



MEMORANDUM

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: TERESA MCCLISH, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

BY: JILL MCPEEK, CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER

SUBJECT: SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT

DATE: JANUARY 27, 2015

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended the City Council:

1. Select two alternatives with which to proceed for environmental study for the Bridge Street Bridge Improvement Project ("Project"): a) replace the existing supplemental truss with a new supplemental truss as the rehabilitation alternative, and b) construct a new conventional bridge with historic features as the replacement alternative for environmental study; and
2. Authorize the Mayor to execute Amendment No. 2 to the consultant services agreement with Quincy Engineering, Inc.; and
3. Appropriate an additional \$563,500 of Local Highway Bridge Program (HBP) grant funds in the capital improvement program budget for the preliminary engineering phase of the project.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The City has been successful in securing 100% funding through the Local Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds for the Bridge Street Bridge project.

Preliminary Engineering (PE)

For Phase I of PE (Preliminary Engineering & Environmental Clearance), the City previously secured \$581,400 in HBP funds. In September 2014, the City requested an additional \$563,500 in order to carry two design alternatives through the environmental process of Phase I, and to complete Phase II – Final Design Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) and Permitting. This request was approved by Caltrans in October 2014. It is anticipated \$996,988 will be used for the design/environmental consultant contract and \$147,912 will be used for city staff time, costs of copies, and exhibits,

**CITY COUNCIL
 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
 BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
 AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
 ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
 JANUARY 27, 2015
 PAGE 2**

consultant contract management and quality assurance. The following is a summary of Preliminary Engineering contract amounts:

	Phase I	Phase II	Total
Original Contract – May 22, 2012			
- Quincy Engineering	467,000.00	390,000.00	857,000.00
- Contract Management/ Quality Assurance	<u>64,400.00</u>	<u>58,500.00</u>	<u>122,900.00</u>
Subtotal	531,400.00	448,500.00	979,900.00
Amendment No. 1 – May 27, 2014			
- Quincy Engineering	39,895.19	0.00	39,895.19
- Contract Management/ Quality Assurance	<u>10,104.81</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>10,104.81</u>
Subtotal	50,000.00	0.00	50,000.00
Proposed Amendment No. 2 – Jan 27, 2015			
- Quincy Engineering	100,092.83	0.00	100,092.83
- Contract Management/ Quality Assurance	<u>14,907.17</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>14,907.17</u>
Subtotal	115,000.00	0.00	115,000.00
Totals			
- Quincy Engineering	606,988.02	390,000.00	996,988.02
- Contract Management/ Quality Assurance	<u>89,411.98</u>	<u>58,500.00</u>	<u>147,911.98</u>
Totals	696,400.00	448,500.00	1,144,900.00

As of December 31 2014, approximately \$234,700 (50%) has been invoiced against Quincy Engineering's original contract, approximately \$35,400 (89%) has been invoiced against Amendment No 1; and approximately \$61,279 of the \$147,900 for contract management has been expended.

Construction (CONST)

For the Construction phase of the project, in September 2014, the City requested \$4,995,500 in HBP funding. This request has been included in Caltrans' 2012/13 – 2017/18 Highway Bridge Program showing that the project has met eligibility requirements of the HBP program.

Although the majority of staff work will be performed by contract engineering staff that is covered by the grant, additional in-house time will be required for staff management and during environmental review.

**CITY COUNCIL
SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
JANUARY 27, 2015
PAGE 3**

BACKGROUND:

Bridge Street Bridge

Due to various deficiencies, the Bridge Street Bridge is restricted to a 3-ton maximum load limit. 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 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 for both engineering and construction through the use of a new program which allows for the use of toll credits for bridges off the Federal-aid system to cover the local match fund portion. Authorization to proceed with Preliminary Engineering was received in April 2011, and City and Caltrans staff met in July 2011 to review the alternatives contained in the 2005 PES. Most of the alternatives still appeared feasible and eligible for funding under the HBP program, and it was determined that the next step would be for the City to secure a consultant team that would provide refinement of feasible alternatives, prepare visual displays of the alternatives for public review and input, environmental studies, and preparation of plans, specifications and estimates of the preferred alternative.

The consultant team developed three replacement and one retrofit alternatives, along with a no-build alternative which is required to be analyzed as part of the environmental study process. These alternatives were presented to both the community and the Stakeholder group that was established by the Council in June 2013.

The first community meeting was held November 6, 2013. All Stakeholders, property owners and tenants along Bridge Street and East Branch Street were mailed a meeting notice, and a notice was posted in front of City Hall. The focus of the meeting was to review the condition of the existing bridge, summarize work completed to date, introduce the design alternatives, and solicit public comments.

The first Stakeholders group meeting was held on January 8, 2014. The focus of the meeting was to review the condition of the existing bridge, summarize work completed to date, introduce the design alternatives, and provide direction to solicit input from the respective groups. Each Stakeholder member present was requested to go back to their respective groups and solicit input and questions, and to encourage the members of these groups to attend the January 22, 2014 community meeting.

**CITY COUNCIL
 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
 BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
 AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
 ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
 JANUARY 27, 2015
 PAGE 4**

Comments received from these two meetings were collected and responses prepared for the second community meeting held on January 22, 2014. All stakeholders, property owners, and tenants were mailed a meeting notice. In addition, two of the Stakeholders hand walked notices to each address throughout the Village area (e.g., Bridge, Branch, Nelson, Mason, and Short Streets). A notice was posted in front of City Hall as well as on the City's updated website. The focus of the meeting was to discuss the various alternatives in further detail, provide feedback on public comment received, and to outline the future activities in moving the project forward.

In preparation for the second Stakeholders group meeting, staff contacted each Stakeholder member requesting that each group meet during the month of February 2014 to discuss the alternatives and to provide their representative direction/voice vote on which alternative should be carried forward through the environmental review process. The second Stakeholders group meeting was held on March 12, 2014. The focus of the meeting was to review newly acquired traffic information, consider research performed on alternative funding sources (should the selected alternative or portions of the selected alternative not be covered by the HBP grant), and perform a straw vote on preferred alternatives.

The straw vote on which alternative should move forward through the environmental process resulted as follows:

	Stakeholders Group	Others Present at the Meeting
Option 1: Conventional bridge replacement	2	3
Option 2: Salvage & relocate truss on new bridge	3	5
Option 3: Replace bridge with new similar truss	1	1
Option 4: Rehabilitate existing bridge	2	4
Option 5: No build	0	0

The vote was followed by discussion that perhaps two alternatives could be carried through the environmental review process. A second vote was conducted to identify which additional alternative should move forward if two alternatives could be possible. The vote resulted as follows for a second alternative:

**CITY COUNCIL
 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
 BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
 AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
 ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
 JANUARY 27, 2015
 PAGE 5**

	Stakeholders Group	Others Present at the Meeting
Option 1: Conventional bridge replacement	1	2
Option 2: Salvage & relocate truss on new bridge	4	8
Option 3: Replace bridge with new similar truss	0	1
Option 4: Rehabilitate existing bridge	1	3
Option 5: No build	0	0

Further discussion was held about additional information that may need to be gathered by staff before presentation of the alternatives to the City Council, and that if anything significant is identified, a third Stakeholders Group meeting should be held to discuss and a re-vote conducted. The four areas of additional information discussed were traffic, historical eligibility, fundability through the HBP program, and cost to carry two alternatives through the environmental process.

Following the Stakeholders Group meeting, staff began researching these items. Research did reveal significant information, including the development and refinement of two retrofit strategies for Option 4. Alternative 4a involved removing the existing supplemental truss and strengthening the existing historic truss by replacing deficient members. Alternative 4b involved removing the existing supplemental truss and replacing it with a stronger supplemental truss. It is important to note that regardless of what retrofit/rehabilitation alternative is selected the existing bridge foundations must be completely replaced due to seismic and hydraulic scour deficiencies. Other significant findings included:

Traffic

A Bridge Street Corridor Study Report was prepared in March 2014 and it was found that in the near term, there would be some traffic impacts from the various options, but nothing as significant as anticipated (e.g., a drop in one level of service (LOS) at some of the surrounding intersections and roadway segments).

Historical Eligibility

A Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategy Analysis Report was prepared in August 2014. Preliminary analysis indicates that only two options (Option 4b and Option 5) would allow the bridge to maintain its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and/or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

**CITY COUNCIL
 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
 BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
 AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
 ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
 JANUARY 27, 2015
 PAGE 6**

Fundability through the HBP Program

The Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategy Analysis Report was prepared to assist Caltrans in determining fundability. A preliminary opinion from Caltrans was obtained that states all options as presented in the 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 Two Alternatives through the Environmental Process

Caltrans considers both a replacement and rehabilitation design alternative fundable through the environmental review phase and the City secured additional funding for this in October 2014.

With this additional information, meetings were scheduled with both the Friends of the Bridge Street Bridge and Stakeholders groups.

A meeting was held with the Friends of the Bridge Street Bridge on October 13, 2014. The focus of the meeting was to discuss the four areas of additional information obtained following the March 2014 Stakeholders Group meeting. No formal action was taken, but the consensus of the group was to move Option 4b forward. The group also agreed that they were most interested in alternatives which would not affect the historic eligibility of the existing bridge.

A third Stakeholders group meeting was held on November 19, 2014. The focus of the meeting was to discuss the four areas of additional information obtained following the March 2014 Stakeholders Group meeting, and to perform a re-vote on the preferred alternatives. The vote on which alternatives should move forward through the environmental review process resulted as follows:

Option 4b:	Remove the existing supplemental truss and replace with a new supplemental truss	Unanimously chosen as preferred Option to be carried through environmental review
Option 2:	Salvage and relocate truss on new bridge	First choice as second Option to be carried through environmental review
Option 3:	Bridge replacement with new similar truss	Second choice as second Option to be carried through environmental review

**CITY COUNCIL
 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
 BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
 AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
 ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
 JANUARY 27, 2015
 PAGE 7**

Option 1:	Conventional bridge replacement	Unanimously eliminated
Option 4a:	Remove the existing supplemental truss and retrofit the existing historical truss	Unanimously eliminated
Option 5:	Do nothing / No build	Unanimously eliminated

Consultant Services Agreement

In May 2012, after issuing a request for proposals, the Council approved a consultant services agreement with Quincy Engineering, Inc. for:

Phase I – Preliminary Engineering & Environmental Clearance

Refine feasible alternatives, provide visual displays and conduct public review, perform necessary engineering and environmental studies.

Phase II – Final Design PS&E and Permitting

Prepare plans, specifications and estimates for the preferred alternative.

On May 27, 2014, the Council approved Amendment No. 1 to Phase I of the consultant services agreement with Quincy Engineering, Inc. in order to prepare the above mentioned Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategy Analysis Report to assist Caltrans in determining funding eligibility of the rehabilitation alternative and to determine a preliminary opinion regarding historical eligibility.

ANALYSIS OF ISSUES:

Bridge Street Bridge

The 3 ton load limit is the lowest posting allowed before bridge closure is required. If the bridge is not rehabilitated or replaced, the condition will continue to deteriorate and eventually bridge closure will be required. The proposed alternatives will rehabilitate or replace the bridge on the existing alignment. However, the alternatives presented also have varied width options which must be selected prior to final design. The following is a summary of these alternatives followed by a table listing the anticipated outcome and impacts of each alternative.

Option 1: Conventional Bridge Replacement

Construct a new cast-in-place post-tensioned concrete box girder bridge in the current location. The new bridge could incorporate some design elements that would match the

CITY COUNCIL

SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT

JANUARY 27, 2015

PAGE 8

Village area. The existing steel truss bridge could be relocated to a location accessible to the public for viewing or possibly pedestrian use.

Option 2: Salvage and Relocate Truss on New Bridge

Construct a new cast-in-place post-tensioned concrete box girder bridge in the current location and incorporate the architectural features of the existing historic truss. Portions of the existing bridge, such as the main trusses and railings could be attached to the new structure as architectural components in order to recreate the historic feel of the existing bridge. Separated and raised wooden sidewalks could be designed to replicate the existing pedestrian sidewalks.

Option 3: Bridge Replacement with New Similar Truss

Construct a new steel truss bridge in the current location that would incorporate the architectural aspects of the existing historic truss designed to be similar in truss dimensions and member sizes. Separated and raised wooden sidewalks could be designed to replicate the existing pedestrian sidewalks. The existing steel truss bridge could be relocated to a location accessible to the public for viewing or possibly pedestrian use.

Option 4: Rehabilitate Existing Bridge

Option 4a Remove Supplemental Truss & Retrofit the Existing Historical Truss

Remove the existing supplemental structure and rehabilitate the historic structure. Due to the existing trusses and vertical members having insufficient capacity, the end verticals of the truss would be replaced, all vertical members and top chords would be rehabilitated by replacing the lattice bracing with a half inch plate, and damaged diagonals due to vehicular collisions would be replaced. Heavily modifying the existing structure will likely impact the historic eligibility.

Option 4b Replace Existing Supplemental Truss with New Supplemental Truss

Replace the existing supplemental structure with a new stronger supplemental structure. The new supplemental structure will be designed to handle 100% of modern design live loads as well as support the weight of the historic truss. No structural changes would be made to the members of the historic truss. However, the historic truss would need to be removed and disassembled during new foundation construction.

**CITY COUNCIL
SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
JANUARY 27, 2015
PAGE 9**

Option 5 No Build

Retain the existing historic bridge and make no improvements beyond normal bridge maintenance that the City would perform. Eventually the existing bridge condition would continue to deteriorate leading to closure.

**CITY COUNCIL
 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO
 CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
 JANUARY 27, 2015
 PAGE 10**

Option	Number of Travel Lanes	Traffic Circulation	Proposed Bridge Deck Width	Bridge Loading (metric tons)	Projected Sufficiency Rating	Functionally Obsolete (FO)	Potential Historic Finding ⁽¹⁾	Construction Cost Estimate	Fundability through HBP	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1: Conventional bridge replacement	2	Same as existing	28 feet	Full design live load	82.6	FO tag would be removed	Not Eligible for NRHP	\$1,508,00	New bridge fully fundable but potential that excessive aesthetic features may not be fundable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest construction cost • Lowest long-term maintenance costs • Clear span over AG creek 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not match historical context of existing bridge • Must be constructed on falsework
(with possible relocation of existing bridge)							Relocated bridge may be eligible for CRHR		Potential funding for relocating existing bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving existing bridge could be mitigation for Section 106 • Relocated bridge could retain eligibility for CRHR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of eligibility for NRHP • Future maintenance and inspection to be borne by City
Option 2: Salvage and relocate truss on new bridge	2	Same as existing	28 feet	>32.4 (Full design live load)	82.6	FO tag would be removed	Not Eligible for NRHP or CRHR	\$1,711,00	New bridge fully fundable but potential that excessive aesthetic features may not be fundable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower construction cost • Lower long-term maintenance costs • Clear span over AG creek • Matches historical bridge context • Actual historic bridge elements remain near existing location • Reuse of truss part of mitigation under Section 106 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to historical resource • Must be constructed on falsework • Loss of eligibility for NRHP and CRHR • Longest construction duration of replacement alternatives

⁽¹⁾NRHP = National Register of Historic Places
 CRHR = California Register of Historic Resources

**CITY COUNCIL
 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO
 CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
 JANUARY 27, 2015
 PAGE 11**

Option	Number of Travel Lanes	Traffic Circulation	Proposed Bridge Deck Width	Bridge Loading (metric tons)	Projected Sufficiency Rating	Functionally Obsolete (FO)	Potential Historic Finding ⁽¹⁾	Construction Cost Estimate	Fundability through HBP	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 3: Bridge replacement with new similar truss (with possible relocation of existing bridge)	2	Same as Existing	28 feet	>32.4 (Full design live load)	77.6	FO tag would be removed	Not Eligible for NRHP	\$2,258,000	New bridge fully fundable but potential that excessive aesthetic features may not be fundable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest construction duration of replacement alternatives • Similar appearance to existing bridge • Clear span over AG Creek 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to historical resource • Highest construction costs of replacement alternatives • Higher long-term maintenance costs
							Relocated bridge may be eligible for CRHR		Potential funding for relocating existing bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving existing bridge could be mitigation for Section 106 • Relocated bridge could retain eligibility for CRHR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of eligibility for NRHP • Future maintenance and inspection to be borne by City
Option 4a: Rehabilitation of Existing Bridge (by removing supplemental truss and retrofitting existing historical truss)	2	Same as Existing	24 feet	18.9	55.3	FO tag would remain due to bridge width	Not Eligible for NRHP	\$3,424,000	Rehabilitation of bridge may be fully fundable with the exception that excessive aesthetic features may not be fundable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes visual impacts of the supplemental truss • Restores original condition of historic bridge carrying load • Depending on alternative may remove FO tag 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some visual impacts due to replacement of some historic features • Higher construction costs • Higher life-cycle costs • Higher long-term maintenance costs • Requires longest construction time of all alternatives • Depending on alternative may not remove FO tag • Revision of downtown circulation pattern and business access (single lane conversion) • Impacts to historical resource (likely loss of bridge eligibility for NRHP and CRHR)
	2	Same as Existing	28 feet	12.4	49.2	FO tag is expected to be removed	Not Eligible for NRHP	\$3,551,000			
	1	Vehicular traffic limited to SB or NB only	24 feet	27.4	75.0	FO tag would remain due to bridge width	Not Eligible for NRHP	\$3,424,000			

⁽¹⁾NRHP = National Register of Historic Places
 CRHR = California Register of Historic Resources

CITY COUNCIL
 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO
 CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
 JANUARY 27, 2015
 PAGE 12

Option	Number of Travel Lanes	Traffic Circulation	Proposed Bridge Deck Width	Bridge Loading (metric tons)	Projected Sufficiency Rating	Functionally Obsolete (FO)	Potential Historic Finding ⁽¹⁾	Construction Cost Estimate	Fundability through HBP	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 4b: Rehabilitation of Existing Bridge (by replacing existing supplemental truss with new supplemental truss)	2	Same as Existing	24 feet	>32.4 (Full design live load)	72.6	FO tag would remain due to bridge width	Eligible for NRHP	\$3,443,000	Rehabilitation of bridge may be fully fundable with the exception that excessive aesthetic features may not be fundable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic truss remains visually unchanged • Depending on alternative may remove FO tag • Possibly no adverse effect and remains eligible for NRHP and CRHR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest construction costs of all alternatives • Higher life-cycle costs • Higher long-term maintenance costs • Requires longer time to construct • Depending on alternative may not remove FO tag • Revision of downtown circulation pattern and business access (single lane conversion) • Re-evaluation required if widened and may possible have adverse effect and jeopardize eligibility for NRHP and CRHR
	2	Same as Existing	28 feet	>32.4 (Full design live load)	74.6	FO tag is expected to be removed	Reevaluation required if widened to determine eligibility for NRHP	\$3,984,000			
	1	Vehicular traffic limited to SB or NB only	24 feet	>32.4 (Full design live load)	82.7	FO tag would remain due to bridge width	Eligible for NRHP	\$3,443,000			
Option 5: No Build (eventual closure of bridge)	0 (possible pedestrian and/or bicycle)	No vehicular traffic between Olohan Alley and parking lots south of the bridge	24 feet	3 Tons	12.8	Yes	Eligible for NRHP and CRHR			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge would maintain its eligibility for NRHP and CRHR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance and inspection to be borne by City • If not maintained eventual full closure, including bicycles and pedestrians • Revision of downtown circulation pattern and business access

⁽¹⁾NRHP = National Register of Historic Places
 CRHR = California Register of Historic Resources

**CITY COUNCIL
SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
JANUARY 27, 2015
PAGE 13**

Consultant Services Agreement

The project is currently in Phase I of preliminary engineering and the consultant team has developed three replacement alternatives, one retrofit alternative (with variations), and a no-build alternative.

Due to public comment received and additional funding procured, it is being recommended that two alternatives, one rehabilitation and one replacement, be carried through environmental study. Should the Council agree, then Amendment No. 2 to Phase I of the consultant services agreement with Quincy Engineering, Inc. in the amount of \$100,092.83 will allow the consultant team to carry two alternatives through the environmental process rather than one preferred alternative that was originally in the contract scope of work.

ALTERNATIVES:

The following alternatives are provided for the Council's consideration:

- Approve staff's recommendations;
- Do not approve staff's recommendations; or
- Provide direction to staff.

ADVANTAGES:

Approval of two alternatives to continue through environmental review could eliminate restarting the environmental process should only one alternative move forward and be found to be infeasible.

Quincy Engineering has an established working relationship with City staff and the community, specializes in this type of historic bridge work, and continues to demonstrate responsive professional engineering services on the Bridge Street Bridge Improvement Project which will help ensure the project progresses through the development process according to plan. This contract amendment will provide consistency and efficiency in engineering services. The rate adjustments do not increase the contract totals.

Amending the CIP budget will allow the City to request 100% reimbursement for two alternatives to continue through the environmental review process.

Bringing the Bridge Street Bridge up to standard load to utilize Bridge Street as a route.

**CITY COUNCIL
SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FOR THE
BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND CONSIDERATION OF
AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH QUINCY
ENGINEERING, INC. AND BUDGET AMENDMENT
JANUARY 27, 2015
PAGE 14**

DISADVANTAGES:

Approval of two alternatives to continue through environmental studies will require some additional time and effort from existing City staff.

If preliminary engineering work is not completed in a timely manner, it is possible that the grant funding could be deobligated by Caltrans or that 100% funding for construction may not be available due to other projects in the State completing their project first. However, staff believes this is unlikely.

Construction activities will also cause some traffic related disruption within the Village.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The Preliminary Engineering work being requested in this staff report includes environmental studies and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) approval with Caltrans as the lead agency. The City will be the lead agency for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) approval and an environmental determination will be presented to Council at the time of the selection of the preferred alternative.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND COMMENTS:

Attachment 2 includes a list of all public comment received prior to the preparation of this staff report and the associated responses. The Agenda was posted in front of City Hall on Thursday, January 22, 2015. The Agenda and report were posted on the City's website on Friday, January 23, 2015. No further public comments were received.

Attachment:

1. Consultant Services Agreement, Amendment No. 2
2. Public comment received
3. City Council report June 11, 2013 Public Input Process for the Bridge Street Bridge Project

CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 2

This Second Amendment ("Second Amendment") to Consultant Services Agreement ("CSA") by and between the **CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE** ("City") and **QUINCY ENGINEERING, INC.** ("Consultant") is made and entered into the _____ day of January 2015, based on the following facts:

WHEREAS, the parties entered into a CSA dated May 22, 2012, for preliminary engineering work on the Bridge Street Bridge Improvement project; and

WHEREAS, the First Amendment to the CSA was agreed to on May 27, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to modify the CSA as set forth herein.

NOW THEREFORE, for the good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is acknowledged, the parties agree that the CSA is in full force and effect as amended, and subject to the new terms and conditions set forth below:

1. Section 1, entitled "TERM" shall be amended in its entirety as follows:

This Agreement shall remain and continue in effect until May 22, 2018 unless sooner terminated pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement.

2. Exhibit B to the CSA entitled "Payment Schedule" shall be amended to reflect current billing rate sheets as specified in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.
3. Scope of services shall include the additional services as specified in Exhibit "B" attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.
4. Except as modified herein, all other terms and conditions of the CSA, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, **CITY** and **CONSULTANT** have executed this Second Amendment on the day and year first set forth above.

CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE

QUINCY ENGINEERING, INC.

By: _____
Jim Hill, Mayor

By: _____
John Quincy, President

Attest:

Kelly Wetmore, City Clerk

Approved As To Form:

Timothy J. Carmel, City Attorney

**BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION / PUBLIC COMMENTS**

November 6, 2013 – Community Meeting

Comment / Question	Response / Action
Can we make the bridge one-way?	Corridor analysis was prepared by City traffic consultant
What would be the approximate length of construction?	Comparable length of construction for each alternative was presented at the 01-22-14 community meeting
Post alternatives on the City website	A Bridge Street bridge project page has been created on the City's website

January 8, 2014 – Stakeholder Group Meeting

Comment / Question	Response / Action
Opinions heard from the community is that they do not want the elimination of the steel structure	N/A
The historical groups believe preservation of the existing bridge is the preferred option	N/A
For the rehabilitation alternative, would it be possible to remove the bridge, build something like a pony truss underneath from bank to bank and put the existing bridge back on top to possibly eliminate the super-bent structure?	Response was presented at the 01-22-14 community meeting
The possibility of a test closure to determine traffic patterns was discussed should the bridge be closed. It was suggested that we use data instead to illustrate traffic patterns.	Corridor analysis was prepared by City traffic consultant
Are there any restrictions with the funding that would require a minimum time that bridge must remain open for vehicular traffic should the City desire to convert the bridge to ped/bike use later?	Consultant team has not yet been able to determine a definitive answer
The replacement alternatives may be more desirable should relocation of the existing bridge be feasible and/or desired	N/A
If the existing bridge were to be relocated, would this be an eligible cost for the grant funds?	Possible funding for bridge relocation was presented at the 01-22-14 community meeting
Should the bridge close or relocation of the existing bridge result, what should be expected in the way of annual costs for bridge maintenance?	Until the type of bridge(s) are known (e.g., vehicular or pedestrian), there is no way to estimate the annual costs

Surrounding residents need to be notified of the meeting. In particular, properties along Nelson Street and Mason Street where additional traffic could be expected should the bridge be closed and/or closure during construction.	These additional property owners and tenants were mailed a notification of the 01-22-14 community meeting, and each address was also hand walked a notice
We need to be sure that the businesses in the Village area are notified	These property owners and tenants were mailed a notification of the 01-22-14 community meeting, and each address was also hand walked a notice

January 16, 2014– Community Comments during Hand Walked Notices

Comment / Question	Response / Action
Three residents stated they were aware of meeting via mail notice	N/A
One resident stated she read about the project via the Stagecoach newsletter	N/A
Would it be possible to present projected costs and construction timelines of the various alternatives?	Comparable costs and length of construction for each alternative was presented at the 01-22-14 community meeting
One resident stated that the bridge was closed for the repair in the 80's and the Village survived (e.g., do nothing alternative)	N/A
Two residents supported replicating the existing bridge providing it looks like the current bridge	N/A

January 22, 2014– Community Meeting

Comment / Question	Response / Action
Public requested access to meeting notes and presentation materials	A Bridge Street bridge project page has been created on the City's website
Consider changing Bridge Street bridge to a one-lane, one-way bridge to side step bridge widening and guardrail requirements	Corridor analysis was prepared by City traffic consultant
Widening bridge could result in higher traffic speed	N/A
Widening bridge could alter historic integrity	N/A
Traffic impacts from changing Bridge Street bridge to a one-way, one lane bridge would need to be studied to determine larger area impacts	Corridor analysis was prepared by City traffic consultant
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	N/A

Private funding used to pay for Bridge Street bridge upgrades that do not meet standard safety criteria could place the City at legal risk	N/A
Public questioned whether or not a different renovation approach completed in the 1990's could have prevented current bridge status	Staff does not have record of criteria that was used for prior renovation
Public posed questions about whether or not the bridge could remain at its current width. 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.	This will be part of the Council's decision on which alternative to move forward through the environmental and permitting phase
Audience members discussed environmental constraints surrounding past bridge repair, maintenance and painting, and questioned viability of procuring permits for proposed bridge improvements	Consultant team explained environmental process for this particular project
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.	Consultant team explained Stakeholders Group meetings are open to the public and notifications about the project and upcoming events are posted on the City's website, in front of City Hall, through specific mailings, City newsletter, City website, etc.

Miscellaneous

Comment / Question	Response / Action
11-07-13: Suggestions from citizen following first community meeting: - Salvage and relocate trusses on new bridge is the best option. - Send questionnaires throughout Village area regarding alternatives and bridge history - Parking lot of former church on Bridge can be used for construction staging - Incorporate permanent flower planters on new bridge with drip irrigation - Incorporate permanent "Village type" lighting on the new bridge -Clean creek of non-native vegetation in cooperation with CCC or local groups	- N/A - Property owners and tenants were mailed a notification of the 01-22-14 community meeting, and each address was also hand walked a notice - To be considered during construction phase - To be considered during design phase - To be considered during design phase - May be a project mitigation measure; to be considered during construction phase
02-10-14: Request from citizen to be added to mailing list for meetings and other information	Citizen has been added to mailing list
02-18-14: Article published in The Tribune entitled: "Span Garners Support:	N/A
02-19-14: The Tribune ran an editorial entitled "Preserve the Bridge Street Bridge"	N/A

02-21-14: Request from citizen to be added to mailing list for meetings and other information	Citizen has been added to mailing list
02-22-14: Email from grandson of County surveyor who designed the bridge believes salvage and relocate trusses on new bridge is the best option. Suggests riveting on existing plaques to prevent vandalism	This is an alternative to be presented to Council for consideration To be considered during design phase
02-22-14: Article published in The Tribune entitled "History of Bridge Street Bridge Spans More than a Century"	N/A
02-26-14: Letter from Arroyo Grande Citizen to City Council requesting retention of the old bridge by fixing the issue of weight loads and leaving existing width	This is an alternative to be presented to Council for consideration
02-27-14: Letter from Citizen summarizing his report to Los Robles de Rancho Grande HOA choosing conventional replacement. Suggests alternative photos be on display at City Hall and perhaps include an "vote" box	This is an alternative to be presented to Council for consideration
03-11-14: Citizen disturbed by the photo of the "do nothing" alternative on the City's website taken from another location	The image was changed to better reflect the Bridge Street Bridge location
03-21-14: Request from citizen who attended Stakeholder meeting for information re: historical register	Project manager responded with information that was available to date
05-07-14: E-mail from citizen to City Manager requesting rehabilitation rather than demolition	This is an alternative to be presented to Council for consideration
05-14-14: Letter from Arroyo Grande Citizen to Mayor requesting rehabilitation of the bridge instead of demolition	This is an alternative to be presented to Council for consideration
05-30-14: Letter to City Council from Counsel for Friends of the Bridge Street Bridge re: environmental process and opening up Stakeholder meetings to all businesses	Upcoming Council decision will be which alternative(s) to move forward through environmental and permitting process; Stakeholder meetings are open to the public
05-30-14: Article by City Manager published in TPR entitled: "Bridge Street Bridge a Complex Issue"	N/A
08-13-14: Request from citizen to be added to mailing list for meetings and informed of Stakeholders meetings	Citizen has been added to mailing list
Ongoing: A petition has been initiated and signatures have been received on www.change.org	N/A

08-18-14

**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