



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

<http://www.edcgov.us/DOT/>

PLACERVILLE OFFICES:

MAIN OFFICE:

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5900 / (530) 626-0387 Fax

MAINTENANCE:

2441 Headington Road, Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 642-4909 / (530) 642-0508 Fax

LAKE TAHOE OFFICES:

ENGINEERING:

924 B Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 573-7900 / (530) 541-7049 Fax

MAINTENANCE:

1121 Shakori Drive, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 573-3180 / (530) 577-8402 Fax

El Dorado County Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project– Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) April 8, 2014 Meeting #1 - Summary

The following groups are represented on the SAC

American River Conservancy,
Coloma/Lotus Chamber of Commerce
EDC Chamber of Commerce,
EDC Historical Society,
Gold Trail Grange #452,
Coloma Heights Neighborhood Assoc.
Compass2Truth,
Coloma Resort,
Camp Lotus,
Scott Road
Coloma Lotus News,
Bike and Pedestrian,
Raft California,
Mt. Murphy Road
Garden Valley Ranch Estates

Project Development Team

El Dorado County (EDC): Matt Smeltzer, Janet Postlewait, Thor Larsen

CH2M HILL, Leslie Bonneau. Hans Strandgaard, Chris Benson, Hans Larsen

ICF: Shahira Ashkar, Will Henderson, Steve Mikesell

El Dorado Transportation Commission, Dan Bolster

On April 8, 2014, from 5:30 pm to 8:00 pm, El Dorado County hosted the first Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting for the Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Alternatives Analysis project. The meeting was held at the Gold Trail Grange (Grange) located in Coloma, CA and adjacent to Mt. Murphy Road Bridge. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the SAC to the design team, provide an update of work completed as directed by the Board of Supervisors to analyze the rehabilitation options for the bridge, establish working protocols for the group, and obtain input from the SAC on issues and concerns that should be critical considerations during the planning process.

Materials provided for review during the meeting included “Protocols and Working Agreements for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee” and a “Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project Development Schedule” graphic. A copy of the presentation used during the meeting and this summary will be posted on the project website at www.edcgov.us/MtMurphyBridge.

This summary has been prepared to provide an overview of the discussions that took place during the meeting and is not intended to represent a verbatim meeting transcript.

Agenda and Introductions

Matt Smeltzer/ El Dorado County (County) Deputy Director of Engineering welcomed participants and provided introductions for Janet Postlewait/County and Thor Larsen/County. Matt introduced Leslie Bonneau/CH2M HILL as the Consultant Project Manager and the facilitator for the SAC meetings.

Leslie provided an overview of the meeting agenda and provided an opportunity for each member of the SAC to introduce themselves and identify the organization they represented and one point of interest on why they love living in or doing business in Coloma, CA. A summary of the things attendees said they love about Coloma are:

- Appreciation for history and rural quality of life
- Coloma Heights: the place and the people
- Sense of community
- Whitewater rafting
- Historical importance of the area
- Gold trail range
- Viewsheds of the river and valley
- Recreation (running, biking, hiking)
- State Park access and use

Protocols and Working Agreements

Leslie then reviewed a document with the SAC entitled “Protocols and Working Agreements for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee”. She highlighted a few points in the Protocols and asked that attendees review the document and note any questions, concerns, or suggestions they may have for discussion and consideration by the SAC at the next meeting. Following are the points that were highlighted from the document:

Agenda – The group was advised that each meeting will start and end on time and that a “Parking Lot” will be used to capture items for discussion or follow-up that are not on the agenda for that meeting.

Consensus Recommendations – The SAC was advised that the group’s goal is to make consensus recommendations to the County and the Board of Supervisors (BOS) regarding the design elements being reviewed by the SAC. While every effort will be made by the group to craft recommendations that reflect the vision and goals of each organization represented, there will be times of disagreement. In such cases, every effort will be made to find an acceptable compromise. When an acceptable compromise is not achievable, recommendations will be based upon a majority consensus with minority opinions reflected within the corresponding meeting summary. All recommendations and supporting reasons will also be documented within the SAC meeting summaries.

Media Communications – SAC members were advised that Janet Postlewait/County and Matt Smeltzer/County will act as the official Media Spokesperson for the SAC and the project in general. If a SAC member chooses to respond to a media inquiry, they will clearly state that they are representing their own personal perspective or the perspective of their respective constituencies, and not that of the County or the SAC.

Meeting Schedule –Currently, there are three SAC meetings and one general public meeting scheduled. The two additional SAC meetings are planned for late May and late July. SAC meetings are intended for SAC members, and are not formatted to be open public meetings.

Meeting Summary and Contact Lists –Leslie noted that the presentation shown to the SAC and a summary of the meeting would be posted on the County’s project website. She also passed around a sign-in sheet and asked each member of the SAC to write down their contact information and to note in the margin if they did not want their contact information to be shared with other attendees. Contact information will not be put on the website, and will not be shared with the public.

Project Overview

Leslie Bonneau/CH2M HILL provided an overview of the safety project history, the project development process, and how SAC input will be incorporated to the project. She noted that the SAC is an important part of coming up with a solution that people can feel good about. She said that by understanding what the public thinks, the design team can be responsive to those needs and can help the SAC to develop a criteria that will be used to evaluate and eventually rank alternatives. Hans Strandgaard/CH2M HILL gave an engineering explanation of the safety issues with the existing bridge and the results of the analysis that has been performed to date. Leslie discussed the project organization chart (see attached). Following is a detailed description of the role for some of the groups on the organization chart:

Role of the County – El Dorado County will serve as a vital communications link between the Agencies (FHWA, Caltrans), Project Development Team (PDT), SAC, and the general public. The County will periodically update the Board of Supervisors on progress of the project and ensure that the project website is up to date with the project.

Role of the SAC – The SAC serves as a vital communications link between their respective organizations, the general public, and the County. SAC members are expected to provide updates to their respective constituencies and bring back feedback they receive regarding suggestions, questions, or concerns for consideration by the SAC.

Role of the PDT – The PDT is the project development team that will manage and facilitate the project. The PDT will present the Alternatives Analysis Report (AAR) to the SAC and general public, and then take final recommendations to the BOS.

A comment was made that in order for the SAC representative to truly represent their constituency, they would like to have material to take back to their groups to discuss and get input in order to bring that input back to the SAC. Every effort will be made to provide material in advance, or allow time following the SAC meeting for the SAC representatives to get that feedback to pass along for consideration.

The Project Development Schedule was reviewed, including major project milestones and how the SAC fits into this schedule. An overview was also provided of the overall Project Development Process, which illustrates that this project will take approximately 7-8 years from the current phase to end of construction.

The presentation given to the SAC includes the project schedule and the development process. This presentation is available on the Mt. Murphy Bridge County website, along with this meeting summary.

Questions

Q: What bike path class will be provided?

A: Bike path class will be determined during development of alternatives.

Q: Has it already been decided to replace the existing bridge?

A: No decisions have been made at this time. All options will be analyzed according to the criteria developed during the SAC meetings. A report was completed that analyzed the existing bridge condition and the results were presented to the Board on February 11, 2014. The *Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Rehabilitation Executive Summary Outline, January 2014* is available on the Mt. Murphy Bridge website, as is the Board presentation.

Q: Will “rehabilitation” and “no build” options be scored along with the proposed alternatives?

A: Yes, all alternatives will be scored and presented during the SAC #3 meeting.

Q: Is a single span bridge possible to keep bridge supports out of the river?

A: At this time, all options are on the table for evaluation.

Q: Will Hwy 49 be realigned to follow the bridge?

A: The Mt. Murphy Road Bridge project is a County project focused on providing a safe crossing of the river. The latest information the County has received from Caltrans regarding any plans of realigning SR 49 can be found in the, *State Route 49 Realignment Study, March 2010*, completed for Caltrans by the EDC Transportation Commission. This study has complete independent utility from the Mt. Murphy Road Bridge project.

What’s Important To You

Following the overview, the SAC was asked to break into groups, each around a large aerial view of the project area, and to brainstorm ideas and themes to serve as the basis for the initial project screening criteria. Leslie asked that each group choose someone to summarize the thoughts of the group at the end of their half hour of discussions. The SAC was advised that the ideas generated would be taken by the project development team (PDT) and developed further into categories of screening criteria that represent their values and vision for the community. These criteria will be presented for discussion at SAC meeting #2.

Each table group was then asked to report out a summary of their discussions. Following is a summary of the tables reporting out:

- Protect the historical, rural and community aspects of the area.
- Minimize construction impacts of downstream use of the river.
- Replacement should respect history, iconic. The Pine Street Bridge in Nevada City was given as an example that has been able to maintain historical appeal, but provides a bridge that meets current engineering standards. The Sundial Bridge in Redding was given as an example that is too modern in appearance.
- Protect viewsheds: attraction for pedestrians, pedestrian use on both sides of the river, lookouts on old bridge would be nice.
- Bike lane on bridge to be Class 1 or 2? Pedestrian and bike travel need to be separate.
- Adequate turning radius for ingress & egress
- Build bridges in halves upstream
- The street should include sidewalks on both sides and balconies or lookouts would be great.
- Downstream flood and erosion concerns
- Because of river erosion there are limited river access points downstream that need to be maintained
- Would prefer if a new bridge had no piers in the waterway
- Traffic issues should consider State park plans as well
- Noise concerns around Scott Rd
- Access considerations:
 - Traffic increases if bridge improved
 - Bike friendly means more people, “bottlenecks”

- Need to manage traffic in general, bridge functions as traffic calming
- Consideration of Hwy 49 re-alignment
- Evacuation routes from north side of the river.
- Zero sustainable development options given the parking and current use of the area.
- Viewshed (river, bridge)
- Nature/History: Eagle nests, turtle habitat
- Maintain current beach access and use.
- Maintain current river access points during construction. Location of construction equipment is concern.
- Clear span with new bridge would be preferable
- Circulation: Traffic congestion, connecting elsewhere (ie: Lotus Rd), bridge access for bikes.
- Historic building and sensitivities to vibrations during construction.

A list of the comments noted at each table follows:

- River access at Lotus and Hwy 49 (Lotus side of the river)
- Traffic backups along Hwy 49 between Lotus and the Park
- Protect turtle and eagle habitats along the river downstream from the bridge.
- Flood and river bank erosion concerns downstream from the bridge. Hwy 49 flooded in 1997.
- Monroe ridge trail (viewshed). Located in the Park south of Hwy 49
- Protect historic native use sites including the park south of Hwy 49 and Orchards.
- Below Monroe ridge trail and south of Hwy 49.
- Kayak landing use, north of Hwy 49, west of the Bridge.
- Protect bird nesting habitat.
- Concern about construction equipment being stored in area south of Carvers Road and north of the River.
- Mill site and high pedestrian use in and around the Park, both side of bridge.
- If the bridge is replaced, please consider the Grange has limited property and moving the driveway to the bridge side and how that would be coordinated with the Park property.
- Integrity of historical structures in the Park.
- Traffic and access to north side of river.
- Nature center at bend in Hwy 49 east of the Bridge.
- Baby beach. East of the Bridge, south side of river
- Residential housing. South side of the River, east of Hwy 49 bend
- Eagle's nest sites upstream from the bridge
- Mt. Murphy "trailhead". Dutch creek. Between Bayne and Mt Murphy Rd.
- Viewshed up Mt Murphy Rd

- Private property right north of the river, north of the peninsula. (Mt Murphy Rd @ Marshall Grade)
- Minimize right of way takes from private property owners
- Lotus is central to location of the Park.
- Re-alignment Hwy 49? Prefer re-route behind Monroe Ridge.
- Sustainable development along Hwy 49 between Lotus and the Park.
- Evacuation route from Carvers Rd, north side of the River.
- Address concerns that Hwy 49 will be moved onto a new wider bridge later
- Coloma Resort traffic congestion.
- Trouble Maker Rapids viewshed.
- The bridge is an anchor and backbone for the area and community. Keystone of the area.
- Protect the historical, rural and community aspects of the area
- Maintain current “chokepoint” that a narrow bridge provides, to the extent possible.
- Consolidation/integration with Hennessey Lotus Park
- Pedestrian connectivity, trail continuity, river access along north side of Hwy 49 between Lotus and the Park.
- Replacement bridge should have historic, aesthetic, iconic structure represents the area.
- Existing Bridge issues with turning radius, sight distance (tall approach span barriers), 100-yr flood passage.
- Safe access and use for pedestrians and vehicles.
- Feasibility of building new bridge one half at a time upstream of the existing bridge.
- River use and access during construction.

Parking Lot Comments

Following are the items that we placed on the Parking Lot for future discussion:

Will realignment of Hwy 49 follow the route of the new bridge alignment?

In the event of a disaster, what is the evacuation route for north side of river?

Next Steps

Leslie concluded the meeting at 8:00 and noted that the next SAC meeting will be held at the Grange approximately mid to late May with the time to be determined. The group noted that Tuesdays or Wednesdays are the best days to meet with the exception of the 4th Tuesday of the month. A meeting summary with all materials presented will be distributed to members of the SAC.

The next SAC meeting is scheduled for May 28, 2014, 5:30-8:00 p.m.