



MEMORANDUM

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: TERESA MCCLISH, ^{MDP/ter} DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: STATUS OF THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE PROJECT

DATE: FEBRUARY 4, 2014

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Planning Commission provide input to Commissioner Russom for his participation on the Bridge Street Bridge Stakeholder Group Committee regarding the selection of a preferred alternative for the rehabilitation or replacement of the Bridge Street Bridge (the "Bridge"). No formal action is requested from the Planning Commission at this time.

IMPACT ON FINANCIAL AND PERSONNEL RESOURCES:

Costs are included in the Capital Improvement Program budget and are 100% grant funded through the Federal Highway Bridge Program. Staff time will continue to be required to for project management and to solicit and process stakeholder input.

BACKGROUND:

Due to various deficiencies, the Bridge is restricted to a 3-ton maximum load limit. Rehabilitation or replacement may both be feasible options to bring the Bridge up to standard loading conditions.

In 2005, a Preliminary Engineering Study (PES) was prepared that presented a preliminary set of alternatives and associated costs for rehabilitating or replacing the Bridge. However, further project development was halted due to the required local match funds under the regular Local Highway Bridge Program (HBP).

In July 2010, the City submitted requests and received 100% Federal funding through the use of toll credits for bridges off the federal-aid system. Preliminary Engineering work includes environmental studies, NEPA/CEQA approval, permitting, final design, and other related work, including the cost of advertising leading to physical construction of a project. Construction work includes the actual cost to construct the project itself, construction engineering, and administrative settlement of cost for contract claims.

Authorization to proceed with Preliminary Engineering was received in April 2011, and City and Caltrans staff met on July 12, 2011 to review the alternatives contained in the

**PLANNING COMMISSION
STATUS UPDATE FOR THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE PROJECT
FEBRUARY 4, 2014
PAGE 2**

2005 PES. In May 2012, the Council awarded Quincy Engineering a contract to refine feasible alternatives, provide visual displays and conduct public review, perform necessary engineering and environmental studies, and prepare plans, specifications and estimates for the preferred alternative. Most of the technical studies are complete and four feasible alternatives have been developed, including a "no-build" alternative.

ANALYSIS OF ISSUES:

Feasible alternatives include (in no order of priority):

1. Conventional bridge replacement;
2. Salvage and relocate truss and bridge deck components on new bridge;
3. Bridge replacement with new similar truss;
4. Rehabilitation of existing bridge; and
5. Do nothing.

It is important to note that the no-build option would mean that the Bridge will remain both functionally and structurally obsolete, would not be eligible for maintenance funding and consequently, and would eventually need to be closed. Replacement options will mean some impact to the historic bridge and visual changes. The retrofit option will also result in visual changes due to the need to strengthen the existing/ lower supporting truss. Because the Bridge is a prominent historical feature in the Village, careful consideration of perspectives and renderings is necessary to inform the environmental review process and assist decision makers and the public.

The first community meeting was held November 6, 2013. A second community meeting was held on January 22, 2014. All stakeholders, property owners, and tenants were mailed a meeting notice. In addition, for the second meeting, two of the Stakeholders hand walked notices to each address throughout the Village area (e.g., Bridge, Branch, Nelson, Mason, Short). A notice was posted in front of City Hall as well as on the City's website.

The main focus of the most recent community meeting was to discuss the various alternatives in further detail, provide feedback on public comment that has been received from the first Community Meeting in November 2013 and Stakeholders Group meeting earlier in January 2014, and to outline the future activities in moving the project forward.

Advantages and disadvantages of each alternative were discussed, as well as relative costs and construction schedules. The alternatives presented are alternatives that appear to be eligible for funding (up to 100%) that the City has secured under the Highway Bridge Program (HBP).

Variations of Alternative 4 – Retrofit Existing Bridge were also discussed. Particular items of interest included possibly making it a one-way bridge, and if features selected are not be eligible for funding under the HBP program ways to fund the project from other sources.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
STATUS UPDATE FOR THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE PROJECT
FEBRUARY 4, 2014
PAGE 3**

The overall project schedule and immediate next steps were also discussed. Each Stakeholder Group is scheduled to meet in February 2014, in order to discuss the alternatives, and vote on a preferred alternative. City staff will gather community comment, Stakeholder Group votes, and present a preferred alternative to the City Council in March 2014. The City Council will then select the preferred alternative.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND COMMENTS:

The Agenda was posted in front of City Hall and on the City's website on Friday, January 31, 2014.

ATTACHMENT:

Power point slides from January Community Meeting