

# Meeting Notes

## Town of Truckee Rail Crossing Feasibility Study

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

May 1, 2025  
4:30 - 6:00 PM

1) Attendants:

- **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**
- **Bron Roberts - Town of Truckee**
- **Mariah Stone - Town of Truckee**
- **Danielle McHug, Transportation Program Analyst**
- **Kurt Reinkens, Member of the Public**
- **Bill Kenny, Member of the Public**
- **Cindy Steel, Member of the Public**
- **Julie Hieck, TDMA**
- **Sophia Heidrich, Mountain Area Preservation**
- **Cory Peterson, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency**
- **Bill Ramsey, Truckee-Donner Railroad Society**
- **Greg Zirbel, Truckee-Donner Historical Society**
- **Sara Van Sclen, Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Assoc.**
- **Paco Lindsay, Truckee Trails Foundation**
- **Ruth Gersey, Truckee Chamber of Commerce**
- **Rolf Godon, River Revitalization Steering Committee**
- **Barney Dewey, Member of the Public**
- **Lynne Marie Whately, TranSystems, Senior Planner**
- **Marian Rule, TranSystems, Project Manager (Online attendance)**

2) Introduction

- a. The Town of Truckee held the second CRC meeting on May 1<sup>st</sup> 2025 at 4:30pm in Downtown Truckee, which consisted of a site visit of the three proposed locations for the future ped/bike crossing.
- b. The team met at Truckee Tire located at 10262 West River Street Truckee. The Town staff and consultants distributed the materials to the CRC members: Agenda, Evaluation Criteria Matrix and 3D Exhibits for the crossing options on each location.
- c. A brief overview of the Evaluation Criteria Matrix was provided, outlining the key factors used to assess the conceptual designs. Group members were expected to analyze each design alternative using this matrix, apply the criteria objectively, and contribute to a collective assessment based on the established evaluation framework.
- d. The group visited all three locations (A, B, and C), where they had the opportunity to view the conceptual designs for each location, and listen to discussions on their considerations and implications.

3) Questions and Comments

- a. Question: Is an undercrossing even an option? Why are we talking about it if UP won't approve it?
  - i. Response from Marian: UP does not prefer them, but they'll consider if an overcrossing is totally infeasible, so it's important we explore all our options at this stage.
  - ii. Response from Dan: Through this study, if the consensus is that residents are vehemently against and overcrossing, that would be important information for Council to hear.
- b. Question: What is the grade percentage requirement for ramps?
  - i. Response: Less than 5% if continuous or up to 8% with flat spots. Renderings show the ramps at 4.5%, so if it was decided to go with a higher grade, the ramp would be approximately 25% shorter than what is shown.
- c. Question: How/when is that decision made?
  - i. Response: It is a design choice.
- d. Question: Where does funding for this project come from? Would it all be General Fund or is there an opportunity for State or Federal grants?
  - i. Response: The Town would pursue grant opportunities. It is challenging to know what funding is available at this point in time. A good example is the Mousehole Project. It took years to accumulate approximately 13 million in state/federal funds, and the Town only ended up contributing approximately \$1 million.
- e. Question: Will the ramps be covered?
  - i. Response: Most likely. If we're going to build something and spend all this money, we might as well make sure the crossing can be used year-round and require minimal maintenance. Snow removal above the tracks would be very complicated, so it would make the most sense to cover the entire thing. Other options could include building a full structure around the ramps. Also, if the option is to go with an elevator instead of ramps, that would be in a building.
- f. Question: What is the maintenance cost?
  - i. Response: We don't know yet. We know that elevators would cost more due to the mechanical maintenance, but we do not yet have estimates.
- g. Question: Is it anticipated that this crossing would be closed each night? And where would it be closed?
  - i. Response: We would need to have access control that would allow us to lock when needed, but not necessarily every night. We would need to keep an eye on it to see how things go and adjust accordingly. When closed, it would need to be closed at point of entry.
- h. CRC member (Kurt) recommends a glass/see through elevator for safety reasons.

#### 4) Location Discussion

##### Location A

- a. Ramps with multiple switchbacks is approximately 1700 feet long and takes about 7 minutes, compared to approximately 14 minutes to walk along West River, up Bridge Street, and back down Donner Pass Road to reach the other side.
- b. Undercrossing ramps would be slightly shorter than overcrossing
- c. Question: How tall would the elevator be?

- i. Response: Approximately same height as structure. Elevator building needs to have an additional 5-8 feet on top for maintenance.
- d. Question: How does the Town expect to deal with the contamination unground at Location A? Would this contamination prevent an undercrossing at this location?
  - i. Response:: We would need to remediate any contaminated soil, and the need for that could definitely impact cost and ultimately the final decision.
- e. Question: How many steps are there on the stairs?
  - i. Response: 71 steps (this is the total up and down)
- f. Question: Does this location take parking spaces?
  - i. Response: It may. Could change in Final Design, but not it's assumed it would take some spaces.
- g. Question: The Town currently owns/has an easement on this dirt lot/future parking area, and the allowed development is only the parking lot. Would an additional permit be needed to construct this project?
  - i. Response: Yes, the Town would need to work with UP to add a permit for the structure into the existing easement.
- h. Question: Would it be possible to go all the way over the parking lot and terminate at the new park?
  - i. Response: Yes, it is possible. One option is to change the layout of the ramp at location A or B (both?) to have the ramp terminate at the north side of West River Street across from the park. This creates a longer walk for those who park in the parking lot and intend to cross; however it would make it more accessible from the street, removing the need to traverse across the parking lot.
  - ii. One thing to note is that the structure is shown using the depth of a parking space, rather than extending beyond that depth. If it gets extended out, it takes up what would be parking lot circulation/drive aisle and would impact the parking lot.

Location B

- i. This location would require the owner of the Jack and Emmy building to update their easement with UP. They would also lose their private parking lot. This location has more logical pedestrian access being situated directly across from the park, rather than behind the building.
- j. It was noted that an undercrossing would be easier further west (Location A) and more difficult as we move east.
- k. Location B offers the best alignment with the park, providing the most direct and accessible connection.
- l. Question: Regarding line of sight from UP signal to the west.
  - i. Response: Mike Upton confirmed that this information was taken into account and incorporated so that the line of sight will not be an issue.

Location C

- m. Ramps would fill the whole open space on the North Side between the two buildings. The bottom of the structure would be approximately 5 feet above the peak of the loading dock building.
- n. Parking lot on north side would have to be surrendered by property owner—the property owner has been informed of this project, but this specific conversation has not been had yet. Property owners would need to renegotiate lease with UP, then Town would work with UP to acquire an easement for that land.
- o. Question: Would bikes be required to be walked on ramps?

- i. Response: One factor would be width. Ideally you'd need 14-16 ft wide in order for cyclists to be able to comfortably pedal if other people were on the ramp/without being a nuisance. Town would need to decide if they want to fully prohibit bikes on the ramps unless walked.
  - p. Question: If there is an undercrossing with elevator instead of ramps, would you still need to take the same precautions (shoring walls) for the building at Location C?
    - i. Yes, shoring walls would be required regardless, to protect the structural integrity of the surrounding buildings. However, installing them would be more straightforward in the case of an undercrossing, as excavation would already be taking place.
- 5) Other Comments
  - a. Elevator and ramp could be mix and match—could do elevator on one side and ramp on the other.
  - b. Location A&B have better direct connection to the park.
  - c. Undercrossing is likely 1.5-5x more expensive than an over crossing.
  - d. Possibly the overcrossing would have no roof.
  - e. It was noted by the Town that if any business happens to be impacted, it would be up to them to analyze the impact to their business and see if they concur.
  - f. The Town noted that, should any business be impacted, it would be at the discretion of that business to determine whether the impacts are acceptable and whether they choose to proceed.
  - g. It was noted that the Streetscape Project included measures to offset the loss of parking by creating additional spaces. The Town clarified that this project would include the development of a new parking lot, and while some existing parking may be lost, a significant number of new spaces would be added.
  - h. The Town clarified that, if an overhead option is ultimately selected, historic architectural design considerations would be addressed in later project phases.
  - i. All ramps are currently designed with a constant slope. If the design is modified to incorporate a maximum grade of 8%—the standard allowable slope for accessibility and roadway design in many cases—the overall length of the ramps could be reduced.
  - j. Escalators were suggested.
  - k. Gondolas were suggested.
  - l. If needed, structure could be closed at night.