



# DOWNTOWN BRIDGES PROJECT

Building Connections to Downtown Roseville!

The summary of public comments below reflects a compilation of input received between November 14<sup>th</sup> and December 6<sup>th</sup>. Public comments were submitted through the Downtown Bridges website, display stations at the Roseville Civic Center and Downtown Public Library, the Downtown Bridges Public Workshop on November 29<sup>th</sup>, or via email and fax.

## Public Comments received for the KPFF Consulting Engineers Design Proposal

<p>I like that you guys keep the icehouse bridge in place. I also like the idea of having art pieces on the bridge.</p>
<p>I really love your design it looks very nice.</p>
<p>Personally I like the plans of the KPFF Design Team much better. Good design, with good ideas helping the City move forward! Plus looks more appealing to all cultures &amp; opens up the landscape for much better use.</p>
<p>This is Best. I like that this option has neat sculptures at the bridge along with seating options that are like sculptures. It's artistic! Like that it has rails that you can see over and through like the ramp for downtown bridge and bike access to both bridges.</p>
<p>I like it because it's very organized. The boys like the sculpture skateboard ramp bench. Mom likes the sculpture garden &amp; neat benches. Teen boy likes the bike trail going by the library. Girls like leaving the Icehouse bridge in its spot. Mom likes the continuity of design with existing buildings and bridge design (flat bottom) w/Icehouse bridge. Concerns: Library parking, Bike path crossing the downtown bridge.</p>
<p>I like the elements of each proposal. I like the decking material of KPFF that make a visual link to the Civic Center Plaza but, I don't like the modernistic look for a traditional downtown. I also think the Ice House bridge needs to be painted as shown in the specific plan.</p>
<p>I apologize, but I incorrectly labeled my previous post. This is the correct posting. I feel this design is a starting point, but I am much more impressed with the MTDT design and vision for our City (SORRY). Our city needs to be aligned with a vision that fits its creative and progressive direction; one which our City's leaders have already exhibited within in their planning. The MTDT design adds an additional element of charm, which is missing in this design.</p>
<p>I like how KPFF designed the bike trail to not take out additional parking as well as putting the ice bridge on the other side of the Veteran's Hall. This design seems to not take up a larger foot print of Royer Park where the bridge enters into the park compared to the other designer. I still would like to see a classier look for the bridge with more hometown accents.</p>
<p>The downtown bridge design and surrounding area looks like it will be very appealing to walkers, runners, cyclists, and lots of families looking for a friendly atmosphere for a financially friendly afternoon outing/picnic. The artwork will work as great conversation starters as well. I bet the city leaders can envision a quaint ice cream vendor alongside the walkway to entice those Residents with a sweet tooth!</p>
<p>Great design. I think it will be great for the people of Roseville.</p>

## Public Comments KPFF Consulting Engineers

The general concept of the KPFF proposal, with the bike trail moved to the downtown side of the creek, is a good idea. That would keep "through" bike traffic on the trail separate from pedestrian activity in the park, preventing conflicts. The main pedestrian bridges ("downtown" and "icehouse") would be free of bike traffic, so pedestrians would have a safer and more enjoyable experience. Bicyclists would also benefit because the new "library" bridge can have a deck much more suitable for bike traffic than the plank deck on the icehouse bridge. The icehouse bridge would remain suitable for pedestrian use, and its current location would be fine, as shown.

Love the bridge idea and openness. Seems inviting to all

I like the organization of this plan and the Washington round-about has my vote, but it feels too modern. I would like to see some of the classic design from the other project incorporated into this one. You worked so hard to emphasize the old railroad feel of our town and this seems to go too far in the opposite direction. As a Royer Street resident, I would like to continue to feel "at home," even after this project is done.

I am intrigued by the concept of locating the bike trail on the north side of Dry Creek and using the library bridge to connect it back to the south side. Realize that this concept in effect renders the Icehouse Bridge unnecessary (its location and orientation is not conducive to where people will primarily be moving to and from.) I would hate to see the Ice House bridge not being used frequently and sitting there as a relic. It would be nice to see an exploration as to whether it could be retrofitted as the Downtown Bridge or the Library Bridge in this design concept? One other comment...the architectural character of the Downtown Bridge in this proposal seems to lack special quality. I would like to see the design of that bridge revised if this proposal is selected.

I'm concerned with the bike path's impacts on wildlife. I'm also concerned that the trail will make regular pedestrians less comfortable since they would have to share the trail with fast runners.

Where are we going to Park?

How does either of the proposals deal with the parking required for the Library? The lot in back is not enough to accommodate the amount of cars that use the Library. I hope the Planners Do Not Expect the patrons of the Library to use the parking garage, which is roughly 2 blocks away. If so, the Planners are not taking into account the elderly who use the Library extensively and the times that it is very cold and rainy. I do hope that the local Dry Creek lot is expanded and left close to the Library!

I think KPFF has done a better job with the lay out of the bridges and bike path. Everything will center around bringing people to downtown. Because they aren't moving the historical bridge you get rid of the historical headaches due to moving it, and you probably reduce the total project cost since there are only 2 bridges. For those that like the Mark Thomas architectural features (the aesthetics like stonework, flooring), that can be changed I'm sure. Based on layout, practicality, and cost, I'd give it to KPFF. Mark Thomas may have the better looking bridges, but that can be changed to how the public wants it.

Much better idea and design concept to keep the Ice House Bridge and only build two bridges. This is provides less impact to the creek and wildlife along with being more cost effective.

This bridge is straight and open to allow efficient traffic flow and feels like a fit where volume is a concern (which is not important for this downtown park location). It is too modern and doesn't communicate warmth or community. The straight lines aren't inviting for lingering but instead feel too industrial, commercial.

I like the attention to lighting which does not increase light pollution, and leaving the ice house bridge in place, without additional parking in the small grassy triangle area at the base of the bridge. I am concerned about traffic congestion with additional parking, entrance to resident driveways, and the dangerous cross street at Sutter St. /Park Drive. I find the other proposal more aesthetically pleasing, and would prefer a combination of designs.

I like the modern look of KPFF's design. Looks clean, inviting, and up-to-date. The handrail design allows people to enjoy looking at the creek. Keeping the icehouse bridge is a good use of existing resources. The layout looks like it will function better than the other proposal.

I love this design but think the bridge designs do not show much, at least on this visual computer plan I see. I am thinking a mix of the two designs in regard to the bridges design would be a perfect solution. The flow of the movement looks to be very in keeping with what I have heard most want from meetings. My concern is that parking garage has been nearly full during the day when I visit the area since the city removed the parking at the civic center. With the additional development it would seem that parking has been overlooked.

**Public Comments**  
**KPFF Consulting Engineers**

This design is updated, light, and inviting. It covers every aspect well, inviting young and old alike! Great lighting, seating, an area that invites you downtown!

Likes: - Icehouse bridge is preserved - bridge designs in terms of style Dislikes: - I'd prefer the bike trail south of the creek - Don't like the use of Dietrich. Would rather all vehicular traffic be kept off that road. Summary: - Why so many bridges, and why such a grandiose City Center bridge? I'd prefer keeping the area more quaint. A single well-designed bridge can accommodate traffic to and from the park for everyone, including library patrons. And please keep the Icehouse bridge exactly as it is.

I've walked along Dry Creek for years and have been awed by its simple beauty and myriad wildlife in all seasons. I understand the need for change, but would hope for the least possible impact on the area. I'm leaning towards the KPFF concept because it leaves the Icehouse bridge intact and plans for the replacement of the popular crossing to the library. I would, however, prefer to see a less imposing City Center bridge plan.

After reading both proposals, including the current comments and concerns that are written, my choice would be for the KPFF design. I like that the current "Ice Bridge" remains in place, both for cost and historic value. I like that the bike trail is suited for a pleasing ride, yet out of the way of foot traffic. The attention to the lighting as to the environment is important. The downtown bridge has a grand staircase area that is beautiful, the style of handrails are perfect for viewing and at the same time, aesthetically pleasing. The artistic thoughts for the seating area and having a "sculpture garden" is an artistic, and also "fresh" addition to the site, along with using the established pattern of paving for continuity of a matching fit to what is already in place. This would be a beautiful area with the historic feel that represents both the past and the future for the city of Roseville perfectly. I believe that KPFF is by far, the best proposal for the Downtown Bridges Project.

By keeping the Nelson/Ice House bridge in place, I fear the encroachment of the Oak St. /Washington Blvd. roundabout will endanger the pedestrians using this bridge. I like the Royer Park landing of the 'Downtown' bridge is better incorporated into the existing park. Both of the Downtown bridge designs I believe would benefit from a different start point, that being across Oak St. and eliminate the at-grade crosswalk. Better pedestrian safety, more display opportunity if that is one of the goals of this project. Both designs need to address the parking needs of the area in some way, it seems to me there is a disconnect in either the direction, or presentations by and to the city. There is no doubt that more than one bridge is needed for adequate access between downtown and Royer Park. In short, the resulting project needs to be a combination of the two plans presented. Both have merits.

Whatever the plan...please make sure to keep enough parking to enable practical use of the surrounding areas including the park and the Veteran's Hall - otherwise it becomes inaccessible for the disabled, for families, etc. Please make sure to keep and/or build in enough parking.

No, the whole project is too upscale for Roseville.

I'd like to have seen more attention paid to aesthetics and how the design of the bridges link to one another. Intersecting the trail and the bridge at grade increases the risk of collision and conflict.

Leave Ice House Bridge in place. Parking at Vet's Hall needs to be enlarged to at least double in size from 42 to 84 parking spaces.

I think more discussions should be given to the pedestrian crossing on Oak Street. It should be included in the project. It was good to see that the Ice House Bridge would stay as is. Cost wasn't discussed; I think the cost should have been discussed more. There was a lot of discussion about maintenance. Don't you have to know how much money is available before a design can be selected? There can be a drastic difference between cost and design.

As with any construction project, the potential for crime increases. Consultation and input from the Roseville Police Department is vital to mitigate this potential increase. I would suggest involving the Police Department early so that issues of crime and traffic can be addressed. Crime prevention and crime prevention through environmental design (CP & ED) concepts are very important for the safety of those who use the facilities.

I like this concept better because it makes the bike trail flow better by going under cross streets and off the main road, it also ties in the park to the downtown area.

Doesn't seem as flexible as the Mark Thomas proposal.

## Public Comments KPFF Consulting Engineers

This proposal looks to be more cost-conscious. It also seems flawed because the bike trail and river-walk on the same side of the creek is problematic because of unavoidable congestion. The bike trail winding around the amphitheater seems to be a poor design. Better to have the bike trail away from the library/amphitheater/river walk/roundabout/multi use facility/automobile traffic.

Let's start with the FINE Print; ---- KPFF did! They went into detail as to what & why they designed it the way they did. I think they looked more ahead to the future of how things will be utilized, by you, your son & daughter, your grandparents, & your future grandchildren. Where's our future going? A healthier generation. More & more people are bicycling, walking, running, to keep in shape. Their design gives it a flow for all to enjoy, & adds the wide open space, the views of the park, creek, and downtown for all to enjoy. Roseville is built on "Tradition, Pride, & Progress"; I believe KPFF has touched bases on all. Let's move ahead & show how Roseville can be "Always Amazing"!

KPFF has my vote! Their design is by far the best for a thriving Roseville!

Stark. I don't think the modern lights add character or distinction. This is part of Old Downtown.

I want to agree with the comment here about the crossing on Oak Street. I didn't see that in either design. This one pictures "future developments" that are not in the other design. --Have we considered what "future development" we want next to the park? I would like to see more open space around the creek rather than less. Royer is popular and a bit cramped. I imagined a contiguous space from the plaza across into Royer.

I like the overall plan. I like how the Ice House bridge is preserved. I particularly like how the Civic Center is tied in with the main bridge/walkway. This design seems to be the most pleasing and I especially like the placement of the bike trail.

I like this design team's out of the box thinking! They also appear to be good stewards of the city's money by suggesting many cost saving elements to their design. Leaving the Ice House bridge in place and not trying to retrofit it for cyclists seems like it may be a wise move. The pre-fab Library Bridge also seems very practical as a cost saving measure. I do like that they planned for the future amphitheater in the path of the bike trail. Their design seems to have more accessibility options to cyclists who want to frequent the businesses downtown, although the appropriate turn off points are not indicated explicitly. I like the at-grade bridge that will appear to be an extension of the street. Even though it may not be in the WPA style, I like the minimalist design of the bridge, especially the railing that will allow full views of the creek and not dominate the landscape. I also appreciate the consideration of the deck lights to minimize light spilling into the creek and "polluting" the night sky. I do not think it is a good idea to plan to eventually have the nature trail use the bike trail. However, I think the nature trail would be better located south of the creek in the future to be close to the park, farther from the downtown infrastructure, and built with a natural surface that would have a smaller footprint. I also think it may cause too many problems for cyclists passing through downtown to have to intersect the pedestrians crossing onto the downtown bridge. A below grade route with the option to pull off into downtown, like they propose at the Ice House Bridge, would be much more preferable. I have the same comment about the other design, but I want to emphasize that connectivity for cyclists to Vernon Street and north of the railroad tracks needs to be planned for. This is as simple as providing protected splits that would lead to bike lanes into downtown.

I prefer the proposed plan from KPFF Consulting Engineers: 1.) From a historical perspective retaining the placement of the R.F. Rube Nelson "Ice House" Bridge is preferred. It will also be more cost effective by just updating it and not moving it. 2.) I am very happy with the replacement on the popular crossing to the library. The new library bridge is very attractive even though they said it would be a pre-fab bridge. I'm sure that will be more cost effective of the two proposed plans. This deck will also be more suitable for bike traffic. 3.) KPFF's plans for the downtown bridge are the most attractive architectural design. The grand staircase area is very inviting, along with the adjoining sculpture garden and seating area. The decking material of KPFF attains the continuity to the Civic Center Plaza. The attractive yet functional design of the handrails allows for excellent viewing of the creek and surrounding landscape. The energy efficient LED lighting provides lighting only on the bridge, thus avoiding excessive light pollution.

Leave the Ice House Bridge alone. Make other creek crossings tie to this bridge - classic. Too much "pavement." Can't see any LID elements.

## Public Comments KPF Consulting Engineers

The MT Co design was better and more complete than the KPF design. Since no costs were included it could not be determined if either one was cost effective. I hope that information is available to the Selection Committee when they choose which design team is awarded the project. Locating the bike trail in the park on the south side of the creek makes much more sense. Separating pedestrian traffic from cyclists is safer and more reasonable. The cyclists can access the downtown area by walking across the bridges or using the bike trail access points on either end of the park if they chose to do that. Reorienting the Ice House Bridge may offer a better path into the park but it is more expensive and may create problems with the structure itself while moving it. New bridge footings and abutments must fit into the existing grade and how the bridge interfaces with the Veterans Hall facilities appeared to be a potential problem. Nothing appeared to have been done to resolve the parking concerns of the Veterans. Comments from meeting attendees indicated a conflict between residents who use the park and playground and the Veterans with their parking concerns. The Parks Department should be asked to find a solution to those opposing interests. The existing library parking is marginal at best and the designs did not offer any improvement. If anything, the additional vehicles who may park in the library lot to access the park will exacerbate the problem. Some additional library parking should be included in the design. The Downtown Bridge to Royer Park was the main focus of the design presentation and will be the main access for pedestrians between the park and the downtown area. How that is compatible with the vehicle traffic in Oak Street is unclear, regardless of whether a roundabout is used at Washington and Oak Street or not. It seems dangerous and ill advised to design a surface grade pedestrian crossing at the location shown in the design. It should be moved to the nearest traffic signal or changed to an elevated grade crossing. Regarding the proposed roundabout for the intersection of Washington and Oak Street, I cannot visualize how that will improve traffic flow, particularly with signals added at Oak and Taylor and Oak and Lincoln as proposed. I assume the traffic simulation models indicated it is workable but I can only see it as being worse than the current traffic flow. Lighting was mentioned as important to security. Because there are homeless people who use the park and that is not likely to change in the future, a police substation located in the park would enhance security of the area and make people feel safer in the park and more likely to use it. The riverfront development is the key to drawing people to downtown Roseville. Until that project is completed, the number of people visiting downtown is not likely to increase, regardless of the other downtown projects including the Bridges and Trail Project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this project.

I prefer KPF's plan: I walked out of your meeting just before the end. It is obvious the selection committee was showing bias and already had their minds made up to go with Mark Thomas and Co. Does the City want to move forward? Or stay in the WPA era? We already have old Roseville, Cherry Glen, the Sierra District, and Vernon Street, which has implemented WPA. A team you've already worked with, well yeah we have to go with them, What about the future? What about going forward, let's have new Roseville. Go above and beyond. Open up the dreams and aspects of a thinking, reinvigorated Roseville. Are we moving forward or staying stagnant! The same thing that got Roseville in trouble before. I agree with the Veteran's I believe their day will come when a new hall will be built for VFW also. This plan is about the bridges and Royer Park and connecting with Civic Center and Downtown. Move forward with new ideas, new design, new blood, new vision, not backwards with WPA era, WPA bridges, WPA walkways, WPA design. I love them and their history and work ethic but let's move the City forward.

Love, love the art slide bench etc. Long time by Royer Park, grand parents also. It is bike and pedestrian friendly. May be inflation by the time project is finished.



# DOWNTOWN BRIDGES PROJECT

Building Connections to Downtown Roseville!

## Public Comments received for the Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. Design Proposal

<p>I like most of this design. I like the light posts, the building materials, and the overall look...it seems to fit in with the current decor of downtown Roseville, which is traditional and classic. The bridge has a railroad inspired look, which fits perfectly with Roseville. I am not happy about the ice bridge cover being removed. I really like the look, but hate the wooden flooring, (I ride/walk it once a week). Isn't there some way to save the upper part of the bridge and make it look cohesive too? Good luck!</p>
<p>I was reading the notes, and saw that "shade structures will be incorporated for use during all seasons." In the summer time that will be very important, however I do not see any imagery that tells me anything about how shade will be implemented. We all know trees take time to grow, so if trees are to be incorporated, what kind, how long will they take to mature, etc.? And if not trees, what?</p>
<p>This design feels very natural and compliments surrounding Roseville history and architecture. I like that this design strays away from a more modern concept and connects with Roseville's historic roots. The Mark Thomas company's overall project design is also much more comprehensive and appears to be a lot more flexible in terms of cost and integration with future Roseville design projects. Great work! I very much appreciate the transparency and voice afforded to Roseville citizens by their local government. I'm excited about the future of this community.</p>
<p>I really like how you guys keep the bike trail on the Royer Park side and have it go under the downtown bridge. I like the simplicity in the style and design of these bridges.</p>
<p>I enjoy the sense of character that this bridge evokes. The design's functional ability is obvious, but the aesthetic design aims to blend it with pre-existing elements of downtown, which I feel is necessary. It seems unique and inviting to use.</p>
<p>I really like the Mark Thomas' design. Very classy!!</p>
<p>My choice. Great enhancement to the area.</p>
<p>Very attractive bridge, exactly what Roseville needs?</p>
<p>It is my belief that The Mark Thomas Design Team has a brilliant vision for a progressive City. It is my contention that the Mark Thomas Design greatly enhances the Cities charm, and brings to life an area worthy of a world-class design for a future world class City. Charm equals charm, and that is what I see in this design. I expect this to be a rewarding and model project (based on their vision) deserving the cities full and complete attention.</p>
<p>Like the wideness and seating of downtown bridge. Connects directly to plaza and make ease of parking for park functions and access to both Park, Library and Downtown. Refurbishments and general tying in of the stones.</p>
<p>I like it because it is organized. Mom likes the bridge lighting. Teen girl likes the literary quotes in decking (Mom too). Concern: arches on new bridges not consistent with Ice House Bridge, Library parking.</p>
<p>I like the more traditional elements except for the gun turrets.</p>
<p>I like the other design better. This one seems a bit stark. I also like the ice bridge on the other side of the Veteran's Hall.</p>

**Public Comments**  
**Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.**

The MT Co proposal closely follows the current Downtown Specific Plan, but does not show how some critical issues would be handled. It shows using the icehouse bridge for the main bike trail, but the existing deck on that bridge is unsuitable for bikes. The proposal notes "deck replacement," but without a hint what it would be replaced with. It is also unclear how the "new handrail treatment," showing a half-through truss bridge, would be implemented on the existing through truss span. It seems the reuse and refurbishment of the icehouse bridge has not been thought through.

I really like the look and functionality of the library and downtown bridges. Very thoughtful and good looking design. I'm not so sure about the ice bridge though simply because I'm having trouble understanding what's going to be done with it. I am rather fond of the covering on the ice bridge if you're getting rid of it for aesthetic reasons. My only concern would be the potential light pollution from those lights but that's fairly minor. I definitely prefer this one.

The architectural character of the bridge designs in this proposal is a good fit for Royer Park / Downtown. They have a timeless quality. There are some nice details too. I particularly like the bowed overlooks on the Downtown Bridge as it passes over the creek. I do think that both proposals could improve how their Downtown Bridges land on the Royer Park side, but hopefully that will be developed as the design process progresses.

This is a great plan it thinks of the many people that uses the veterans hall. This is the only plan that Parking is thought thru

I'm concerned with the bike path's impact on wildlife. Why put up statuary of wildlife, when the project will at the same time be hurting wildlife?

We need up close parking Please!

I prefer this bridge design. It has character, shapes that are interesting and organic lending to the location. I will walk with my children to this bridge to play, look over the edge and picnic.

I really like your downtown bridge concept. I'm mildly concerned with the width of the icehouse bridge for a class 1 bike trail. I do however prefer the alignment of the KPFF library bridge. I like the way the walkway wraps around the planned outdoor amphitheater. I like the alignment of the class 1 bike trail on the south side of the creek but I think the planned pedestrian walkway on the north side should be bike friendly also. Slow bike friendly. I think both design teams did a good job with their presentations and I think the City of Roseville is on the right path.

this is the design I prefer for available parking and access to Royer Park and the Veterans Hall

I like this bridge best.

I really like this design. I vote for this one.

Winner. The round lines are much more relaxed and invite a restful feeling along with the traditional lighting. This design is more appropriate for this park/downtown link. This looks like a park bridge which invites you to relax where the other design looks like a people mover encouraging you to quickly get across. Reconsider the square shape of the supports under the light posts, maybe a softer look to blend with the round edges instead of such a contrast.

I prefer these overall design elements, however have 2 concerns. 1. Lack of attention to light pollution (which the other plan addresses) 2. Additional parking to the right of the Veterans Hall, which may cause dangerous congestion for resident driveways near the entrance and for traffic turning onto Park Drive.

This is too big and cumbersome. It is heavy and not very inviting.

I like this design better, primarily because it keeps the bike trail south of the creek and provides plenty of space on the north side for foot traffic. Keeping the two separate is very important, as experienced by numerous towns and cities across the country. This way we get the best of both worlds. My one issue is the movement of the Icehouse bridge, which I think is completely unnecessary. If I had a choice, I'd reject both designs, but this one is the better of the two. Below is the same comment I posted on the other design. Summary: - Why so many bridges, and why such a grandiose City Center bridge? I'd prefer keeping the area more quaint. A single well-designed bridge can accommodate traffic to and from the park for everyone, including library patrons. And please keep the Icehouse bridge exactly as it is.

I really like the Mark Thomas design. It looks very elegant, but simplistic at the same time. Really like the idea it is more than a bridge but also an area for people to relax around and around the bridge. This really seems to blend in with the area, like it has always been there.

**Public Comments**  
**Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.**

I prefer the Mark Thomas design, because it keeps the bike trail in the park, It provides access to the front of the Veterans hall from the Oak street parking area, The rear parking area would provide handicap parking for veterans using the other entrance to the hall, both upper and lower floors. The front parking area could be upgraded and improved by removal of the two sycamore trees repaving and stripping. The ice house bridge would be refurbished.

Additional comment, on ice house bridge, with the new concrete stamps, the covering could be made to look like railroad ties.

I like this bridge design much better.

I like this project, but do have concerns. One of the items I like is the rotation of the Ruben Nelson/Ice House bridge, but do have concerns about the landing position in Royer Park and the proximity to the front of the building. I like the continuity of the primary/new bridge over the creek being in-line with the plaza in front of the Civic Center. I would encourage a look at the use of a bridge over Oak Street in place of the at grade crosswalk currently planned. This would provide more pedestrian safety, as well as opportunity for display space. A greater opportunity to incorporate historical themes into this bridge as well. I think the 'landing plaza' in Royer park is overdone, and will intrude into currently used spaces. Additional parking is needed for the park, and Veteran's building, but I understand that is not a part of these plans. I must find the appropriate outlet for those concerns. The concept of using some of the park on the 'back side' or east side of the building is not suitable in my opinion.

Whatever the plan...please make sure to keep enough parking to enable practical use of the surrounding areas including the park and the Veteran's Hall - otherwise it becomes inaccessible for the disabled, for families, etc. Please make sure to keep and/or build in enough parking.

I am just going to say I would go with this design and of course I do have some misgivings. I would like the playground moved for more parking for the Vet Hall.

Innovative bulb outs on main bridge make it more of a destination. Interesting concept of having a seasonal cover. Good tie in of design elements across bridges. Considers the addition of a river walk. Great focus on all the expected flow into Royer park. Appears to be more costly, I hope we can fund it.

Over designed and overpriced to area. No to Vet's Hall parking on east side. This area is used by the Vet's picnics and outings.

Bike trail should be on the other side of creek and Ice House Bridge should stay as is. Money was not discussed. Why a roundabout? I think it makes more traffic congestion than the current light.

As with any construction project, the potential for crime increases. Consultation and input from the Roseville Police Department is vital to mitigate this potential increase. I would suggest involving the Police Department early so that issues of crime and traffic can be addressed. Crime prevention and crime prevention through environmental design (CP & ED) concepts are very important for the safety of those who use the facilities.

I believe the Mark Thomas proposal is the best. The only thing I wonder about is when the parking spaces are added behind the lodge can they figure a way to keep the bar-b-q area. Maybe move it a little. We definitely need to preserve parking for the hall in light of disabled veterans.

This design is more expansive and feature-rich. It allows for more varied use of the Civic Center Bridge. This design is preferable.

Not much to like here. A lot of old ways, old designs, & old ideas! Lines are too harsh, seems too costly, why move the Ice House Bridge. What is the cost alone to move the bridge?? Let's look to the future, more open ideas, & ease for bicycles & pedestrians! And who is paying for these canopies on the main bridge to go up, and then taken back down? All the time more costly to implement this & pay for park personnel to maintain. Remember the plan is for bridges & bike trails, Are we being fooled with parking that is not in the plan.

**Public Comments**  
**Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.**

I hope that there is a process for making changes in the design. -I definitely vote for the old style of the lighting on the Downtown Bridge. What is the lighting for the Library and Icehouse bridges? It should be in the same style, and not glaring and minimizing pollution. -There seems to be a lot of clutter in the design of the Downtown Bridge, boxy elements with no apparent function? -I don't think that "vendor activities" should cause the bridge to be bigger than needed. -I'd rather see a smaller, simpler design that fits into the scenery, rather than a showpiece bridge. I think the icehouse bridge should set the tone for the other 2. I like the simplicity of the Library bridge here. I wish that the bridge could connect from Civic Plaza across Oak Street--was there attention to that street crossing? As a segue way somehow, rather than an interruption of the public space?

I like the design of the bridge. Its modern and open design will bring a fresh look to Downtown Roseville.

The Mark Thomas Design Team has captured the criteria set by the City. The bridge will be good for walking and biking. Overall, it is a nice design.

I think both designs are big steps forward for Roseville and I would accept either. I like that the MTC o design allows cyclists using the bike trail to travel south of downtown unencumbered by separating the trail from the pedestrian additions being added. However, I did not see a clear explanation of how cyclists who were travelling to downtown as a destination would have easier access to the businesses on Vernon St. It appears they would have to walk their bike up the steps and over the new Downtown bridge, then across the crosswalk and up another set of steps. Or possibly use the reconfigured Ice House bridge or Library Bridge to get across the creek and then ride in traffic to the main strip. Likewise in the reverse direction, I am not sure how the completed bike path will be accessible for cyclists connecting from north of the tracks, for instance from the bike path being extended along Washington Blvd. I would like to know that this system wide integration is being planned for. While I prefer modern architecture, I believe the design team has met the criteria of a WPA style, and has the advantage of designing the architecture of the surrounding area so that they will integrate seamlessly. I like the modular tent structure design that can be changed with the seasons. Lastly, even though I appreciate that the team has separated the cyclists just passing through from the majority of foot traffic by locating the trail on the south side of the creek, it seems to make more sense given the location of the more natural park setting and children's facilities on the south side of the creek to plan for the interpretive nature trail to be located eventually on the south side of the creek. Perhaps a hybrid of both team's designs would allow for a separate nature trail in the future, would limit cyclist and pedestrian conflicts, and provide a more inviting route into downtown for cyclists with a well thought out connection to the north of the tracks.

Neither of these bridge designs feels very organic but the Mark Thomas one is better. However, all the cement definitely subtracts from the nature of the creek and is a shame to the beautiful naturescapes they are trying to connect. I dearly hope that the Icehouse bridge can remain intact as that is a beautiful organic piece of construction that I feel exemplifies nature and the classic feel of Roseville. It is a shame for me to see these designs both creating a concrete jungle feel instead of a natural park like feel.

I like the design proposed by Mark Thomas Design Team best. The bridge is very modern and intriguing. It's hard to see, but I think benches/concrete blocks or somewhere to sit on the bridge would be a nice addition. As someone else had mentioned, it would be great to have an extension to the bridge from the Civic Center. Anytime to walk from downtown across Oak Street is crazy with a lot of traffic. During such events as 4th of July this would be great access from the parking structure and plaza to the park with little impact to traffic. The bike trail seems to flow very nicely through the park. I like the additional parking on the east side of the Veteran's Hall as well.

Unsure if LID elements included. City of Roseville should be in the forefront of supporting more LID design/projects. How does this design pull together the downtown area, such as Riverside/Vernon streets - no common elements?

Like the lighting, framing of creek. Love literary quotes - teacher.

Need auto and foot access to veteran's hall that is safe!

**Public Comments**  
**Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.**

The MT Co design was better and more complete than the KPFF design. Since no costs were included it could not be determined if either one was cost effective. I hope that information is available to the Selection Committee when they choose which design team is awarded the project. Locating the bike trail in the park on the south side of the creek makes much more sense. Separating pedestrian traffic from cyclists is safer and more reasonable. The cyclists can access the downtown area by walking across the bridges or using the bike trail access points on either end of the park if they chose to do that. Reorienting the Ice House Bridge may offer a better path into the park but it is more expensive and may create problems with the structure itself while moving it. New bridge footings and abutments must fit into the existing grade and how the bridge interfaces with the Veterans Hall facilities appeared to be a potential problem. Nothing appeared to have been done to resolve the parking concerns of the Veterans. Comments from meeting attendees indicated a conflict between residents who use the park and playground and the Veterans with their parking concerns. The Parks Department should be asked to find a solution to those opposing interests. The existing library parking is marginal at best and the designs did not offer any improvement. If anything, the additional vehicles who may park in the library lot to access the park will exacerbate the problem. Some additional library parking should be included in the design. The Downtown Bridge to Royer Park was the main focus of the design presentation and will be the main access for pedestrians between the park and the downtown area. How that is compatible with the vehicle traffic in Oak Street is unclear, regardless of whether a roundabout is used at Washington and Oak Street or not. It seems dangerous and ill advised to design a surface grade pedestrian crossing at the location shown in the design. It should be moved to the nearest traffic signal or changed to an elevated grade crossing. Regarding the proposed roundabout for the intersection of Washington and Oak Street, I cannot visualize how that will improve traffic flow, particularly with signals added at Oak and Taylor and Oak and Lincoln as proposed. I assume the traffic simulation models indicated it is workable but I can only see it as being worse than the current traffic flow. Lighting was mentioned as important to security. Because there are homeless people who use the park and that is not likely to change in the future, a police substation located in the park would enhance security of the area and make people feel safer in the park and more likely to use it. The riverfront development is the key to drawing people to downtown Roseville. Until that project is completed, the number of people visiting downtown is not likely to increase, regardless of the other downtown projects including the Bridges and Trail Project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this project.