

October 27, 2009
6:00 p.m.
Maidu Community Center

Staff & Consulting Team Present:
Mike Dour, City of Roseville
Gladys Cornell, Aim Consulting

Stakeholder Representatives Present:
David Allen, Biking Roseville
Keith Hallsten, Hillcrest
Joe Orsini, Hillcrest Concerned Homeowners
Scott Reid, Maidu Neighborhood Association
Bill Schultz, Hillcrest Concerned Homeowners
Susan Somers, Dry Creek Conservancy
Eileen Spangler, Warren T. Eich Intermediate School
Gordon Stevenson, Sunrise Commercial Property Owner
Jim Williams, Meadow Oaks Neighborhood Association

Interested Parties Present:
Phil Germond, Hillcrest Resident
Phil Kister, Joanne Lane Resident
Jerry Turner,

1. Introduction & Project Overview

Gladys Cornell reported that the draft plan was sent out to stakeholder representatives by e-mail. Hard copies are available to take home.

2. Draft Plan Overview

Mike Dour presented the draft plan overview along with a summary of the history of stakeholder activity and discussion as it related to each section off the plan. Dour also explained opportunities for future review during the EIR process. The EIR process would include an Initial Study; focused Stakeholder and neighborhood involvement; EIR preparation by Consultant; Transportation Commission public hearing; and City Council review and approval. The process will take 1-1 ½ years to complete, starting late Spring-Summer. Mr. Orsini requested a flowchart of the process, and Dour indicated this would be provided by email.

Mr. Schultz asked when the feasibility study would be going to the Transportation Commission. Dour responded November 17 or December 15.

3. Preferred Trail Alignment Review

Dour summarized the preferred trail alignment.

Discussion of Sheets 1&2 (Segments A2 vs B2). Dour reviewed the options for crossing Darling Way, with an at-grade crossing likely. Mr. Orsini stated that an at-grade crossing is not preferred because cyclists would have to wait for traffic to clear before crossing, and he asked whether or not the trail would cross under Darling Way. Dour answered that an undercrossing is not off the table, but recently installed utility boxes create an obstacle. Use of bridge #1 is also still open for consideration. Jerry Turner also commented that funerals at St. Rose Church back up traffic. Dour noted trail users would have to wait for funeral procession to clear, just as they would when crossing a street.

Bridges 2 and 4 (or alternatively Bridge 3) would require hydraulic analysis with detailed topographic studies during the environmental review section. Segment A2 provides a potential connection to Hernandez/Machado. Segment B2 is more compatible with the Hillcrest

neighborhood concerns. The disadvantage of B2 is that it is steep, requires a good amount of grading work and retaining walls, with a possible bridge (environmental impacts) and ROW acquisition from the towing yard.

Mr. Orsini expressed concern with the evaluation criteria and scoring for Segments A2 vs B2. Dour reminded the group that the scoring was reviewed and agreed upon by the Stakeholders in Meetings 3 and 4. Dour agreed to meet with Mr. Orsini after the meeting to review. Findings will be sent to the group via email and, if necessary, a 7th stakeholder meeting would be scheduled prior to the Transportation Commission meeting.

Discussion of Sheets 4 & 5 (Segments A7 vs B11/12). Dour summarized the trail options beginning at the confluence of Cirby and Linda Creeks to Oakridge Drive. Dour noted that the basic options are on the north or south side of the creek, and that options through commercial parking lots were considered but determined by the Stakeholders to be undesirable, in part because the City previously studied a request for a signal at the corner of Sunrise and Sundown, and it was determined to be undesirable due to safety and traffic circulation reasons.

Dour noted that members of the Stakeholders group walked this area in August 2009. The participants on that walk agreed that, if access to Sunrise Avenue can be achieved, placing the trail on the north side was preferred because there is an existing bench for the trail that reduces compatibility and environmental concerns. Mr. Stevenson suggested a bridge from the north to the south side of Linda Creek on the east side of Sunrise to help achieve access to Sunrise. Dour noted that this would have to be a low flow crossing, which creates flooding concerns that would have to be addressed by a hydraulic study.

Discussion of Meadow Oaks Connections. Dour noted that there are two potential connections to the south side of the Meadow Oaks neighborhood, at bridge 16 or 17. Bridge 16 would lead to Dana Way and provide an opportunity for looped trails through the open space. Bridge 17 leads to Blue Jay Drive. The neighborhood is already using Dana Way, and neighbors may express concerns with the Blue Jay Bridge 17 access. As a result, Dana Way is preferred by the City.

4. Property Acquisition

Dour reviewed the maps of potential right-of-way acquisition. Mr. Kister asked if all issues regarding bridges and ROW will be resolved before construction begins. His concern was that construction would stop due to unresolved problems. Dour stated that a hydraulic analysis and environmental review phase will be completed before starting, and that it is not the intent to stop once the project is started. However, right-of-way will be acquired in phases, so there may be stand-alone trail segments on an interim basis.

5. Design Treatment

Trail Cross-Sections. Dour discussed options for trail design, including 1) Wider cross-section to enhance trail user comfort and compatibility between bicycles and pedestrians and 2) use of concrete (instead of asphalt) on entirety of trail to minimize maintenance costs. Options for trail design will be reviewed during the EIR and Final Engineering stages, with consideration to construction cost, maintenance, environmental impacts and trail user experience.

Ms. Somers asked if the City could use permeable surfaces on the trail, such as open grade asphalt. Dour noted that open grade asphalt has advantages on some roads, but may not be applicable to bike trails.

Mr. Hallsten stated that the City should consider use of decomposed granite instead of crushed rock (aggregate base) on shoulders. Dour stated that this may be possible if concerns related to erosion and maintenance are addressed.

Ms. Somers asked if bridges would be wood. Dour responded that bridge loading requirements may not allow for use of wooden bridges, but consideration can be given to making cement bridges more aesthetically pleasing.

Road Crossings. Dour reviewed the road crossing alternatives. The trail is planned to go under all major roads, with at-grade crossings for minor roads. Crossing of Darling Way to be studied further.

Trailhead Parking. Dour noted that three trailhead parking lot locations were identified. The Riverside location is highly likely to be developed. The Rocky Ridge location may be unlikely due to access limitations and neighborhood compatibility. The Old Auburn lot would be considered based upon need. Each location would be evaluated separately. Dour noted that we may consider use of permeable surfaces in the parking lots, such as aggregate base. Mr. Allen noted that aggregate base is dangerous for bicyclists, so a paved throughway from the trail to the adjacent street is necessary.

6. Safety and Security

Dour summarized the safety & security section of the plan. Dour noted that safety was the primary concern among respondents to the on-line survey.

Fencing. Dour discussed use of post & cable fencing along much of the trail to establish territorial reinforcement, which guides people to areas they should be and away from areas they should not be going.

Dour noted that property line fencing exists along most of the trail. Depending on proximity to properties, the City may facilitate fence installation for homeowners by studying the hydraulic impacts of an open fence during the environmental phase.

Mr. Kister asked if a fence would be installed along his property on Joanne Lane, with fencing going all the way to the street. Dour noted that at a minimum least post and cable fencing would be provided.

Landscaping. Dour noted that landscaping can provide additional territorial reinforcement, but it would need to be designed to maintain view sheds toward trail from residences so residents can keep an eye on the trail.

Video Cameras. Mr. Williams mentioned that the Meadow Oaks neighborhood will be installing a video camera to provide live streaming video surveillance system near Woodlake Lane. Dour stated that City-owned cameras may result in a liability to City if they are not monitored. However, use of cameras is becoming more common. Dour noted that cameras may be considered in the future. Mr. Hallsten stated that the City should first see if there is a problem and then use cameras only to address problem areas, instead of blanketing trail. Ms. Somers stated that cameras are an unnecessary intrusion, and objects to widespread use of cameras on trails.

Trail Setback. Dour noted several specific plans have adopted a standard for residential property line setback of trails. The standard in those plans is between 10 and 15 feet. Dour noted that the Dry Creek Greenway project would provide a minimum 15' setback in most areas, with only a few limited areas where a lesser setback: Commercial property along Riverside, Cirby Hills Town homes, Windscape Apartments, Joanne Lane, I-80 Residential crossing residential home. However, Dour noted that topographic separations make the trail compatible with surrounding homes in those areas. Mr. Kister suggested moving bridge #7 closer to I-80 to maintain a greater setback near his home.

Fire Safety. Mr. Orsini expressed a concern with open space fires. Dour noted that the City maintains a 30-40' wide mowed area where open space areas abut homes.

Nighttime Use. Mr. Orsini expressed a concern about night use. Dour noted that development of the trail will allow the Police Department to monitor the open at night.

Mr. Allen noted that the City should do everything it can to get more people to use the trail, because good use of the trail helps mitigate problems. Good use drives out bad use.

7. Phasing Plan & Cost Estimate

Dour provided an overview of the phasing plan and cost estimate. Dour noted that the construction cost estimate of \$8 million includes a 40% contingency because bridge costs are not well-defined at this time. Estimate does not include property acquisition. It will take 10+ years from onset of construction to build-out. We are 3-years out from beginning construction.

Mr. Orsini expressed concern with maintenance cost of areas in floodplain. Dour noted City's new standards for trails within floodplain address this.

Dour noted that the trail will be built in sections. In general, phasing may adjust according to ROW, trail characteristics and availability of grant money. We are looking at the logical extension of existing trails. Phases could be combined, or broken down into smaller phases.

8. Next Steps

Dour noted that project will be brought to Parks & Recreation Commission for input on November 2 for input. Mr. Stevenson requested a short email with the result of the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting.

The Transportation Commission will be held November 17 or December 15.

There will be a Council walk of the trail project, including the Hillcrest and Sunrise areas. If time allows, the mobile home park area.