



MEMORANDUM

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: TERESA MCCLISH, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS FOR THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE PROJECT

DATE: JUNE 11, 2013

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City Council approve the recommended process regarding public input for the Bridge Street Bridge project.

IMPACT ON FINANCIAL AND PERSONNEL RESOURCES:

Consultants will be used to assist in facilitating public outreach for the project. Costs are included in the Capital Improvement Program budget and are 100% grant funded through the Federal Highway Bridge Program. Staff time will still be required to solicit and process stakeholder input.

BACKGROUND:

Due to various deficiencies, the Bridge Street 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 presents a preliminary set of alternatives and associated costs for rehabilitating or replacing the Bridge Street 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, 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 2005 PES. In May 2012, the Council awarded Quincy Engineering a contract to refine

**CITY COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS FOR THE BRIDGE STREET
BRIDGE PROJECT
JUNE 11, 2013
PAGE 2**

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 technical studies are complete and four feasible options to study are defined along with a no-build alternative.

It is anticipated that there initially will be two stakeholder group meetings and additional meetings as needed as the project progresses. Therefore, it is proposed to form a stakeholder group to seek public input.

ANALYSIS OF ISSUES:

Feasible alternatives include three replacement and one retrofit option, along with the no-build options required to be analyzed. However, 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, would cause bridge closure. Replacement options will mean some impact to the historic bridge and visual changes. The retrofit option also will result in visual changes due to need to strengthen the existing/supplemental truss. Because the bridge is a prominent historical feature in the Village, careful consideration of perspectives and renderings will inform the environmental review process and assist decision makers.

The Stakeholder group is proposed to include representatives from the following groups as appointed by the City Manager for staff and each Commission, Committees or association respectively.

- Community Development Department
- Public Works Department
- Planning Commission
- Architectural Review Committee
- Historic Resources Committee
- Chamber of Commerce
- Village Improvement Association including Bridge Street Business Owner

The meetings will be open to the public. They will also be advertised to help encourage as much public participation as possible.

ALTERNATIVES:

- Approve Staff's recommendation;
- Provide staff direction on other groups to include in the Stakeholders' meeting or how to promote the meetings to the public;
- Do not approve Staff's recommendation; or
- Provide other direction.

**CITY COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS FOR THE BRIDGE STREET
BRIDGE PROJECT
JUNE 11, 2013
PAGE 3**

ADVANTAGES:

The process will provide valuable input from stakeholders in determining a balance in applying modern requirements to a historic bridge, will educate and involve those who have an interest in the project regarding the issues that will need to be addressed, and help build consensus regarding the design direction.

DISADVANTAGES:

The process may increase workload and or lengthen the project schedule.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

No environmental review is required for this item.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND COMMENTS:

The Agenda was posted in front of City Hall and on the City's website on Friday, June 7, 2013. No comments were received.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK