

# PROJECT RECORD

City of Arroyo Grande  
Bridge Street Bridge Improvement Project  
Stakeholders Group Meeting  
0232-5608



Project Update

Meeting

Teleconference

**Date:** August 26, 2015

**Time:** 8:30 AM

**Location:** Arroyo Grande City Hall  
2nd Floor Conference Room  
300 East Branch Street Arroyo Grande, CA

**Attendees:** See attached sign in sheet

**Prepared by:** Jill McPeek, Consultant Project Manager

CIVIL AND  
TRANSPORTATION  
ENGINEERING

CONSTRUCTION  
MANAGEMENT

LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTURE

MECHANICAL  
ENGINEERING

PLANNING

PUBLIC WORKS  
ADMINISTRATION

SURVEYING /  
GIS SOLUTIONS

WATER RESOURCES

## I. Introduction Items

Self introductions were conducted.

## II. Recap of alternatives to be studied during environmental phase

A brief recap of the two alternatives that were approved by Council in January 2015 to proceed through environmental studies was presented.

Option 2 Salvage and relocate truss on new bridge

Option 4b Rehabilitation of existing bridge by replacing the existing supplemental truss with a new supplemental truss

Option 5 Do nothing / No build (would require eventual closure)

## III. Design features

### Bridge Railing

It was the consensus of the group that in order to retain federal funding, the proposed 27-inch, TL-2 rated railing with a 24-foot separation could be an acceptable design feature. The group agreed to have the design team move this railing forward into design.

Items to consider as part of the design:

- Installation of some form of skateboarding deterrent along the top of the rail (could be rivets to match those on the existing bridge)

WALLACE GROUP  
A California Corporation

612 CLARION CT  
SAN LUIS OBISPO  
CALIFORNIA 93401

T 805 544-4011  
F 805 544-4294

www.wallacegroup.us



- Installation of some sort of aesthetic treatment that could be placed over the end tapers (could be some form of plating to match the existing truss end tapers)

The group requested a cross section of the existing bridge and a cross section with the railing installed. In particular, the group was interested in what the new width between the green trusses will be versus the current width.

*Following the meeting, the design consultant, Quincy Engineering, was able to provide the following information:*

*The clear distance between the existing truss elements is 24'-0". The railing will be 1'-6" wide on each side, resulting in the new distance between the truss 27'-0" wide.*

For the railing along the outside of the walkway, as opposed to adding railing inside of the existing diamonds to achieve 4-inch openings, it was suggested that an additional set of diamond lattice be placed directly on the outside of the existing (it could be smaller cables painted dark to fade out). That way the existing railing would remain as is which may be more true to its historic features. It was further suggested that perhaps there may be opportunity to have a maintenance area between the two sets of railings.

#### Supplemental (Supporting) Truss

Three alternatives for a supporting structure was discussed: a truss similar to the existing truss with bulkier members; a steel girder; or a concrete girder. It was the consensus of the group that the existing truss is not a key component of the historic bridge. In fact, it tends to distract from the green historic trusses. There was further discussion regarding concrete versus steel girders. The group questioned if there was a significant cost differential between concrete and steel girders.

*Following the meeting, the design consultant, Quincy Engineering, was able to provide the following information:*

*Steel Girders are typically twice the cost of concrete girders. They also have a much higher maintenance cost due to repainting. But there is a significant weight savings utilizing steel versus concrete girders.*

It was the consensus of the group that a solid steel girder would be the most aesthetically pleasing, and should be easier from an inspection and long term maintenance standpoint. It should also result in a shorter construction duration. The group inquired if the steel girder would jeopardize the bridge's historic eligibility.

*Following the meeting, the design consultant, Quincy Engineering, was able to provide the following information:*

*Historic eligibility will be based on the SHPO/Caltrans Memorandum of Agreement and the Finding of Effect. The design team is trying to anticipate*



*what bridge modifications SHPO and Caltrans may find as an impact to the historic resource based on past experience. Based on past experience the team feels that replacing the existing supplemental truss with a new supplemental truss has the lowest potential for there to be an impact to the historic resource finding. Replacing the existing supplemental truss with a new steel girder would still likely have a low potential to be an impact finding. However it would probably be a slightly higher chance relative to the new supplemental truss option. However, since the review is subjective there are no guarantees until the Memorandum of Agreement is issued.*

Item to consider as part of the design:

- A tube or "C" frame girder that would not have an outside lip that may lend itself to access for graffiti, etc.

### Single Column Bent

While the group did desire the center support to resemble the existing support, it was not opposed to a single column that would work better hydraulically (scour) and environmentally (small footprint). However, the top bent or cap that was presented in the example were rejected by the group. Perhaps a smaller bent could be utilized, or one that tucks up in the bottom of the structure, or a steel bent that blends in better, or perhaps the bent can sit directly on the column.

*Following the meeting, the design consultant, Quincy Engineering, was able to provide the following information:*

*The structure type and span configuration dictates what type of bent cap is feasible. Steel bent caps are feasible for deep steel girders with continuous supports (when a bridge structure does not have a joint at the bent cap). Where there is a joint the girders need to sit on top of a bearing to allow for movement and this bearing needs to be supported by a concrete cap. For the Bridge Street Bridge the historic truss and new support structure will not be continuous over the support so they will need to sit on bearings. In order to better hide the new support truss/girders they will need to be placed in between the existing historic bridge chords. This means that bearings are required all the way across the center support (not just the edges) so unfortunately a bent cap will be required. The approach span steel girders will also require a cap to sit on. This is similar to the existing condition. The bent cap can only be tucked up towards the inside of the structure with the new supplemental truss option. With the new steel girder option the cap will need to be below the steel girders to support them. If the goal is to minimize the cap appearance, the new supplemental truss alternative should be selected rather than the steel girder alternative. A bent cap will still be required, but the distance of the cap below the historic truss would be lower relative to the new steel girder approach.*

Items to consider as part of the design:

- Different shape for the column perhaps something other than cylindrical (for aesthetics)



- Some type of texturing or veneer that blends better than just plain grey concrete

#### **IV. Public Comment**

- Would it be possible to have stamped concrete or asphalt that resembles the original wooden travel lanes? It is understood that wood would most likely not meet the structural requirements, but perhaps a treated surface would work. Would there be an adverse rumble affect by treating the surface? The group will look for pictures of the original travel surface for reference.

*Following the meeting, the design consultant, Quincy Engineering, was able to provide the following information:*

*Stamped and colored concrete could be feasible for the bridge deck. The "rumble" effect could be reduced by the depth of the stamped elements. It is important to note that over time tire residue, dirt and other debris may discolor the surface.*

#### **V. Additional information requests / direction to staff**

- None noted.

#### **VI. Next Steps**

- Staff to work with design engineer on questions posed above and present answers to Stakeholders Group.
- Community meeting in Fall 2015
- Circulation of draft environmental document in Spring 2016

**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.*



Bridge Street Bridge Stakeholders Meeting 8/26/15

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency / Group</u>	<u>E-mail / Phone</u>
Jill McPeck	Wallace Group	JillMcWallacegroupus 544-4011
Church Fellows JIM & KATHY MAROCCO	Friends of... Bridge LOS ROBLES DE RANCHO GRANDE HOA.	710-3277 J.K.MAROCCO@SBC GLOBAL.NET
JOHN MACK	Planning Commission	440 8812
MATT HORN	CITY OF <del>AG</del> AG	mhorn@ArroyoGrande.ORG 473-5441
Tina Meehan	City of AG	Tmeehan@arroyogrande.org
Bob Lund	VIA	bob@lundsgift.com
Steven Ross	AGTC	srobysthoseac.aol.com
MIKE LIND	City of AG	miline.arroyogrande.org 473-5441
Dianne Thompson	City of AG	dthompson@arroyo grande.org
Judith Bean	Chamber	JudithBean@chamber.ca
Maxwell Bennett	Resident Bennett Loomis Archive Landlord - 122 E. Branch St. Friends of Bridge	bennet@mtproceeds.net
Shirley Gibson	Bennett - Loomis Archives HRC member Friends of Bridge St. Bridge	
Bill Hart	HRC	hart-bill@sbcglobal.net