Meeting Minutes
City of Arroyo Grande
Bridge Street Bridge Improvement Project
Community Meeting #2

Date: January 22, 2014
Time: 8:30 am – 10:30 am
Location: Arroyo Grande City Council Chambers, 215 East Branch Street, Arroyo Grande

Consultant Team Attendees:
Quincy Engineering: Mark Reno, Greg Young, Brent Lemon
Wallace Group: Jill McPeek
JRP: Chris McMorris
SWCA: Jon Claxton, Gary Ruggerone
LWC: Menka Sethi, Becky Singh

Arroyo Grande City Staff Attendees:
Mayor Ferrara, Steve Adams, Mike Linn, Geoff English, Aileen Nygaard, Ron Simpson

Consultant Team Presentation

1. Welcome and Introductions. Jill McPeek of Wallace Group welcomed attendees, discussed meeting protocol, directed self-introductions of those present, and reviewed the meeting agenda.

2. Summary of Work to Date. Jill McPeek provided a quick overview of work and efforts that have been completed to date.

3. Presentation: Condition of Existing Bridge. The Quincy Engineering team summarized technical components of the project and led discussion on current load capacity, federal Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funding requirements, and explanation of Caltrans SD (Structurally Deficient) and FO (Functionally Obsolete) designations. In summary: the Bridge Street Bridge has a sufficiency rating of 12.8 and is restricted to a 3 ton loading which is the lowest rating prior to bridge closure.
4. **Presentation: Design Alternatives.** Quincy Engineering presented four design alternatives and a no-build alternative. Quincy Engineering discussed advantages and disadvantages of each alternative, relative construction costs and construction durations, and minimum bridge width requirements.

5. **Presentation: Existing Traffic.** Quincy Engineering presented current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) counts on the Bridge Street Bridge, traffic patterns assuming one-way traffic on Bridge Street, and detours during bridge construction or bridge closure.

6. **Presentation: Public Comments.** Quincy Engineering responded to public comment and questions that have been received since the first Community Meeting in November 2013.

7. **Presentation: Next Steps.** Jill McPeek outlined the project timeline and remaining project milestones.

8. **Meeting Closing:** Jill McPeek thanked the public for providing comments to the consultant team and adjourned the meeting.

**Issues Raised by the Public During the Meeting**

**Meeting Minutes and Presentation Materials Request:** Public requested access to meeting notes and presentation materials.

**One-Lane, One-Way Bridge Comments:**
- Consider changing Bridge Street Bridge to a one-lane, one-way bridge to side step bridge widening and guardrail requirements.
- Widening bridge could result in higher traffic speed.
- Widening bridge could alter historic integrity.
- Traffic impacts from changing Bridge Street Bridge to a one-way, one lane bridge would need to be studied to determine larger area impacts.

**Private Funding Comments:** Discussed whether or not private funding could be used to reinforce bridge in such a manner that may increase bridge functionality but may not meet Caltrans (or other applicable) standards.

**City Liability Comments:** Private funding used to pay for Bridge Street Bridge upgrades that do not meet safety criteria could place the City at legal risk.

**Prior Bridge Reinforcement Comments:** Details of prior bridge reinforcement completed in the 1990’s were questioned. Public questioned whether or not a different renovation approach could have prevented current bridge status.

**Bridge Widening:** Public posed questions about whether or not the bridge could remain at its current width. Additional discussion followed. Not widening the bridge per current design/safety
standards could put the City at legal risk and render it ineligible for Federal funding for long-term maintenance and repairs.

**Maintenance & Environmental Permits:** Joined by Mayor Ferrara, members of the public discussed environmental constraints surrounding past bridge repair, maintenance and painting, and questioned viability of procuring permits for proposed bridge improvements.

**Public Engagement:** Questions arose regarding the Stakeholders Group and its role in the project. There was some concern that other stakeholders (business owners, residents) may not be aware of opportunities to engage/participate in the project.