

Meeting Notes

Town of Truckee Rail Crossing Feasibility Study

Community Review Committee (CRC) Meeting #1 : Study Objectives and Purpose

February 5 , 2025
4:30 - 6:00 PM

1) Introductions

- **Dan Wilkinson - Town of Truckee, Public Works Director/Town Engineer**
- **Becky Bucar - Town of Truckee, Assistant Public Works Director**
- **Alfred Knotts - Town of Truckee, Transportation Program Manager**
- **Scott Ferguson, Member of the Public**
- **Kurt Reinkens, Member of the Public**
- **Cindy Steel, Member of the Public**
- **Travis Pribble, River Revitalization Steering Committee**
- **Wrenn Cavallo, TDMA**
- **Stephanie Olivieri, River Revitalization Steering Committee**
- **Sophia Heidrich, Mountain Area Preservation**
- **Bill Ramsey, Truckee-Donner Railroad Society**
- **Greg Zirbel, Truckee-Donner Historical Society**
- **Mitch Clarin, Planning Commission**
- **Sara Van Sclen, Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Assoc.**
- **Lisa Wallace, River Revitalization Steering Committee**
- **Lindsey Romack, Town Council Member**
- **Paco Lindsay, Truckee Trails Foundation**
- **Mike Olinger, Member of the Public**
- **Ruth Gersey, Truckee Chamber of Commerce**
- **Rolf Gordon, River Revitalization Steering Committee**
- **Katie Baker, Member of the Public**
- **Barney Dewey, Member of the Public**
- **Goerge, Zaffle, Member of the Public**
- **James Blatter, Emergency Services Department**
- **Lynne Marie Whately, TranSystems, Senior Planner**
- **Marian Rule, TranSystems, Project Manager (Online attendance)**
- **Andressa Carmo, TranSystems, Environmental Planner (Online attendance)**

2) Presentation

- a. Alfred Knotts provided an overview of the meeting's purpose.
- b. Alfred Knotts outlined the project's goals, scope, relationship to other Downtown projects, as well as the purpose, need, funding, and location of the project.
- c. Becky presented an overview of the Town's ongoing and upcoming projects involving Union Pacific Railroad.
- d. Lynne Marie and Marian presented TranSystems experiences in similar project to the public.

3) Questions and Comments

- a. A participant (Lisa) inquired whether there was a possibility that none of the options would be viable. Answer: Yes.

- b. A participant why the operations that occur when a train is present was part of the purpose. Answer: While this is relatively infrequent, staff felt it was important to understand how impacts vary during this situation.
 - c. A participant expressed concern that an underpass should not be selected due to its higher cost.
 - d. A participant asked whether there was a possibility that an at-grade solution could work. Answer: Probably not.
 - e. A participant suggested that the endpoints of the ramps do not necessarily need to align with the same directional orientation as the grade separation, offering flexibility in the design to potentially accommodate different land constraints.
 - f. A participant questioned whether the structure would support vehicle traffic, noting concerns from health professionals about the limited two-way traffic. Answer: No. Vehicle crossings are part of separate studies.
 - g. A participant pointed out that crossings for vehicles are also a significant issue and should be addressed.
 - h. There was general support for the project, though Travis raised questions regarding its necessity, expressing a preference for a separate bike path.
 - i. A request was made for additional pictures or visual representations to provide a clearer understanding of the project and its potential impact, helping to better visualize the design.
 - j. One individual expressed support for the concept of a bridge, suggesting that its construction could enhance the town's aesthetic by incorporating a historic design element, potentially adding charm and character to the area. The overcrossing could align well with the industrial character on the western edge of town, but there is a lack of support for it in the central downtown area.
 - k. Participants expressed a preference for the crossing that aligns with the Legacy Trail Bridge.
 - l. The idea of connecting the project to the trail was well-received. However, concerns were raised about the underpass design, with some questioning its visual appeal. Additional concerns included whether the underpass would take up parking spaces and the other potential challenges, including the risk of individuals experiencing homelessness using the area for camping.
 - m. A participant brought up considerations related to the proximity of the project to West St., comparing the advantages and disadvantages of an underpass versus an overpass.
 - n. Regarding safety, there was a suggestion to make the tunnel more visible to enhance visibility and reduce potential hazards. Additionally, there were concerns about snow accumulation on steel stairs and drainage, emphasizing that these issues need to be addressed adequately.
 - o. It was noted that the western crossing could be implemented without the need for property acquisition or the removal of existing parking spaces.
- 4) Report Out from Groups
- Lynne's Group
 - a. The distance between key points isn't that far, raising the question of whether the project truly provides a significant benefit at this time.
 - b. There is a potential need for the project in the future, though it may not be essential at the moment.

- c. More visual representations are needed to help understand the scale and impact of the project.
- d. Crossings further to the east might make more sense, as they could better serve pedestrian flow and minimize disruptions.

George's Group

- a. George expressed a preference for an overcrossing, suggesting that it could add an aesthetic value to the area.
- b. He also favored crossings near the park, emphasizing the importance of pedestrian accessibility in bridge design.
- c. Alternative transportation methods, such as shuttles and trolleys, were suggested as options to complement the existing bridge and crossings.

Sara V's Group

- a. Connecting the project to the Legacy Trail was strongly supported, as it would enhance connectivity and promote walking and biking.
- b. The eastern crossings may lead to increased pedestrian traffic, which could justify their location.
- c. The underground design was seen as potentially more aesthetically pleasing.
- d. The potential loss of parking spaces in the district was a concern, and it is important to fully understand the implications of this.
- e. Security and the possibility of squatting in the underpass areas were highlighted as issues that need to be addressed to ensure safety.

Mitch's Group

- a. The three western crossings were preferred, with a general consensus that they would best serve the needs of the area.
- b. When comparing overcrossing versus undercrossing, drainage was identified as a key consideration, particularly in the underpass option.
- c. The ramps may need to be long—potentially around 600 feet—and there was a suggestion to consider including an elevator alongside the staircase for easier accessibility.

Kurt's Group

- a. The debate between overcrossing and undercrossing was framed as a trade-off between aesthetic value and security concerns.
- b. There was a clear preference for the crossings at locations A, B, and C due to their alignment with the broader goals of the project.

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS

(collected from the roll plot mark-ups and via electronic communication after the meeting)

- At Grade Crossing
- Under crossing security issue
- Given the area, this should be an aesthetic crossing
- The bike/walk distances are not compelling / cost vs. benefit
- Could be pedestrian only
- For the bicycle and pedestrian travel times, project times to the future
- Visualize the scale (of the overcrossing)
- Provide more examples (especially of overcrossings)
- Elevator fully enclosed vs. glass
- Show distance from back of buildings to center line
- These seem like the best options (Purple, Green and Blue Arrows) to study In terms of connectivity to the future parking lot and Legacy Trail. Also, better distance from existing crossings
- Not sure a crossing is compelling given existing travel times the potential impacts/costs/constructability/etc.
- Over crossing would have major character/ viewshed impacts
- To close to existing crossing (Pink Arrow)
- Squatter concerns/safety
- Underground more aesthetic to historic downtown, but is it feasible?
- Concept of under or over?
- Parking either side spaces removed/ added?
- Union Pacific (UP) prefers overcrossing
- What does overcrossing construction look like?
- Would be good if there is a bus stop close to bridge / tunnel
- I like the idea of it crossing by Legacy trail bridge for easy access
- Pro bikes and pedestrian
- May get more traffic if it is closer to the heart of downtown
- Positive closer to businesses (Red Arrow)
- Business parking under UP ownership
- Twenty years from now bridge would be iconic
 - Iconic or eye sore?
- Further to east makes less and less sense
- Like this location and connection (Purple Arrow)
- Clear span West River Street altogether
- (Blue arrow) Extend to park and relocated tanks
- Lower speed limit on West River Street all the way to Hwy 89
- Make pedestrian only downtown
- Build parking structure and bridge connection out of structure
- Trolley / circulator instead
- Over Crossing - could be asset, community benefit.
- Under Crossing - crime, conflicts with wildlife



