Introduction Items
- Self introductions were conducted.
- Additional information has been gathered following the last Stakeholders Group meeting in March 2014.
- A rehabilitation and replacement strategy analysis report was prepared by Quincy Engineering and shared with Caltrans that outlines the bridge alternatives.

Recap of design alternatives
- A brief recap of the design alternatives was discussed, in particular the two methodologies for Option 4.

Option 1 – Conventional bridge replacement
Option 2 – Salvage and relocate truss on new bridge
Option 3 – Bridge replacement with new similar truss
Option 4 – Rehabilitation of existing bridge
  4a – Remove the existing supplemental truss and retrofit the existing historical truss
  4b – Remove the existing supplemental truss and replace with a new supplemental truss
Option 5 – Do nothing / No build (would require eventual closure)

Follow-up items from March 12, 2014, Stakeholders Group meeting
Traffic Impacts – Near Term
- In the near term, there would be some traffic impacts from the various options, but nothing as significant as anticipated.
-
- Options 1, 2, 3, and 4 (two-lane) maintain two way traffic between East Branch and Nelson Street with no changes to LOS at surrounding intersections and roadway segments.
- Option 4 (northbound only) would require traffic to turn around at parking lots south of the bridge, and there is a LOS drop at some of the intersections and roadway segments.
- Option 4 (southbound only) would require traffic to turn into Olohan Alley or Klondike parking lot north of the bridge, and there is a LOS drop at some of the intersections and roadway segments.
- Option 5 would require NB traffic to turn around at parking lots south of the bridge, and require SB to turn into Olohan Alley or Klondike parking lot north of the bridge. There would be a LOS improvement at the East Branch/Bridge Street intersection, but Traffic Way between East Branch Street and Bridge Street drops from LOS C to LOS E.

**Historic eligibility**

- Preliminary analysis indicates that Option 4b and Option 5 would allow the bridge to maintain eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and/or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).
- Option 1 Not eligible for NRHP; If relocated, may be eligible for CRHR
- Option 2 Not eligible for NRHP or CRHR
- Option 3 Not eligible for NRHP; If relocated, may be eligible for CRHR
- Option 4a Not eligible for NRHP
- Option 4b Eligible for NRHP and CRHR
  (28-foot, 2-lane may not be eligible)
- Option 5 Eligible for NRHP and CRHR

**Fundability through HBP program**

- The above alternatives, as described in Quincy Engineering’s Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategy Analysis Report, would be fundable (with the exception of some aesthetics that Caltrans might consider too much).
- In addition, there may be some requirements such as a long-term maintenance commitment by the City for some of the alternatives.

**Cost to carry to alternatives through environmental**

- Caltrans considers both a replacement and rehabilitation design alternative fundable through the environmental phase.

**Public Comment**

- We need to preserve our historic resources as they are being chipped away one by one over time.
- There are travelers that will visit the Village to see the bridge as a historic destination which is good for the surrounding businesses.
- The existing narrow width acts as a traffic calming measure in the village.
• **Vote on Alternatives**
  - Those present unanimously eliminated Option 1, Option 4a, and Option 5 as preferred alternatives.
  - Those present unanimously voted for Option 4b to be carried through the environmental process.
  - Option 2 obtained the most votes as the second alternatives to be carried through the environmental process, with Option 3 coming in second.

• **Additional information requests / direction to staff**
  - Those present at the meeting requested meeting notes as soon as possible so they can share with their respective groups prior to the City Council meeting.

• **Next Step**
  - Presentation to the City Council on 12/09/14 to select alternative or alternatives to be carried through the environmental process.

*Note:* These minutes are the preparer’s understanding of the items discussed at the meeting. If discrepancies are noted, please contact the preparer within three days of receipt.
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