



**Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail
SRG Meeting #9 Summary**
February 27, 2013, 6:00 to 8:00 pm
Maidu Community Center

Stakeholder Representative Group members present:

Name	Organization
Sharon Adamson	Dry Creek Conservancy
Davis Allen	Biking Roseville
Mark Allen	Dry Creek Conservancy
Bart Codiga	Sand Dollar Properties
Keith Hallsten	Creekside Homeowner
Dave Kingsbury	Roseville Unified School District
Vicki Miller	Maidu
Dave Pringle	Sutter Roseville
Scott Reid	Maidu
Jim Robinson	Meadow Oaks
Bill Shultz	Hillcrest
Gordon Stevenson	Tri Commercial
Dan Washburn	Cirby Hills Town Homes
Jim Williams	Senior Citizens Commission

Project Team

Name and Affiliation
Mike Dour, City of Roseville
Carl Walker, City of Roseville
Mike Wixon, City of Roseville
Tim Hayes, PSOMAS
Brian Wright, PSOMAS
Gladys Cornell, AIM Consulting
Ciara Zanze, AIM Consulting

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail
SRG Meeting #9 Summary

Twenty one stakeholders and community members attended Stakeholder Representative Group (SRG) Meeting #9 for the Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail Project.

The goals for this meeting included:

- Provide results of technical analysis
- Receive feedback from Stakeholder Representative Group
- Discuss next steps and upcoming community workshop

Project Goals:

The community's goal for the project is to provide access for multi-recreational opportunities within the Dry Creek Greenway and to create a safe, comfortable, convenient, and highly connected bike route as an alternative to using City streets in an area of the City that is underserved by bicycle facilities. The multi-use trail will connect schools and businesses to residential neighborhoods. The trail will also provide important regional connections as a part of a series of existing and planned trails that will form a loop around the greater South Placer/ Sacramento area.

Project Overview:

In 2008, the City conducted a planning and feasibility study for the Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail Project. The study included an inventory of existing conditions, developed trail alignment alternatives, and prepared a report to the City Council. The purpose of this effort was to develop a locally preferred alternative for trail routing and road crossings that adequately addressed challenges and fit within the context of the neighborhoods. Public engagement was an important component throughout the feasibility study process and included a series of Stakeholder Representative Group and public open house meetings that were well-attended by the public. In March 2010, the City Council accepted the Dry Creek Greenway Trail Planning & Feasibility Study, and directed staff to proceed with additional feasibility analysis, preliminary engineering, and environmental review. The current phase of work is the additional feasibility analysis for the Hillcrest (Riverside Avenue) and Sunrise Avenue trail segments. The City has also completed additional analysis for the Meadow Oaks/Sierra Gardens trail segment. This phase of the project is scheduled to be completed by November of 2013. It is anticipated that final design could begin in 2014 with a first phase of construction beginning in 2015/2016. All phases are dependent upon Council approval and funding availability.

The following is a compilation of questions and comments by members of the SRG and public organized by topic:

Results of Technical Analysis:

Discussion Objective: provide stakeholders with the results of the technical analysis for segments 1, 5, and 7, and receive feedback from the SRG.

For detailed technical analysis information see the maps located at the end of this summary.

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail
SRG Meeting #9 Summary

Segment 1: Darling Way to Machado Lane

Questions and comments from stakeholders included:

- *Comment:* It looks like the safety rating for option 1a, should be fair and not good.
- *Question:* Does option 1c include a bridge to the proposed trail head parking lot?
 - *Answer:* Yes, all options include a connection to the parking lot.
- *Question:* Would option 1c include a connection to Darling Way?
 - *Answer:* Yes, the neighborhood would have access to the trail and the parking area.
- *Question:* The Darling Way Bridge was underwater recently during a storm, is raising the Bridge being considered?
 - *Answer:* No, not at this time.
- *Question:* Will the slope from the bridges down to the trail be compliant with ADA standards?
 - *Question:* Yes, the trail will meet ADA requirements.
- *Question:* What is the total length of each bridge?
 - *Answer:* Bridge #2 would be about 80-100 feet long and bridges #3 and #4 would be about 160 feet long.
- *Question:* Are the bridge renderings just examples or will the final product look like that?
 - *Answer:* Yes, the renderings are examples of what the prefabricated bridges may look like. However, due to the length of Bridges #3 and #4 the most efficient design is an arch style as shown.
- *Question:* Is there a rendering for Bridge #3?
 - *Answer:* Bridge #3 would be similar in look and size to Bridge #4.
- *Question:* Regarding the hydraulic analysis, what standards are being used to determine the height of bridges?
 - *Answer:* The project team is using the most recent standards implemented by the Central Valley Flood Control Board; these standards require the soffit (underneath) of a bridge located in the floodway to be 3 feet above the 200 year water mark.
- *Question:* Have construction costs been identified?
 - *Answer:* The project team has completed preliminary cost analysis and identified which alternatives will have the most significant costs. Analysis is as follows:
 - 1A – Costs are high due to large retaining wall, Darling Bridge widening and Bridge #3
 - 1B – Significant costs include Darling Bridge widening and underpass, Bridge #2 and Bridge #4
 - 1C – Significant costs include the Darling Bridge underpass, Bridge #2 and Bridge #4, and retaining walls in constrained area
- *Question:* What is the height of Bridge #2 and will it meet ADA requirements?
 - *Answer:* There is about 6-8 feet from the soffit (underneath) of the bridges to the existing ground. On either side of the bridge we would construct approach fills at 5%-8% maximum grades per City Bikeway standards which meet ADA requirements.
- *Question:* Additional right of way will have to be acquired for the trail head parking lot, how is the portion of the lot being used now?

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail
SRG Meeting #9 Summary

- *Answer:* There are two properties involved. The one is not occupied, while a portion of the other parcel is currently used as storage for the businesses located there.

Segment 5: Sunrise Avenue to Meadow Gate Drive

Questions and comments from stakeholders included:

- *Question:* What is the cost difference between the alignments?
 - *Answer:* The project team has completed preliminary cost analysis and identified which alternatives will have the most significant costs. Analysis is as follows:
 - 5A – Costs are higher due to additional retaining walls and Bridge #14
 - 5B – Significant costs include Bridge #13 (reinforced concrete bridge)
- *Question:* Is a majority of the trail alignment located on City owned property?
 - *Answer:* Yes, however additional right of way acquisition may be required in some areas.
- *Question:* Is option 5b routed under Sunrise Avenue?
 - *Answer:* Yes, both options are routed under Sunrise Avenue and provide access from the trail onto Sunrise Avenue.
- *Comment:* Both options 5a and 5 b have impacts to businesses on both sides of the creek.
- *Question:* Would Bridge #13 be similar to the Miner’s Ravine Bridge during a flood event?
 - *Answer:* No, Bridge #13 will not look like that. Bridge #13 is located within a very wide floodway. As such it would not be practical to span the entire floodway and to meet the requirements of the CVFPB the trail would have to be constructed on a boardwalk type structure. The bridge is therefore being designed with the soffit elevation set at the 10 year water surface elevation. During a larger storm event the bridge would be designed to be inundated with storm water.
- *Question:* Would oak trees near the alignment need to be removed to accommodate the trail?
 - *Answer:* Yes, some oak trees along alignment 5a will be impacted.
- *Comment:* Would like to see which trees will be removed, it will be important to see what the landscape will look like once the trail is constructed.
- *Question:* The addition of the trail may have an impact on the ability to lease a property.
 - *Answer:* The environmental assessment will analyze socioeconomic and community impacts of the project.
- *Question:* Concerned that trail users will park near the commercial properties along the trail; will fences be installed to prevent access from the trail up to the commercial properties and the street?
 - *Answer:* Fencing will be considered; likely post and cable since the trail is located in the flood plain.
- *Question:* How will security concerns be addressed?
 - *Answer:* A representative from the Roseville Police Department will be attending the next SRG meeting to discuss safety concerns.

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail
SRG Meeting #9 Summary

Segment 7: Sierra Gardens

Questions and comments from stakeholders included:

- *Question:* How much space is between the paved trail and the private gravel driveway?
 - *Answer:* There will be 3 to 5 feet of separation; the paved trail would generally be located where the current sewer maintenance road is.
- *Comment:* The School District would like to talk with City staff regarding fencing options for portions of the trail that are near school campuses.
- *Comment:* There is a private path from the Cirby Hills Town homes down to the creek, concern for people parking in the neighborhood and accessing the trail.

Alignment Feedback

In addition to the discussion, stakeholders were asked to provide their feedback on the segments through a feedback form, responses are included below:

Segment 1:

- There is a private trail that runs from Valley Oak Drive to the proposed trail through Cirby Hills Townhomes property. How do we mitigate the likelihood that people will access the trail from that location? Can we limit access through our property?
- Visibility is only fair for option 1A along south bank of Cirby Creek.
- Bridge #3 has less of an impact on open space, and more impact on the south bank environmental? There are less security issues with option A.
- Consider using 5% grades for ease of use by elderly. I prefer option 1B.
- Option C seems to be the best option.
- Option 1B looks like the best choice as it keeps the trail away from homes on east side of narrowest points, and avoids the retaining wall of option 1A.
- I prefer option 1B or 1C. If I had to pick, I would prefer option 1B.
- Option A saves a nice beach head that is located where bridge #2 is slated to go, and unfortunately none of the other routes do so. Option B is more feasible than option C due to the closeness of the creek on portions of option C. All 3 options will completely change the way the open space looks. 2 huge bridges with long ramps building up to them, or a long, made to look natural, retaining wall. I believe option A would be more aesthetically pleasing and impact that neighborhood the least.

Segment 5:

- Property security issues with Bridge #13. Environmental issues with trees being removed on Option A.
- I prefer option 5B on north side.
- Public access off Sunrise Ave. and parking will become issue.
- As presented, segment 5B appears superior.
- Option 5B is my initial preference. Parking violation concerns were raised with regard to option 5B. There is much existing signage warning about being towed. The building along the option 5B easement will need to assert their security concerns along with monitors....if they haven't already.

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail
SRG Meeting #9 Summary

- Option A is the only option that allows riders to cross under Sunrise with access to get up to Sunrise on either side, which is the safest. But there is a concern that a trail near those businesses may increase crime. What is the City going to do to prevent that if this side is chosen? Option B due to the flood wall can only allow access to Sunrise on only one side and that is dangerous. Riders would need to go north or south to cross at a light, those sidewalks weren't made for bike traffic, and the street is way too busy to put a bike lane safely. But this alignment seems to impact less business owners and fewer trees removed.
- "Option B: provides significantly less impact to commercial property owners (1 building impacted vs. 3 in Option A on west side of Sunrise Avenue). Utilizes the existing "bench" (previously constructed flood water control feature) which is stable vs. Option A (South Side). Option A: High impact to adjacent commercial properties including security and trespassing risk together with increased liability to property owners. Potential loss of rents or lower rents to property owners due to trail impacts, therefore directly affecting property values. Risk Mitigation Measures: Prepare for risk mitigation (i.e. fencing and police patrols) to protect property owners, tenants, property values, and users. This segment has no plan related to risk mitigation (see above). No specific cost data related to trail options. The project team has not delivered photo simulations that identify bridge impacts to include ramps up to and down from bridge spans.

Segment 7:

- I prefer paving and using the service road as a multi-use trail to facilitate elderly access beyond Rocky Ridge connecting to Maidu Park.
- This option has major homeowners issues.
- Particular attention for neighbor concerns as to trail widths, distance from creek should be expanded upon, particularly where space is most constrained, i.e. toward Rocky Ridge end.
- As a representative of DCC, the further the trail is from the waterway, the least impact you place upon the riparian habitat. This is a general rule.
- We are happy to see the alignment is now using the existing trail around the Wetland Meadow. We believe that the rendering you showed of the Mallard section, the one showing a 5 foot shoulder on one side of the paved trail, and a 2 foot shoulder on the other, next to the access road is a fair compromise. MONA is not in favor of a 10' separation between the access road and bike trail in the Mallard section, as was mentioned by Friends of Linda Creek, due to the fact it would impact the owners of those properties unnecessarily. We believe that having the access road with a short post and cable separation between the bike trail should be sufficient, and is much more respectful of those owners. We are also concerned about the effect of stabilizing the trail side of the creek, with the erosion that is already occurring near Blue Jay. How will that affect it? What will the City do to protect the properties on the Blue Jay side of the creek? There is one section that is still problematic and that is by the Woodlake Bridge, once you drop down in that section it is really close to the creek. It seems like you would have to go back into the trees that run along there and remove a lot of them, but if you stay up by the flood wall just another 100 ft., you can cut through a much narrower section which is mostly

Dry Creek Greenway Multi-Use Trail
SRG Meeting #9 Summary

blackberries and not oaks to get to the Sierra Gardens field. Leaving the walking path alone, leaving all those oaks alone, and arriving at the back part of the field where you need to be anyway. Also making it safer for the walkers who use the current path, which in this section of the Greenbelt is about 85% of the current users.

Next Steps:

- Community Open House – Thursday, March 21st, 6:00 – 8:00 pm at the Maidu Center
- Provide feedback online at www.roseville.ca.us/drycreek