



Citrus Heights Creek Corridor Trail Project

Trail Advisory Group Meeting #5

December 4, 2013

6:00 – 8:00 pm

Trellis Hall, Citrus Heights

Project Overview

The City of Citrus Heights is studying the feasibility of establishing a multi-use trail system within the City's 26 miles of creek and SMUD corridors (the Study Area). The study will identify existing conditions, constraints, opportunities, alignment options, phasing options, and cost estimates for a network of multi-use trails for use by bicyclists, walkers, joggers, wheelchair users, and other non-motorized uses.

The City's goals for this project include:

- Improve Mobility
 - *Create new ways to get between local destinations*
- Provide Connections to Complete Streets
 - *Design roadways for all users (pedestrians, bicycles, and cars)*
- Become More Sustainable
 - *Improved air quality*
 - *Reduced greenhouse gases*
 - *Reduce automobile traffic*
- Improve Recreation Opportunities
- Enhance Natural Environment
 - *Improve water quality*
 - *Reduce flooding risks*
 - *Improve access to natural areas*
- Improve Public Health

Attendees

Representatives from eight of the Trail Advisory Group (TAG) stakeholder organizations attended the third Trail Advisory Group Meeting for the Citrus Heights Creek Corridor Trail Project. Five additional stakeholders and community members also attended the meeting as observers. The attending TAG organizations were:

- Neighborhood Watch
- REACH - Quadrant A (areas 1, 2, & 3)
- REACH – Quadrant B (areas 6, 7, & 8)
- REACH - Quadrant C (areas 4 & 5)
- REACH - Quadrant D (areas 9, 10, & 11)
- Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates
- Sacramento Area Creeks Council
- San Juan Unified School District

Meeting Goals

- Provide an update on community outreach activities
- Recap feedback received on Background Analysis Summary Report
- Present major findings of draft feasibility analysis and receive TAG feedback

Citrus Heights Creek Corridor Trail Project
Trail Advisory Group Meeting #5

Stakeholder Engagement Update

Kate Kirsh (Project Manager, Foothill Associates) provided an update on ongoing community outreach activities. The project team has been attending REACH neighborhood meetings in order to discuss potential trail alignments in each neighborhood area in detail and receive feedback from residents. To date, the project team has attended each neighborhood area meeting.

Feasibility Report

Kate Kirsh (Project Manager, Foothill Associates) provided an overview of the Feasibility Report that was sent to TAG members in advance of the meeting. The presentation included the structure of the report, purpose of the report, highlights of the feasibility analysis, and an overview of major findings. Following the presentation TAG members were asked to provide comments or questions about the report.

General report comments and questions from TAG members:

- *Question:* Why was the 10-year water surface elevation chosen as the design storm for the analysis?
 - *Response:* The 10-year water surface elevation (WSE) is typically what engineers use in these scenarios because it represents a magnitude and frequency that is likely to encompass most of the potential for damage. To engineer for a larger event would result in higher costs and other project limitations that are less likely to be statistically warranted.
- *Question:* Is the photo of the box culvert shown in the report likely what will be used for the trail?
 - *Response:* The photo shown is conceptual only; a good example of a road undercrossing would be the crossing the TAG saw on the Folsom field trip.
- *Comment:* This is a very comprehensive report that clearly took a great amount of time and energy. It clearly identifies the major issues that have been identified.
- *Question:* Bike lanes have recently been installed on Kingswood Drive; do bike lanes help to slow traffic?
 - *Response:* Yes, it is known as a road diet. The City recently striped 10 additional miles of bike lanes using grant funds. Having on street bike lanes is important for this project because it helps to improve connectivity to the creek trail system.
- *Comment:* Change some of the map legends to list “priority 1, 2, 3” and not “priority for future study.”
- *Comment:* The purpose statement at the beginning of the report encourages the use of alternative transportation. However, reading deeper into the report it seems that the purpose expanded to be more recreation focused. The executive summary should focus on all of the intended purposes of the trail.
 - *Response:* Yes, we can expand the executive summary to include all uses.
- *Comment:* This report has the appropriate level of detail and will be good for future grant applications.
- *Comment:* There is a definite challenge for people in area 1 trying to a trail node.
 - *Response:* Yes, the City is looking at additional crossings for bikes and pedestrians at Antelope Road.
- *Comment:* This is really a wonderful report. I really like the Summary of Safety Concerns. I think this will ease the minds of many people who are worried about these issues.

Citrus Heights Creek Corridor Trail Project
Trail Advisory Group Meeting #5

- *Comment:* On all maps, change the color of Sunrise Golf Course (private property) in section AT1-2 so that it is not identified as a SRPD/ORPD park.
- *Comment:* It has been an enjoyable learning experience working on the Citrus Heights Creek Corridor Trail Project. One of the reasons is the exceptional professionalism of everyone involved with the development of this extensive plan. Citrus Heights is not the easiest area to create (or recreate) trails in because of the lack of proper planning during the 70's and 80's. Knitting the many parts together is a time consuming job that you have done well. Thank You!

Comments on specific pages or sections:

- *Comment:* Page 27, road crossings, figure 5.3.9: I would like some more information about why specific crossing treatments were chosen. Road crossings are critical components of a trail and can make or break a trail's cost or usability. I would like to see more information included about the reason for selecting types of crossing treatments so when a trail segment comes up for grant funding in the future it is clear why the decision was made.
 - *Response:* We can add more information and flush out types of crossings and why they were chosen for particular locations. Each segment can include what type of crossing was chosen and why.
- *Comment:* Page 29, Figure 8, segment B03 and B04, there is a broken red line where the trail ends before San Juan Avenue and redirects to the street. How does a trail user know to transition from trail to sidewalk? Descriptions of crossings would be helpful, I struggled to visualize them.
 - *Response:* Yes, more description can be added. There is no crossing planned in that location so a trail user would transition from the trail to the sidewalk and follow the on street route to another trail access point.
- *Comment:* Page 40: "Node amenities should incorporate context sensitive designs appropriate for the setting." When the TAG walked trails in Folsom, we generally felt that consistency throughout the whole trail was important. The report notes that designs may change by location.
 - *Response:* Yes, we had started with the goal of consistent design throughout the trail. When looking at where nodes may possibly be located it seemed like there would be a better chance to make access more noticeable if it was designed to be similar to the signage materials around it. The idea was to create flexibility; 90% of the signage within the corridor would be consistent save for a few key locations where there is an opportunity to achieve greater visibility by incorporating signage into existing designs.
- *Comment:* Would suggest saying something about consistency as it was important during the TAG discussions.
 - *Response:* Can be consistent but maybe use colors in different areas.
- *Comment:* Page 51, "Vegetation adjacent to fences so there is a clear zone from the trail or fence." I understand the reasons for that but there should be a recognition that a lot of the vegetation is important natural habitat.
 - *Response:* Correct, we can add a statement about selective pruning of those areas in order to retain significant structural elements like small shrubs that provide habitat.
- *Question:* Page 53, "Figure 6.4.8, separation of walking and biking trails." Looking at the picture this could be confusing, consistency is important. Will the trail be separated for bikes and pedestrians?

Citrus Heights Creek Corridor Trail Project
Trail Advisory Group Meeting #5

- *Response:* Places that this separation might come into play are in already developed areas like parks. In these areas we might opt to redirect pedestrians onto existing paths and create narrower bike lanes. This can be clarified in the report.
- *Question:* Page 56, summary for siding and design, “trails should be no closer than 20 feet to a back yard fence.” Were the homes along the creek trail in Folsom approximately 20 feet from fence to trail?
 - *Response:* Yes, the homes in Folsom were approximately 20 feet from fence to trail. 20 feet is the goal, but there may be areas where 20 feet cannot be achieved due to constraints.
- *Question:* Page 59, creek crossings, “the trail shall be designed to accommodate a fire vehicle turn-around area on each side of the bridge and/or provisions for alternative access.” Are some bridges required to accommodate fire or emergency vehicles?
 - *Response:* We can clarify this. There are a lot of places where the Fire Department will not use the trail to respond to fires because road access is closer. However, there may be some areas where the only access to the creek corridor will be via the trail, in that case the Fire Department may require the trail to be accessible to them. Typically when a segment is being reviewed the Fire Department and Police Department will review the alignment and determine how fires in the area will be addressed. This access will be determined on a project by project basis.
- *Comment:* Page 144, segment AT 1-2, there is a parcel labeled as private property under single ownership but on Figure 30 it looks like ORPD or SRPD.
 - *Response:* That is a mistake on Figure 30 that will be fixed.
- *Question:* If a trail segment is listed as a priority 2, but is located in open space that a property owner might develop, would that raise the priority because it does not yet have the constraints that a development might bring?
 - *Response:* Segment AT1-2 is an example of this scenario. The recognition of the segment as a potential future trail alerts the City and Planning Commission prior to approving development to consider conditions such as easements or land dedication. The implementation priority of the segment does not influence these conditions of approval.
- *Comment:* Page 205, segment C14. Can you include something to say that this segment is currently under design by the City? Provide more information about it.
 - *Response:* This segment is a standalone project that is already included in the City’s bikeway master plan. The City’s engineering department is currently working with the school and adjacent property owner to move forward with design. We can include more detailed information about this segment in the report.

Additional comments on the report were provided by several TAG members via e-mail and annotated PDFs prior to and after the meeting. These are as follows:

- Page 1: 1.2, 2nd sentence, remove the extra comma after Cripple.
- Page 3: 1st paragraph (a continuation of previous page) - "ranging from range"?? I don't understand what this means.
- Page 3: 1.7 “Each crossing is treatment is also defined” - end of first complete paragraph on page 3: what does this mean?
- Page 24: Crossing number A02_C02 is listed twice.
- Page 27: Proposed crossing treatments - would it be possible to explain this in layman's terms?
- Page 39: extra blank bullet.
- Page 40: art work misspelled

Citrus Heights Creek Corridor Trail Project
Trail Advisory Group Meeting #5

- Page 40: Mention that node amenities should have some consistent/unified elements that appear throughout the system. These elements should reflect the long-term character of the trail system (not trendy so as to become outdated).
- Page 45: "Regulatory signs "include," not "including" as this does not make it a complete sentence.
- Treatment options: I'm sure the engineers must know what this means, but I haven't a clue. I understand the first and last option but - I think a word or two more is needed for options 2 and 3.
- Page 48: "and regular maintenance will held address these concerns." Add "to"
- Page 51: Vegetation management guidelines should provide flexibility some to take into consideration the habitat value of brushy growth.
- Page 53: 6.4.8 Add description of the anticipated setting and needs for separated walking and biking trails.
- Page 56: Siting and Design Discussion's last sentence needs to appear in the text portion "trails should be no closer than 20 feet to a backyard fence."
- Page 57: Separation of Walking and Biking Trails – Replace "Where feasible" with something like "Where needed and feasible"
- Page 59: second paragraph – please make easier to understand, provide a bit more context and/or examples.
- Page 86: There is not data in the chart.
- Page 107: Crosswood Oaks Apartments should read Crosswood Oaks Retirement Community, move legend so more of map is visible.
- Page 124: 8.13.2.6. Access Control: Appropriate signage should be provided so that Illegal parking by bikers/hikers does not impinge upon private business community. Appropriate fines, etc.
- Page 145: Make some mention of the lack of constraints in this section providing opportunities for a wider creek corridor, therefore less creek impacts from the trail and possible habitat mitigation for trail impacts in other more constrained sections.
- Page 175: 8.28.2.2 "from" instead of "form"
- Page 181 – 7: 8.31.1.2.4 Does this trail have parking access?
- Page 195: CO8 Crestmont/Twin Oaks Trail - 8.34.2.6 Private property concerns....appears to be addressed.
- Page 208-209: Segment C14 - Is the cost data omitted because it is already under design by the City?
- Page 209: Provide more information about this project that is currently under design.
- Page 233: 8.46 Seg CT 1-2 Where would bikers park? Maybe this would be considered a neighborhood bikeway that services the area of the C – Bar – C , Cripple Creek at Fair Oaks and Old Auburn, CC at Crestmont and Twin Oaks, etc.
- Page 246: Wonder Way/Madera Park - Creating an access from Glen Arbor – Long over Due!! Thanks!
- Page 280 - Priority Rating – In agreement.

Next Steps

- Next TAG meeting – January 29, 2014, Trellis Hall
- Community Workshop –January 14, 2014, Community Center