

Spoken Comments and Responses

1. Comment Received From:
Comment: Will you widen the approaches?
Response: The approaches will be tapered down from the width of the new bridge to the width of the existing road within 200 feet on either end of the bridge.

2. Comment Received From:
Comment: Is the bridge safe? Is the main reason for replacing the bridge because of the width?
Response: The bridge is safe to carry up to the posted loads of 10 tons. Improving the width and alignment is the main immediate concern; however, it is our understanding that the bridge barrier has been hit several times. Also, degradation of the concrete in the arches, columns, and abutments require immediate repair to avoid unsafe conditions in the future. For these reasons, the bridge is eligible for 80% federal funding.

3. Comment Received From: Bill Chambers
Comment: In Alternative 3, will the existing arches remain the same?
Response: The existing arches would be rehabilitated, and a third arch would be added. The rehabilitation of the arches would consist of replacement and/or repair of the degraded concrete. The arches would maintain the same appearance. Alternatives 1 and 2 propose to remove the existing arches.

4. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen
Comment: What are the future plans for Orangevale Avenue, the rest of the road beyond the bridge?
Response: There are no plans for road improvements beyond the bridge at this time.

5. Comment Received From: Bob Ericksen
Comment: The sidewalk should be on the south side of the bridge, opposite of what the plans currently show. The sidewalk should continue on the west side of American River Canyon Drive to Greenback Lane. This would allow pedestrians to get to Greenback Lane without having to cross American River Canyon Drive at an unsafe location.
Response: The sidewalk can be placed on either the north or south side of the bridge. We will investigate putting the sidewalk on the south side of the bridge.

6. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen, Vic Ellis
Comment: What is the reason for the bridge being replaced if you say it is in good shape?
Response: "In good shape" means it is in good shape for a bridge as old as this one. It also means it is still safe structurally. Bridges of this era were designed for 50 years of useful life. This bridge is well past that at 89 years with the likelihood that potential maintenance costs will increase substantially in years to

Orangevale Avenue Bridge

come. The bridge is being replaced using funds from the Highway Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement (HBRR) program. This is a Federal program guided by safety. And though the bridge is safe, it has deficiencies that warrant replacement. The bridge is narrow for 2 lanes, pedestrians and bikes. By comparison with thousands of bridges nationwide with similar use and geometry, minimum safety standards for width have been developed. This bridge would be upgraded to at least those minimum standards. Improving the width and alignment is the main immediate concern. However, degradation of the concrete in the arches, columns, and abutments require repair to avoid unsafe structural conditions in the future. Cracks in the abutment also indicate possible foundation settlement. The structure can be repaired and widened without removal, but a replacement is less expensive and results in a longer usable life. Present standards are to design for 75 years of useful life. City Staff feel it is prudent to utilize the opportunity for using 80% federal funds as opposed to using all City funds for multiple temporary fixes and patchwork.

7. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen, Bob Ericksen
Comment: Will this bridge generate more traffic?
Response: We do not anticipate that this project will be a significant factor in any increase of traffic along Orangevale Ave. The roadway is still narrow on the west end and the number of lanes will remain the same. The street will continue to be inconvenient for through traffic.
8. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen
Comment: Have you considered just doing a retrofit and not replacing the bridge?
Response: City staff is pursuing this project due to the narrow lanes and shoulders as well as the significant maintenance needed to ensure the bridge is safe. Simply providing a temporary fix of the structural members will not solve the narrowness problem, will not provide a long-term solution for bridge condition, and will make the project ineligible for federal funding. For these reasons, City staff thinks it is prudent to utilize the funding available through the HBRR program.
9. Comment Received From: Hector Alvarez
Comment: What is the estimated time of road closure for construction?
Response: One construction season, May 2005 through November 2005.
10. Comment Received From:
Comment: Will school busses be able to cross the new bridge?
Response: Yes. The new bridge will be designed for a standard 36 ton tractor-trailer type truck loading (HS-20 load). It will not be posted to limit truck weight and the alignment will be improved, so school busses and fire trucks will be able to cross it.

Orangevale Avenue Bridge

11. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen
Comment: Currently, cars have to slow down when they cross the bridge but if the bridge is widened traffic will speed through. We would prefer to see the whole road improved.
Response: Unfortunately, this program only allows for funding of improvements within 200 feet of each end of the structure. We do not anticipate an increase in traffic speed as the remainder of Orangevale Ave will not be widened. If there are additional concerns with Orangevale Ave., they may be addressed by the Traffic Safety Committee. Contact Mark Rackovan at 355-7379 for further information regarding the Traffic Safety Committee.
12. Comment Received From: Greg Moulos
Comment: If the bridge is going to be widened, two stop signs need to be placed on Orangevale Avenue to keep the vehicle speed down.
Response: The road will be posted for appropriate speed limits. Intermediate stop signs are not warranted. Complaints about the need for stop signs can be addressed at the monthly Traffic Safety Committee meetings at the City.
13. Comment Received From: Mike Stukey
Comment: Have you considered closing the road permanently to vehicle traffic, and leaving it open to just pedestrians and bicyclists?
Response: There are approximately 2100 cars per day that use the road and it is a route that the Fire Department and School district would like to use. Therefore, closure of the road to vehicle traffic is not recommended.
14. Comment Received From: Bill Chambers
Comment: Is there any statistical evidence that there is a safety concern with this existing bridge?
Response: We are not aware of high reported accident rates at this bridge but understand there are frequent accidents involving single vehicles that hit the bridge barrier and are not reported. However, the fact remains that the bridge does not meet current standards and presents a potential safety hazard that should be addressed through a program designed for that very potential.
15. Comment Received From:
Comment: Fire vehicles won't cross the bridge due to the posting. What is the posting and where did it come from?
Response: Caltrans inspectors recommended a posting of 10 tons in 1979 based on its estimated year of construction (1915), use, and condition. It was posted with a 10 ton weight limit prior to 1986.
16. Comment Received From: Rebecca O'Donnell
Comment: Will there be any lighting on the bridge?
Response: Yes, there will be lighting on the bridge. The exact type of lighting has not yet been determined.

Orangevale Avenue Bridge

17. Comment Received From:
Comment: Why take away the arches?
Response: The least expensive alternative is a prestressed concrete box girder bridge with no arches. Adding aesthetic concrete arches to the box girder design, or simply widening the existing bridge and adding a third arch substantially (12%-30%) increases the cost of the project. City Staff will not recommend keeping the existing arches or designing aesthetic arches on a new structure to the City Council. From most angles, the arches are not visible and the cost to enhance the structure for aesthetic reasons does not appear to make good use of taxpayer dollars. Staff will recommend, however, funding be used to incorporate other historic features such as railings, lighting and a marker or plaque. The Council will ultimately decide which design alternatives is appropriate.
18. Comment Received From: Bob Ericksen
Comment: More traffic will use the road. It is already happening after the Dam Road being closed.
Response: City staff does not expect significant increase in traffic. See comment 7 above. In addition, the City has pre and post Dam Road closure traffic counts along Orangevale Ave. The January 2003 count was 2090 vehicles per day and 2053 vehicles in January 2004. The Dam Road was closed on February 28, 2003.
19. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen
Comment: If this bridge is not built, could the funding for this bridge be used elsewhere?
Response: Federal funds will not be available for other purposes. Only three bridges were eligible in the City of Folsom to use these funds: Orangevale Avenue Bridge, Rainbow Bridge and Figueroa Street Bridge. The City has determined that Orangevale Avenue Bridge and Rainbow Bridge will be most benefited and is going forward with those two structures.
20. Comment Received From: Hubbert Booze
Comment: Alternative 4, to close the road, is the best alternative available. For the residents, the added travel time to drive around is less important than the increased safety by closing the road.
Response: As discussed previously, from a public safety and overall traffic circulation view, staff would not recommend closure of the road.
21. Comment Received From:
Comment: How does the 80%-20% split work? Is the 20% from the state or the city?
Response: The 20% is from the local funds such as impact fees, general funds or other State or local fund sources. The 80% comes from the Federal Highway Administration.
22. Comment Received From:
Comment: Would taxes be raised to pay for this?

Orangevale Avenue Bridge

- Response: No.
23. Comment Received From: Vic Ellis
Comment: What is the motivation for this project?
Response: An opportunity for 80% federal funding was made available to rehabilitate or replace this structure. The bridge needs substantial maintenance and is past its design life. The City felt it prudent to leverage these federal funds with a limited amount of local funding sources.
24. Comment Received From:
Comment: If the bridge is closed to traffic, we would like to see a pedestrian bridge put in its place.
Response: Other than during construction, we do not anticipate closing Orangevale Ave. The new bridge will have six-foot shoulders and a five-foot sidewalk.
25. Comment Received From: Hector Alvarez
Comment: Some neighbors are concerned that if the bridge is closed it would cut off access to the neighborhood and affect property values.
Response: Comment noted.
26. Comment Received From: Hector Alvarez
Comment: Fire access is a big concern. Without the bridge, it only gets worse. Fire trucks currently don't cross the bridge.
Response: Comment noted.
27. Comment Received From:
Comment: There is a lack of trust between residents and the City, so a promise to fix the traffic problems doesn't count for much.
Response: Complaints or concerns about traffic problems can be addressed at the monthly Traffic Safety Committee meetings which occur the 4th Thursday of every month at 4:00 p.m. in the Public Works Conference Room of City Hall.
28. Comment Received From: Candy Miller
Comment: The historical look of the arch is significant; it is part of our heritage. We want continuity between bridges (Orangevale, Rainbow, new Natomas crossing).
Response: See comment 17 above.
29. Comment Received From: Candy Miller
Comment: Can you keep the sign (historical marker)?
Response: Yes, the historical sign marker can be maintained on a new bridge.
30. Comment Received From: Hector Alvarez
Comment: This group needs to attend a meeting of the Traffic Safety Committee to have the safety concerns of Orangevale Avenue properly addressed.

Orangevale Avenue Bridge

- Response: The Traffic Safety Committee meets the 4th Thursday of every month at 4:00 p.m. in the Public Works Conference Room of City Hall.
31. Comment Received From: Ray Miller, Dokken Engineering
Comment: Which alternative is preferred? (question posed to audience)
Response: Alternative 1 with aesthetic arches or alternative 3, widening and preserving existing arches, were preferred equally. Alternative 2, realignment, was the least acceptable. A fourth alternative, no project, received no votes.
32. Comment Received From:
Comment: Is the cost of alternative 3 less than alternative 1 if alternative 1 had aesthetic arches added to the design?
Response: Yes. Alternative 3 costs \$2.7 million compared to \$3.1 million for alternative 1 with aesthetic arches. See response to comment 17.
33. Comment Received From:
Comment: Are there city light pollution guidelines?
Response: The City does not currently have light pollution guidelines. We have general standard specifications for street lighting. There is nothing to prevent the design from including historic replica lighting.
34. Comment Received From:
Comment: What about using lights low to the ground? The least amount of lighting possible is preferred due to existing wildlife and homes.
Response: Comment noted.
35. Comment Received From: Claire Lessard
Comment: Alternative 2 looks dangerous because of likely increasing the speed of vehicles traveling the road. Also it is most expensive. It must be the least preferred alternative.
Response: Comment noted.
36. Comment Received From: Bob Polinski
Comment: Can you restrict access to get under the bridge?
Response: There are no current plans for access control under the bridge.
37. Comment Received From: Bob Polinski
Comment: Was the traffic count (2100 vehicles per day) done before the closing of the Dam Road?
Response: Counts have been conducted both prior to the closing of the Dam in July 2003 and after the closure. The count in January 2003 was 2090 vehicles per day and 2053 in January 2004.
38. Comment Received From: Bob Polinski, Laurie Ericksen
Comment: Will we be notified when approval for this project goes before the city council?

Orangevale Avenue Bridge

Response: Yes, for those that provided their name and address on the sign in sheet. In addition, information can be found on the City website.

Written Comments and Responses

1. Comment Received From: Hubbert Booze, Candy Miller, Rebecca and Phil O'Donnell
Comment: Arches should remain to match the look of other bridges in Folsom.
Response: The least expensive alternative is a prestressed concrete box girder bridge with no arches. Adding aesthetic concrete arches to the box girder design, or simply widening the existing bridge and adding a third arch substantially (12%-30%) increases the cost of the project. City Staff will not recommend keeping the existing arches or designing aesthetic arches on a new structure to the City Council. From most angles, the arches are not visible and the cost to enhance the structure for aesthetic reasons does not appear to make good use of taxpayer dollars. Staff will recommend, however, funding be used to incorporate other historic features such as railings, lighting and a marker or plaque. The Council will ultimately decide which design alternatives is appropriate.
2. Comment Received From: Hubbert Booze
Comment: Sidewalk should be on the south side of the bridge.
Response: The sidewalk can be placed on either the north or south side of the bridge. We will investigate putting the sidewalk on the south side of the bridge.
3. Comment Received From: Mike Stukey
Comment: Preferred alternatives are #3 if you decide to keep the bridge or alternative #4 as a walking and bicycling bridge only.
Response: Comment noted.
4. Comment Received From: Candy Miller
Comment: On behalf of the Heritage Preservation League, I would like to request that a plaque be installed on the new bridge that recognizes the old bridge.
Response: The historical sign marker currently located near the structure will be preserved in the new design or a new marker will be incorporated.
5. Comment Received From: Rebecca and Phil O'Donnell
Comment: Lighting should match lighting on Rainbow and Natoma Crossing bridges.
Response: This will be considered in the design.
6. Comment Received From: Rebecca and Phil O'Donnell
Comment: Consider posting speed limits prior to entrance of the bridge.
Response: The road is posted at the corner for 35 mph. We will consider placing it closer to the bridge if design standards allow.

Orangevale Avenue Bridge

7. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen
Comment: I Would like detailed comments from the meeting as well as who to contact regarding retaining a historical landmark.
Response: Comments and responses will be mailed to interested parties. The Historic District Commission can aid in determining the historical significance of structures in the city. The Historic District Commission meets the 1st and 3rd Wednesdays of every month at 5:00 p.m. in the Community Development Conference Room of City Hall.
8. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen
Comment: Large concern that the residential community on or around the bridge will see an increase in traffic flow. This is one of the few roads that maintain a “country” feel.
Response: The City does not anticipate an increase in traffic along Orangevale Ave. due to the bridge widening project. The roadway is still narrow on the west end and the number of lanes will remain the same. The major contributor to increased traffic is vehicles going through the neighborhood, not local traffic. The street will remain inconvenient for through traffic as opposed to other major routes. Because of this, significant traffic increase is not anticipated.
9. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen
Comment: Prefer option #4, close the road. Otherwise alternative 3 and keep a similar design.
Response: Comment noted. See comment response #1 above.
10. Comment Received From: Laurie Ericksen
Comment: Want a 3-Way Stop sign at Placer Mine and a 4-Way Stop sign at Stroup Lane.
Response: The road will be posted for appropriate speed limits. Intermediate stop signs are not warranted. Complaints about the need for stop signs can be addressed at the Monthly Traffic Safety Committee meetings at the City.
11. Comment Received From: David McCarthy
Comment: I would like to see the issue of traffic speed addressed in conjunction with bridge planning. As narrow and dangerous as the existing bridge is, it’s single redeeming value is that it slows down the traffic. Don’t take my word for it, go get the data! Set up speed detectors along the road and publish the data. Then propose a means to regulate the speed down to the posted 35 mph limit.
Response: The City has conducted both speed surveys and traffic counts prior to the Dam Road Closure (July 2003) and more recently in January 2004. The data indicates that neither speeds nor counts have increased since closure of the road. The speed survey conducted in April 1999 yielded an average speed of 35 mph with an 85 percentile pace of 40 mph. The January 2004 survey resulted in an average speed of 32 mph with an 85 percentile pace of 38 mph. Counts have reduced from 2090 vehicles per day in January 2003 to 2053 vehicles per day in January 2004. This data does not indicate that traffic speed or volume is a

Orangevale Avenue Bridge

significant problem along Orangevale Ave. Federal funding for the bridge project does not extend to roadway improvements beyond 200 feet from each end. Any traffic complaints may be addressed at the City's monthly Traffic Safety Committee meetings.

12. Comment Received From: David McCarthy
Comment: The bridge is in many peoples back yards and I would like to see a very directed lighting used on the bridge. Perhaps waist height shining directly on the road.
Response: Comment noted.
13. Comment Received From: Eric Taylor
Comment: I would like to see the bridge remain and only be repaired. I am concerned about the cost of the project and feel just repairing the damaged portions would be more cost effective than spending \$400K (City portion) on the new bridge. The existing bridge slows traffic and the historic nature of the structure is part of the character and identity of the City.
Response: City staff is pursuing this project due to the narrow lanes and shoulders as well as the significant maintenance needed to ensure the bridge is safe. Simply providing a temporary fix of the structural members will not solve the narrowness problem, will not provide a long-term solution for bridge condition, and will make the project ineligible for federal funding. Bridges of this era were designed for 50 years of useful life. This bridge is well past that at 89 years with the likelihood that potential maintenance costs will increase substantially in years to come. For these reasons, City staff thinks it is prudent to utilize the funding available through the HBRR program to provide a structure that will remain functional for a long time to come.
14. Comment Received From: Loretta Hettinger
Comment: I am interested in preserving the bridge in it's current state and not widen it. The narrowness creates a bottleneck and slows down the traffic and it should be kept for foot and bicycle traffic. If a decision is made to replace or widen the bridge, it should retain historic railings so as not to deviate from the historic feel of the bridge.
Response: For the reasons stated in previous comments, the City Staff believe the time is right to pursue a substantial upgrade to the structure to solve several problems. Any new structure will be fitted with railings that are designed to produce a historic appearance.