eileen Spangler, Warren T. Eich Intermediate School; Ron Kampling, Mercy Healthcare; Gordon Stevenson, Commercial Property Owner

Interested Parties in Attendance:

Ken and Frances Mentzer; Michael Joseph

Introductions and Project status

Provided by Gladys Cornell.

Overview of Rating Criteria

Mike Dour reviewed the rating criteria. Mike explained that the current rating table includes 17 questions that came out of the original evaluation matrix, which had 50 bullet points. The rating scale to be applied:

- + = Best meets the criteria
- 0 = Generally meets the criteria
- = Least meets the criteria

David Allen asked whether the table would be used as a tool to pick an alignment preference and alternatives. Mike Dour confirmed, and noted that it would be referenced in the future as needed during the environmental review and engineering phases of the project.

Mike mentioned that the draft ratings were prepared by Alta, but not yet reviewed by the City. Scott Reid asked about parenthetical review. Tony Powers answered that the parentheses indicated tentative response, and that they would be replaced after further review of the biological study.

Joe Orsini expressed a need for clarification of the definitions of the application of the rating scale. Joe feels it is necessary to define the perspective used and open for discussion. Gladys noted that not all reviewers will rate the questions identically, and that perspectives will vary. Mike Dour also noted that in part this is a tool for engaging in discussion.

Eileen Spangler: A key is needed. The group agreed.

Mike Dour suggested that stakeholders e-mail any other suggestions for the matrix, so that it can be finalized before the next Stakeholders meeting.

Overview of Trail Alternatives

Tony: Short explanation of how to read Alignment Alternatives Sheets using the key and following the description, map and using the criteria example given. (MD suggested that the criteria sheet also reference the segment #s.) MD noted that a more detailed evaluation of Darling, Rocky Ridge, & Sunrise crossings will be available at next meeting.)

Sheet 1:

Tony noted that crossing expense, safety will be determining factors.

Issues: A1 – Not a lot of ROW against back fences. Protection from erosion, retaining walls necessary. Positive to homeowners is that City would maintain the creek bank, direct access to trail. There is a good bridge connection at creek crossing #4. B-1 – Adjacency advantage in access to parking directly off of Riverside – *potentially* – City may look to acquire for flood control. B2 – Business parking lot, on street.

A1 vs. B1-B2 – No major difference when the criteria are applied.

Keith Hallsten: In reference to Segment B2 Keith mentioned that from a trail user's point of view, having the trail adjacent to a large concrete wall would be an eyesore.

MD: South side, B2 would have significant environment impacts and significant costs due to ROW acquisition. South side to the west is very problematic.

Ron Kampling: Due to restricted access to B1/B2 from the neighborhood, Darling must be used. On-street parking makes cycling on Darling dangerous. Tony replied that Darling is not ideal, but it does not have heavy traffic volumes.

Tony: B1 to A2 is more promising. There is access to both sides of the creek over a short distance.

David pointed out that the connection at creek crossing #3 is important, as the regional connection. Tony confirmed.

Sheet 2

Tony: On the south side there is no connection to the Hillcrest Neighborhood. Retaining walls and ROW access acquisition would be needed.

Mike Wixon asked about the potential for environment impact. MD answered that on B4 would have more impact due to numerous trees/foliage.

Joe asked why A2 seemed to be closer to the homes than the creek. Tony mentioned that the lines are schematic and are not intended to note exact trail location. Group noted that there might be some room to shift A2 slightly closer to the creek, towards but not past the slope shown on the topo survey.

Tony described the on street connections.

Tony noted that the option going from north to south then north to south again (A2 to B3 to A3 to B5) is advantageous from a trail users perspective because it provides access to residences on both sides of the creek.

Sheet 3

Tony: On B7, there would be a 6-8' visual, topographic separation and not a significant structure necessary due to existing bench. A6 is next to a house (the Lee residence or castle), requires retaining wall, but would avert the need for building a bridge.

Eileen asked why there was a reason not to stay on the north side. Tony noted the proximity to the Lee residence and that as you approach Eastwood Park, the bank is not wide enough to support a trail.

David asked why the plan included both B8A and B8B. Tony noted that B8A represents widening the sidewalk along Marlin to avoid crossing 10, while B8B is through the open space and requires bridge 10.

Sheet 4

Tony noted that there is really only one option (B9) as the creek passes Eastwood Park. At the confluence of Cirby & Linda Creek, there is a possibility of using either the north or south side.

Sheet 5

Tony noted that the north side option does not permit access to Sunrise Avenue due to the flood walls. If north side is used, there would be no choice but to stay on the north side all the way to Oak Ridge Drive. MD noted that the bench on the north side was created for maintenance of the flood wall and that it is at best 12' wide, but possibly narrower. To achieve a standard trail design, retaining walls within the creek would be necessary.

Tony noted that the south side offers an opportunity to access Sunrise, but is in close proximity to existing office buildings. Also, crossing 14 is problematic due to limited space afforded by the flood control retaining walls and the overflow pipe outfall. Tony noted that topography precludes a trail on the south side east of Meadow Gate Drive.

Keith noted that access to businesses is important.

Gordon Stevenson pointed out that there are many accidents coming out of the Spaghetti Factory parking lot onto Sunrise and from business parks on both sides of the street, and that a traffic signal is desirable there. MD noted that signal engineers are opposed to installation of a signal due to traffic flow issues. Also, there is a safety concern associated with a bike/ped only activated signal due to initial low use of user activated signal and surprise to drivers upon encountering. Keith stated that he understands why traffic people wouldn't want a signal. MD said that between now and March 10th he will ask Traffic Signal Engineering Technicians to re-evaluate.

Gordon asked for clarification of the segment shown from Sundown to Linda Creek. Sundown along Sunrise to Linda is sidewalk use. Disregard the purple dashed line on the map. Tony indicated that the line would be removed.

Tony: Although the draft rating criteria rate A7 higher, Tony stated that City may be leaning towards B11 & B12 line to facilitate access to Sunrise

The group discussed feasibility of using the north line (A7) and providing access to Sunrise through parking lots. MD noted that this is possible but not ideal from a trail users perspective.

Also, MD noted that commercial property owners would not likely support this. MW noted that obtain legal access through parking lots would be a big undertaking.

Eileen asked if we go with A7, can we still provide bridge crossing #14. Tony noted that this was possible. MW noted that this would be desirable by providing access to Meadow Gate Drive, allowing that subdivision to have easier access to Sierra Gardens school.

Gordon: Opposed to going directly behind Sundown commercial buildings. He owns a building (& is in negotiation to purchase another) that the trail would go behind. Expects increase in graffiti and window breakage. Security is an issue. People will be given access and a right to be there. They can see in the building, especially at night, and can see when people leave. He expressed concern that a trail located there would devalue his property because one of the draws to leaseholders is the view they enjoy of the greenway. Gordon stated that he may not have a problem with the segment going down Sundown through the parking lot. No liability concern with the use of the parking lot, though he does not own the last (west-most) building.

It was noted that the trail is closed at night, so tenants could call PD if they observe anyone loitering. Tony also discussed a situation in Folsom where installation of a trail next to a school actually cut down on graffiti and vandalism at the school.

Sheet 6

Tony stated that Segments A9 through A12 are very feasible. A 10 goes along the existing sewer maintenance path, so that might be preferable. The B alignments are possible, but B14 would be right at the back yard fence of some homes. Tony also noted that some persons have expressed an interest to keeping the existing dirt trails on the south side of the creek unpaved. Mike Dour noted that A9 crosses school property.

Sheet 7

Tony noted again that B14 is close to fences and at yard level, so a trail is possible but not very compatible on this west bank. Also, there is limited room as the trail approaches Rocky Ridge.

A13 and A14 will require ROW acquisition, but otherwise are very compatible for a trail. One of the group noted that purchase of the ROW along A13/A14 should be for reduced value since the property is in the floodplain. MD agreed that the property's standing as floodplain would affect the valuation. Michael Joseph asserted that property owners can build on flood plain property. It is feasible to raise the property and bring it out of a flood plain. MD agreed that there is a process by which a person can request removing their property from the floodplain and that some but not all properties may qualify. MD offered to set up a meeting between Mr. Joseph and appropriate City staff who oversee floodplain issues.

David asked whether or not creek crossing #17 was existing or proposed. MD noted it was proposed, not existing.

Sheet 8

Tony noted that the existing culverts at Rocky Ridge Drive could be used for bike access, but they are not ideal since it is a long, confined and dark crossing. Tony also noted that a short wall would be required so under low-flow conditions it stays dry. 2.) Another option is to build a new tunnel under Rocky Ridge, 14' wide and 10' tall. David asked about the cost, and Tony stated estimates are not complete but it would be at least \$1,000,000.

Scott asked about access into the proposed parking lot at Rocky Ridge. Access to the property south is under discussion for construction and would be sensitive. MD noted that at best there would be right turn movements only.

Tony noted that segment B17 gets close to some of the homes on Jo Court and N. Cirby. He also noted that the on-street option is not ideal from a trail user perspective.

Tony noted that B15 is a “glorified sidewalk” and that heavy turning movements and volumes at Rocky Ridge and Cirby make this undesirable. Ron asked if under this option the sidewalk would be striped, and Tony confirmed that it would be.

Sheet 9: Tony noted that this segment is proposed as a connection to Maidu Park. Ron and Keith supported this connection. Scott stated that homeowners may have a negative opinion. MD noted other options (along Rocky Ridge path, and Champion Oaks.)

Sheet 10

Tony described the options. MD noted that some of the lots along segment A20 are part of a development proposal to remove dirt, adding it to parcels in the flood plain north of Samoa. The A21 bench has flood project mitigation plantings.

David asked which crossing of Champion Oaks is preferred. Tony noted that the two at the creek offer better visibilities. Site distances are all reasonable.

A question came up about the cost of minor bridges. Tony stated that they could be as little as \$50,000 up to \$100,000.

Sheet 11 & 12

Tony described the options for each of these segments, noting possibility of a trail head at Old Auburn/Cirby intersection (NE or SE corners).

Rating Criteria Discussion

Joe expressed a desire to review the rating criteria in terms of fire safety and emergency response. MD stated that the intention of the criteria is related to emergency and fire access. Open space maintenance of fire breaks and PD response to calls are the benefits of access to open space for PD and Fire. General discussion ensued regarding the need for intent of criteria to be clarified. Word-smithing is needed and questions need to be resolved. It was agreed that the criteria definitions of comparisons need to be refined. MW reminded that for now, the criteria is a tool to generate discussion. Use it along with the map and your knowledge of the area. Scott suggested using a blank version to solicit input from constituencies.

Next Steps:

Gladys:

- 1.) Revise Segment numbers.
- 2.) Work on Rating Criteria, especially related to emergency response and fire.
- 3.) Provide a blank criteria table for stakeholders to return with comments.

Gladys queried the group about inviting a homeowner to the next meeting who lives adjacent to a bike trail to answer questions. David suggested also inviting a business owner, and promoted the idea of having the invitees earlier than the next meeting, perhaps at the open house (Wednesday February 25th). Gordon volunteered to seek out a business owner visitor. Tony suggested Folsom businesses along segments within 10' of trail fence line. MD asked Tony to email information and a group effort could be made to contact business owners. Ron knows many facilities personnel. David suggested that it would be important that the individuals have before and after trail experience. Gladys confirmed that the homeowner does, indeed have pre and post trail experience.

Next meeting: Tuesday, March 10, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. Maidu Community Center.

Tentative Agenda:

- 1.) Go through the evaluation criteria.
- 2.) Review the full draft plan.