

Alamitos Creek Bridge Replacement Project Community Meeting  
Thursday, November 21, 2013, 7:00 p.m.

Comments from Residents

1. Local geology protects from earthquake – a resident suggests little cause for concern  
Action needed: comment noted. Design consultants reviewed and took into consideration the local geology as part of identification, qualification, and validation process.
2. Straightening of road – will it cause speeding to get worse?  
Action needed: concern acknowledged. The design still includes curves, but they are designed for 25 mph. Staff will coordinate with Traffic Engineering to review traffic issues generally, and any special treatments to address the bridge site specifically. Project staff will coordinate opening of new bridge with CHP for early enforcement to try and deter bad habits from developing.
3. Sight distance from driveways – is it safe?  
Action needed: concern acknowledged. Staff will coordinate with design consultant and Traffic Engineering to review traffic issues generally, and any special treatments to ensure adequate sight lines at the bridge site specifically.
4. Traffic counts - request to count traffic at bridge location and further down at Hicks Road  
Action needed: Staff will coordinate with Traffic Engineering to request traffic counts. There may be some question as to the need/purpose of the counts, hopefully updated counts will be needed at the locations.
5. Replace in place by rerouting/detour  
Action needed: comment noted. All alternatives were previously reviewed with Caltrans as part of replacement strategy selection. The selected strategy provides continuous access for all residents west of bridge.
6. Can bridge be kept as is – are there historic or scenic issues? Why reconstruct? Why not reconstruct in place?  
Action needed: These questions and comments derive in part from the traffic issues and desire to keep the tight turns. The response to item 2 applies here. Regarding structural repair strategy, see response to item 5. In addition, staff will post the Design Selection Report to the website.
7. Historic issues – H-1 District at bridge? Scenic road designation?  
Action needed: Staff to review applicable discussion in environmental documentation (see posted at website), and County records as applicable. The bridge is simply old and susceptible to earthquake damage, not historic. Staff has offered to consider and

propose aesthetic treatment for the bridge to be context sensitive and fit in the New Almaden environment, possibly including history-referring elements or treatment, if feasible and practical to implement.

8. Will the hillside slopes slide?

Action needed: The project is designed to prevent this. The geology report will be posted at the website.

9. Cutting trees and privacy issues

Action needed: Property negotiations are ongoing. Resolution of individual property owner issues will be addressed through that process. Frank Schober is available to address specific property owner issues at 408-573-2431.

10. Too much money

Action needed: Reduce costs. Addressing some of the issues raised has the potential to increase costs, but we think it will be money well spent. On the issue of the base costs, it will be the responsibility of the County to package, plan, specify, bid, control, and inspect the project with the goal of getting the best price and product for New Almaden area residents that use and depend on the bridge.

11. Existing and Future Traffic – Trucks and Mount Umunhum

This question is a variant of question 2 – see previous response.

12. Traffic calming measures

This question is a variant of question 2 – see previous response.

13. Emergency vehicles going up the road

Action needed: Staff to mention to Traffic Engineering to see if more information might be available.

14. Want low cost alternatives

This question is a variant of question 10 – see previous response.

15. We don't want it.

Comment noted.

16. Aesthetic Ideas: Bridge near Lincoln Avenue. Or covered bridge.

Staff is interested in learning more about examples of bridge components that locals like – if more information is available on locations, please let staff know.

17. Traffic Mitigation

This question is a variant of question 2 – see previous response.

18. Dam Safety – what is happening

Action needed: staff to request information from Water District and report back.

19. Vision for entire roadway

Comment noted. Exceeds the scope of present project, but is a perfect topic for the County study to update the circulation element of General Plan, just getting started. Public meetings are planned. Staff suggests combining topics for future meeting. Study Project Manager has been informed of interest and idea for combined meeting.