



TRINITY COUNTY

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

P.O. BOX 2490, WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 96093
PHONE (530) 623-1365 FAX (530) 623-5312
Email; tcidot@trinitycounty.org

AGENDA ITEM: 6

MEETING DATE: November 19, 2015

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS IN SESSION

FROM: Jan Smith, Sr. Environmental Compliance Specialist,
Department of Transportation

RE: ADDENDUM TO STAFF REPORT
Comments omitted from Staff Report

Project Name: Jordan Road and East Fork Road Bridge Replacements Project

Project Number: PW-15-05

Project Applicant: Trinity County Department of Transportation (TCDOT)

Project Location: Little Creek Bridge: Section 14, Township 32 North and Range 10 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, *Weaverville* USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle.

North Fork of East Fork Hayfork Creek Bridge, Section 28, Township 38 North and Range 10 West; Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, *Hayfork Summit* and *Hoosimbim Mountain* USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle

The Staff Report prepared for this item on November 12, 2015 stated that no comments had been received by the close of the comment period on November 9, 2015. This statement was in error. In fact, one comment on the Jordan Road project was received by email on November 4, 2015. A comment on the East Fork Road project was received by telephone on October 29, 2015. The email comment and an email summary of the telephone comment are attached.

Jordan Road:

Scott and Rachel La Fein own a home adjacent to the Jordan Road Bridge. They are concerned about the proposal to replace the existing one lane bridge with a two lane bridge. They do not feel it is necessary, given the amount of traffic on the road. They fear it will cause people to drive faster past their home.

In addition, their water intake and pump house will have to be relocated to install the bridge. They are concerned about loss or interruption of their long-standing water supply. Their driveway is also very close to the north end of the bridge, and could also be affected.

Staff has spoken at length with Federal Highway Administration, Central Federal Lands Highway Division (CFLHD), who will be administering the design and construction of this project. We have also met with California Division of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal-Fire) about the Fire Safe standards for a residential area with only one access, such as this one. The Fire Safe Standard would require either a two-lane structure or pullouts at each end of the bridge to provide a place for vehicles to wait for vehicle on the bridge to pass. The

concern is, allowing evacuations and fire equipment to pass each other with minimal delays in the event of a fire. Widening the road at each end for the pullouts would also impact the La Fein's pump house and require additional right-of-way from the La Fein's property.

CFLHD is willing to build either a one-lane or a two-lane bridge. However, their one-lane standard is 20 feet wide, accommodating a single 16-foot wide travel lane and 2 feet on each side for bridge rails. The existing bridge is 14 feet wide, so the new bridge would be 6 feet wider, with 10-foot wide pullouts on each side. Also, in order to build a one-lane bridge, a detour would be necessary, which would impact the water system at least temporarily. A two-lane bridge can be built in stages, one lane at a time, so no detour is necessary.

Either design will have approximately the same right-of-way impacts and the same amount of ground disturbance. Both would also impact the water system. CFLHD will ensure there is no interruption of water service, and that the system is relocated and restored to its original capacity at Project expense.

An on-site meeting with the La Feins is scheduled for next week, before the Planning Commission meeting, to discuss the options. The results of the meeting will be presented at the Commission meeting.

East Fork Road:

Bob Taylor of Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) called staff with concerns about the bridge replacement project on East Fork Road. They have active timber harvest plans beyond the bridge and want to ensure continuous access with logging equipment. There is a temporary bridge (Bailey Bridge) at that site now, placed on top of the existing bridge for safety. There is a low water crossing just downstream of the existing bridge. A detour can be made either by moving the temporary bridge to that location, or installing a culvert there.

The log trucks can cross on the temporary bridge, but not on the low water crossing as it is now. If the low water crossing is culverted, log trucks could cross it. So, with either option, log truck access would not be impeded during construction.

However, large equipment, including tracked vehicles and low-bed trailers hauling large equipment would not be able to cross the temporary bridge. During the fires last year, they used the low-water crossing. They could cross the low-water crossing if it was culverted, but they would be too heavy to cross the temporary bridge.

Also, they requested that the low water crossing be restored to its existing condition after construction, to accommodate heavy equipment access in the future. The proposed bridge will not be designed for overweight loads.

CFLHD will leave the choice of detour methods up to the contractor. Log trucks will definitely be accommodated either way. However, if the temporary bridge is used for a detour, it might have to be removed in an emergency, or heavy equipment would have to find another crossing. The Contractor will be made aware of these issues to inform their choice of detour.

Staff sincerely apologizes for the oversight of omitting these two comments from the staff report, and means no disrespect to the Commenters.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jan Smith, Sr. Environmental Compliance Specialist
Trinity County Department of Transportation

From: [tc dot](#)
To: [Jan Smith](#)
Cc: [Richard Tippet](#)
Subject: FW: Little Creek Bridge
Date: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 8:19:50 AM

Laura Lyons
Trinity County Department of Transportation
(530) 623-1365 x 3428

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott La Fein [<mailto:scottlaf@velotech.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 9:18 PM
To: tc dot
Cc: rlafein@tausd.org
Subject: Little Creek Bridge

Nov. 3, 2015

To: Trinity County Department of Transportation
Attention: Jan Smith
From: Scott & Rachel La Fein
Re: Little Creek Bridge

Dear Jan,

My wife, Rachel, and I live at 50 Jordan Rd., the house on the property on Jordan Rd. that includes the Little Creek bridge. We have lived here for over twenty years raising three children and countless animals.

We are opposed to the idea of building a double lane bridge on our road and in front of our house. It is complete overkill and unnecessary. I can almost count the number of times in all these years that I have had to wait the 20-30 seconds for a vehicle coming across the bridge in the opposite direction. In fact, the time it will take me to write this letter will far exceed the total cumulative time I have been delayed in any way by our one lane bridge. There have been times, however, that even with our one lane bridge, we have had to make signs and ask drivers to SLOW DOWN. In fact, we lost a precious dog from a speeding car coming off the bridge right in front of our house. A two lane bridge will only encourage motorists to go faster on our tiny, rural, residential road. The road itself is really one lane. It just makes no sense.

We purposely move to places like Jordan Rd. and Little Creek to enjoy the slower pace, the quietness. If the bridge needs to be upgraded, so be it. We appreciate that. But please maintain the lovely character of our simple road. It's not as though houses are being built--you must be aware the road is a dead-end and all properties accounted for in terms of building-- so the population will not be increasing at any significant rate on this road. Traffic is minimal and, as stated above, a double lane bridge is unnecessary and likely to do undue damage to the surrounding creek banks and our property, considerably physically and visually altering what is currently here. Save the dollars and use them where they are truly needed: rather than creating a double lane bridge, consider putting in a second bridge at the far end of Jordan Rd. connecting it to B Bar K Rd. Then both roads have a second option to exit the valley in case of emergency. There is a single lane bridge, much longer than ours, that crosses the Trinity River on Goose Ranch road in Lewiston to an area with far more homes and traffic than we have. Why should there be a double lane bridge on our little road??

There may be concern about the bridge managing the weight of large vehicles, particularly emergency vehicles. We have delivery trucks, fire trucks, and a huge water delivery truck regularly cross our bridge. The bridge does not shudder or buckle or show any signs of being unable to manage these

vehicles. Perhaps all that is needed (sorely, for many years) is a simple resurfacing.

Another issue for us: Little Creek is our water source and our water line runs under Jordan Rd. approximately ten feet from the north end of the bridge. If the road is going to be torn up, so will our water line. How will that be attended to when construction occurs? We also have our pump-house directly to the NW side of the bridge as well as our water intake by approximately fifteen feet. How do you intend to manage the temporary bridge while improving the current one? How will this impact our water source? What are your intensions with easement property, assuming the county has rights to that? Our driveway and home are very close to the bridge. The driveway touches the north-east corner of the bridge.

As you can see, we have many concerns regarding this "improvement" and would like to have a clear and detailed conversation regarding them.

Thank you for considering our opinions and wishes.

Sincerely,

Scott & Rachel La Fein

From: [Jan Smith](#)
To: [James.Herlyck@dot.gov](#); [Berwyn.Wilbrink@jacobs.com](#); [becky.rude@jacobs.com](#)
Cc: [Richard Tippet](#); [Randy Cessna](#); [Leslie Hubbard](#)
Subject: comment on Many Forks
Date: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:25:00 AM

Bob Taylor of Sierra Pacific Industries called about N Fork of E Fork bridge. They have active harvest plans beyond the bridge and might be logging in there during construction. They want the low water crossing raised up so that they can get log trucks through without scraping the bottom. Lowbeds can, and do, use the low water crossing, and they did during the fires last summer. But log trucks will need the crossing raised a bit. If we culvert it, that would work. If we use the Baily Bridge for the detour we need to make sure it can accommodate an 11.5 foot wide tracked vehicle, and overweight permit loads. If not, it might be better to use a shoo-fly detour with a culvert.

In addition, they want the low water crossing to stay available after construction. Presently, they use the low water crossing for their heavier logging equipment and tracked vehicles instead of the bridge. If we are not designing the bridge to the heaviest weight class, we need to keep that low water crossing available. Also, they need that access to the creek for water drafting when there is sufficient water.

Jan Smith
Senior Environmental Compliance Specialist
Trinity County Dept. of Transportation
(530) 623-1365 ext 3405