



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

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail Planning & Feasibility Stakeholders Representative Group Meeting #4

March 10, 2009

6:00 p.m.

Staff in Attendance:

Gladys Cornell, Aim Consulting; Tony Powers, Alta Planning; Mike Dour, City of Roseville Public Works/Alternative Transportation (COR PW-AT); Mike Wixon, COR PW-AT; Elizabeth Haydu COR PW-AT (Note-taker); Matt Friedman, California Department of Transportation

Stakeholders in Attendance:

Joe Orsini, Neighborhood Assn; Keith Hallsten, Hillcrest Neighborhood Assn; David Allen, Biking Roseville; Jim Williams, Meadow Oaks Neighborhood Assn.; Scott Reid, Maidu Neighborhood Assn.; Ron Kampling, Mercy Healthcare; Susan Somers, Dry Creek Conservancy

Interested Parties in Attendance:

Dallas Kipp; Michael Joseph; Phil Germond; David Schmidt

Invited Guest:

Dennis Cleary, Folsom Trail-side Homeowner

Project Status

A summary of the project outreach efforts and project status was provided by Gladys Cornell. Ms. Cornell noted that the primary goal for the meeting is to poll group on segment preferences.

Trail Experiences of Folsom Resident Cleary

Invited guest, Dennis Cleary, spoke to relate his experience living next to trails in Folsom. Questions were asked by stakeholders and interested parties in attendance. Issues discussed included:

- Although it was a concern of his wife's when they first lived next to a trail, Mr. Cleary stated that security has not been an issue while living adjacent to a trail.
- Mr. Cleary stated that there were not a lot of smokers on the trail, and he had not observed any fires in the open space behind his home. However, he stated that he had never personally observed any enforcement of Folsom's "no smoking" law.
- Mr. Cleary believed that desirability of property is greater adjacent to and in close proximity to trail, based upon anecdotal evidence (i.e. many long-term owners, stable neighborhood.)
- In response to a question, Mr. Cleary stated that transients are not an issue along the trail segment upon which he lived. This was acknowledged by the group as a distinction between that particular trail in Folsom and the open space near Darling/Machado, where transients are present.
- Mr. Cleary noted that trail users occasionally parked on residential streets, but usually it was during the day and of limited duration, so it was not a concern. At times cars would park at night, and then neighbors would call the Police.

Discussion of Alignment Evaluation Criteria

Tony Powers summarized changes to the alignment evaluation criteria. Joe Orsini suggested moving *environmental interpretation* to *trail users*. Mike Dour indicated that there is an awareness tie-in and is not opposed to moving it – but the immediate benefit is for the enjoyment of open space.

Mike Dour Summarized the study for those who hadn't attended prior meetings.

Alignment Preference Feedback

Sheet 1 – The Stakeholders reached a consensus that segments B-1A and B-1B are preferred over Segments A1, C & D. The primary reasons for this are:

- Enhanced land use compatibility of B-1A and B-1B since A1 would put the trail in very close proximity to residential fence lines
- Reduced potential for erosion and environmental impacts of B-1A and B-1B in comparison to A1
- Better transportation system and recreational user performance of B-1A and B-1B in relation to C & D.

The Stakeholders did not reach a consensus regarding segments A2 vs. B2. Considerations under discussion were:

- Joe Orsini stated that most creekside homeowners in the Hillcrest area prefer B2 because they prefer the increased separation that B2 provides.
- Joe Orsini acknowledged that A2 provides better neighborhood access than B2.
- David Allen stated that A2 makes sense from a transportation standpoint given the type of connections that would be made west of Riverside.
- Mike Dour noted that if B2 were chosen, the right-of-way requirements and/or potential impact to wildlife habitat would be significant. B2 would likely require a structure along the creek bank, further increasing the cost.
- The group discussed whether on-street parking would be allowed with the on-street alignments. Mike Dour noted that existing on-street parking will remain, and that bicyclists would likely be required to share the travel lane with motorists. The Stakeholders did not express strong support for on-street options. Joe Orsini asked whether or not bike lanes could be placed on Darling to serve Cirby School, regardless of the chosen alignment. MD will ask Engineering to review. (Note: After the meeting, Engineering informed Mr. Dour that bike lanes could not be installed on Darling Way, since it would require removal of parking in front of single family homes.)
- Joe Orsini expressed concern regarding recent erosion that has caused oak trees to be undercut. Mr. Orsini also noted that a sandbar is developing at proposed bridge 4.

Sheet 2 – The Stakeholders reached a consensus that option 2-2 (segments B3, B4, B5 & B6) was preferred, along with a neighborhood connection to JoAnne Lane using Bridge 7. The primary reason for this determination is that the Stakeholders believed that this alignment would be more compatible with the surrounding land uses. Joe Orsini noted that at least one homeowner on JoAnne Lane expressed concerns with bridge 7, but that bridge would be acceptable if the main trail alignment stays on the south side of the creek, but bridge 7 would not be acceptable if the on-street alternative was chosen instead of option 2-2. The Stakeholders supported bridge 7 for neighborhood access purposes.

Sheet 3 – The Stakeholders reached consensus in support of Option 3-4, (B-6, B-7, B-8a/b, B-8c). The Stakeholders noted that:

- There is not much difference between B8A and B8B, so the primary determining factor should be cost and environmental impacts

- Dour noted that it is feasible to place a trail near the house along B7, and that there is an existing trail easement along B7
- Option 3-4 eliminates unneeded creek crossings

Sheets 4 & 5 - The Stakeholders did not express any concerns with segments B9 & B10, which are the only options from Eastwood Park to the Cirby Creek/Linda Creek confluence. Also, the Stakeholders did not have any concerns with Segment A8, the only option along Linda Creek as the proposed trail approaches Oakridge Drive. However, the Stakeholders could not reach a consensus on the intervening placement of the trail as it passes Sunrise Avenue, with the choices being use of bridge 13 and Segment A7, or Segments B11/B12 with bridge 14. The Stakeholders discussed the following:

- Segment A7 does not afford access to Sunrise Avenue.
- If Segment A7 is used, the potential connection to Sundown Way was discussed as a way to provide access to the businesses along Sunrise Avenue. The group discussed user safety concerns and right-of-way concerns with the Sundown Way connection.
- Segment A7 utilizes an existing earthen bench that was built as a maintenance access road with the flood control project. The width of the existing bench is 12 feet or less. This means that either a wall and earthen fill would be needed to construct the trail to City standards, or the trail would have to be built sub-standard.
- Segments B11 & B12 both have the potential to provide access to Sunrise.
- Segment B11's connection to Sunrise would be in very close proximity to the existing office building at 730 Sunrise Avenue.
- Segment A7, B11 & B12 would all require purchase of right-of-way.
- Segment B11/B12 would impact a greater number of native oak trees, mostly in the proximity of the building at 730 Sunrise Avenue.
- Segment A7 would result in the removal of a greater amount of flood control project mitigation plantings.
- Construction of bridge 14, which would be required for construction of B11 & B12, may be made difficult (in comparison to bridge 13, which is a part of the A7 option) due to its location in relation to the flood control project's overflow pipes.
- David Allen expressed support for B11/B12 option due to the importance of connectivity to Sunrise.
- Ron Kampling expressed support of B11/B12 due to concern with A 7 being narrow and intruding on the creek.
- Jim Williams expressed support for A7 because he believes that was the original preference when the flood control project was built, and because it puts all the hardscape on one side of the creek.
- Mike Dour noted that Gordon Stevenson, absent representative of commercial property owners, prefers A7.
- It was noted that Segment A8's crossing of Oakridge Drive (crossing D) has some site distance concerns that will need to be addressed during project engineering.

Sheet 6 - The Stakeholders reached consensus in support of Option 6-1, which uses Segments A9, A10 & A13, with a potential connection to Dana Way using bridge 16.

Sheet 7 – The Stakeholders reached consensus in support of Option 7-1 or 7-2, which uses Segments A13, A14 & A15a or A15b. Jim Williams noted that the Blue Jay Drive neighbors preferred not having the trail on their side of the creek, but that a connection to blue Jay Drive at bridge 17 may be acceptable. The group discussed crossing Rocky Ridge Dr. and Linda Creek:

- The group favored an undercrossing of Rocky Ridge Drive by using the existing 10' box culvert. The group did not support use of a bridge over Rocky Ridge due to visual concerns. The group also did not support use of the signalized crossing of Rocky Ridge at Cirby due to trail user safety concerns.
- Under Rocky Ridge preferred. No preference regarding bridge 18 and looping back. Yellow (B) route preferred to keep further away from Larkin Drive. A18 to bridge 20 to Strap Ravine. Felt 20A would be secondary viable option.

- David Allen and Ron Kampling expressed support in favor of using A15a, which would use bridge 18 to cross from the north to south side of Linda Creek, rather than looping the trail back to Rocky Ridge and then crossing. On behalf of the Maidu Neighborhood Association, Scott Reid stated that there was no preference regarding the use of bridge 18 versus the loop back to Rocky Ridge.

Sheet 8 – Stakeholders reached consensus in support of either Option 8-1 or 8-2, which use Segments A16, A17 or B16, A18 and A19 to N. Cirby Way. Additional discussion regarding A17 versus B16:

- It was noted that some Larkin Drive neighbors have expressed a preference for use of B16 versus A17, due to increased separation from their homes. Mr. Dour noted, however, that A17 is still separated from the Larkin Drive homes by the actual creek channel, so use of A17 would not be considered a compatibility issue.
- Mike Dour noted that A17 parallels the sewer line, so it may be preferred by our Environmental Utilities Department. However, A17 is located between the main creek channel and the overflow channel, so construction may prove difficult.
- Mike Dour also noted that A17 & B16 may both conflict with flood control project mitigation plantings.

The Stakeholders agreed that additional evaluation to be conducted during preliminary engineering & environmental review phase is necessary to determine which of those two segments to use.

Sheet 9 – The Stakeholders reached the consensus that the Strap Ravine option was not necessary at this time. The following was discussed:

- Strap Ravine is a beautiful corridor that would make for a nice trail. However, it would include 2 bridge crossings (crossings 23 & 24) and earthen fill to get up to McLaren Drive, making this a costly segment. This option would also require a mid-block crossing which would require Engineering review.
- The City has not received any comments from Strap Ravine homeowners regarding this segment, but in the past they have expressed concern with a trail connection.
- Access to Maidu Park is already provided from the Linda Creek open space via Champion Oaks Drive, which includes a bike lane for part of its length and relatively light traffic.
- Access to Maidu Park is also provided by the existing paved path on the east side of Rocky Ridge Drive at Balboa Drive. This path is in good condition. It's the shortest route to Maidu Park's parking lots and restrooms, has a signalized crossing of McLaren and is an overall good option for access. Balboa is longer than going on Rocky Ridge.
- The Strap Ravine option would provide access to a currently isolated sewer manhole, so perhaps this segment would be better pursued if and when the City's Environmental Utilities Department determines it needs improved access to the manhole.

Sheet 10 – The Stakeholders reached consensus in support of Option 10-1 or 10-2, which use Segments A20 or A21 and A22

- Segment A21 may result in removal of flood mitigation plantings, which is a permitting and cost concern.
- Segment A21 would also result in placement of the trail much closer to the creek, thereby increasing the chance of damage to the trail during high water levels.
- It was noted that Segment A20 eliminates much of the conflict with flood control mitigation plantings and damage during floods, but may require some oak tree removals. Segment A20 may also require right-of-way acquisition through undeveloped property that is zoned Floodway.
- Scott Reid noted that A20 would be most visible from Samoa Way/Hurst, enhancing security, but trail users may prefer to be near the creek (A21).

The Stakeholders agreed that additional evaluation to be conducted during preliminary engineering & environmental review phase is necessary to determine which of those two segments to use.

Sheet 11 – The Stakeholders reached consensus in support of Option 11-1, which uses Segment A22 based upon the following:

- Dour noted that along this stretch there is sufficient room on each side of the creek to place a trail, but on both sides there are a couple of pinch points where the trail would approach the rear yard wall/fence of adjacent residences.
- It was noted that many of the mobile home park residents object to B18, which would place the trail on their side of the creek. On the other hand, several residents on the W. Colonial Parkway side of the creek object to A22, which would place the trail on their side of the creek.
- Dour noted that the flood walls on the W. Colonial Parkway side of the creek are all at least 5 feet high, and in most areas up to 6 high. The wall enhances compatibility between the trail and the adjacent homes on W. Colonial Parkway.
- In some areas on the mobile home side of the creek, the flood wall is relatively low in relation to the ground levels, such that it is only 2' high and can be easily crossed by a pedestrian. This creates a security concern for mobile home park residents. This concern could be addressed by additional fencing, but there may still be a visual concern.
- Scott Reid noted that he ostensibly represents the W. Colonial Parkway neighbors and not the mobile home park, since the mobile home park is in another neighborhood association. With that said, he believes that the appropriate location for the trail is A22 on the W. Colonial Parkway side, not the mobile home side.
- David Allen noted that there was no compelling reason to choose B18.
- Dour noted that A22 is aligned with the sewer main, and would be the preference of the Environmental Utilities Department.

Sheet 12 – The Stakeholders reached consensus in support of Option 12-1, which uses Segment A23 & A24. There was discussion of the following:

- Dour noted that the Spahn Ranch subdivision proposed by the City included sufficient room for A23 & A24.
- Segments A23 & A24 would not be necessary unless Placer County chooses to continue the trail eastward. Although this is included in the Placer County. Bikeways Plan, the County is not actively pursuing an eastward connection at this time.
- On an interim basis, trail users would have to use the on-street bike lanes on Old Auburn to go east. David Allen stated that a connection to Old Auburn is important and would be heavily used. The group noted that the undercrossing of Old Auburn should be installed when Segment A22 is put in to enable bicyclists to safely access both sides of Old Auburn.
- Tony Powers explained that Bridge 29 could be used in combination with A23 and B19 to form a loop at the end of the trail until such time as Placer County extended the trail. David Allen did not see a compelling reason or advantage to have a loop.
- The group noted that there are two potential locations for trailhead parking. Dour noted that the parcel on the northeast corner of Cirby and Old Auburn was steep and filled with native oaks. For that reason, consideration should be given to locating the trailhead on the City property across from Lund Drive on Old Auburn Road.

Next Steps: The City is planning one more Stakeholders meeting, with the goal to review the draft plan and the two segments for which the group did not reach consensus. An announcement will be sent 2-3 weeks in advance, when the draft plan is available.