

**Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project  
Public Comments/Questions Received during and following  
the 2-7-13 Public Workshop**

**The following is a typed version of the verbal public comments written down on the butcher block paper during the question/answer session.**

1. Address cumulative impacts with PSR – don't wait.
2. Need community acceptance up front.
3. Factors consider all matters, i.e 30% of property is privately owned.
4. Bridge should have "0" impact on the community.
5. Maintain existing atmosphere.
6. 49 never on east side of river.
7. No tour busses on existing bridge.
8. Is "0" rating safe for foot traffic?
9. Can bridge remain for pedestrians?
10. Can money from a historical group be used? To keep or preserve existing bridge?
11. Does project have to do with Hwy 49 realignment?
12. If County owns the bridge, donate to the State park, it's highly used.
13. Leave Scott Road alone.
14. Could County choose to maintain as a pedestrian bridge?
15. Already a CIP project.
16. 3 Options
  1. State Park
  2. Scott Road
  3. Downstream

Would prefer the downstream version. It would help with access.
17. Is the State park remodeling the mill?
18. 4 adult pedestrians can block access for cars, school kids are better, bridge too dangerous for toddlers. Improve the safety railing, signage for adults.
19. Any solution should separate foot traffic from vehicles.  
Any Federal mandate for width or number of lanes?
20. Of the 280 vehicles, are they identified? Campers, Locals?
21. Is bridge going to fall down?
22. Access during construction is very important; for commuters especially – 40 minute detour.
23. Design of Bridge shouldn't be changed.
24. Has the County already decided?

25. Keep the Bridge just where it is.
26. Access major concern, regardless of what the alternative it.
27. Check Board of Supervisors agenda, item #17 on 2-05-13.
28. Can the bridge be replaced where it is?
29. Can bridge be somewhere else as an option?
30. Would like to keep it one-lane.
31. Keep existing concrete abutments.
32. Should repair NOT replaced.
33. Could go around on another road (Scott Rd.).
34. If using steel – use “core tan”.
35. Evaluated criteria should be based on actual counts including weekends.
36. What is the maximum budget? In millions? For HBP?
37. How much to build a new bridge?
38. What is the average cost to maintain County bridges? Pedestrian bridges?
39. Can we figure out maintenance costs annually for this bridge?
40. Impact of a retrofit on surrounding roads: traffic.
41. Mt. Murphy Road is very narrow and dangerous – consider when doing the detour alternatives they are carefully analyzed.
42. Don't mind existing bridge – rehab and use money to build a pedestrian bridge to help separate foot traffic from vehicle traffic.

**The following are copies of the Comment Cards and Emails Received after 2/7/13 Public Workshop (names and contact information have been removed)**

Improved bridge – change status of feeder roads (public/private)?  
Access to developers to develop land on the other side of the river.  
Where does the public road end?  
What kind of load limit considered for new bridge?  
What detour when bridge closed? I live on Scott Rd  
I like the pedestrian bridge with a vehicle bridge down river where the present sawmill is.  
Your presentation was good, clear and concise. Thank you.

---

I would like to see the original bridge maintained as a pedestrian bridge. I would like a vehicular bridge built to replace BUT I am very concerned that, that would increase tourist traffic and the roads across the river are very hazardous. Thank you for an excellent program presentation.

Those of us who live across the river must have access in and out during all stages of any construction.

---

Any detours are a non starter during construction. Please keep this as low impact to the community as possible. Also consider provision req for rec access (river access, parking, trails); possibly use SMUD mitigation \$ for match (UARP) funding.

\*\*\*NO extension on Scott Rd = private road

\*\*\*NO detour on Scott Rd = private, narrow blind road

---

Please retain the “old time” flavor of the bridge. A one-way bridge with pedestrian / bicycle lanes will be sufficient. That the bridge needs to be replaced is for sure. Do not change it’s look & locate it in it’s current location!

---

We believe a new bridge should be constructed crossing the river downstream from the current bridge and come out at Point Pleasant. The impact to the area resident and Coloma Resort would be minimal and enable a two lane bridge. The road to and from the bridge would come out on Mt. Murphy Road directly across from the Coloma Resort entrance. We believe much of that land is state park owned. While the new bridge is being constructed everyone would continue to use the present bridge. One the project is completed the present bridge can be turned into a pedestrian/horse & buggy crossing.

---

OK with replacement or old bridge kept as ped bridge. Like suspension, steel truss & bowstring truss styles (historical look is important). OK with pedestrians sharing road (no separation), the narrower the better if 2 lanes wide. Peds & bikes can “share the road.”) OK with moving bridge location downstream of Grange. Would like to see dyke removed – see if State Parks wants to include that in EIR and help? (River right downstream) OK with taking Mt. Murphy Rd around (20 min. one way) during construction. Would be nice if County could help Grange clean up debris on river bank.

---

Letter dated 2/4/13 from Supervisor Briggs to Kim Kerr:

“In preparation for the review and evaluation process regarding the future of the Mt. Murphy Road Bridge, District IV requests that the County incorporate the historic value of the bridge as a factor to be considered during this process.

As the bridge crosses the American River and is surrounded by State Park lands, it is a significant piece of the overall vehicle and pedestrian circulation to the recreational and historical attractions within the Marshall Gold Discovery State Historical Park.

---

Dear Supervisors,

Kudos to your DOT team for a wonderful presentation tonight. The workshop helped dispel a lot of misinformation I had been given. I think we are headed in the correct direction and have no misgivings in this project. The clincher was the chart showing the status of the current bridge. We had no idea it had such a low rating. I think this project will be advantageous to the community and will support it in every way I can. Had I seen the presentation before last Tuesday I would not have taken up your time at the meeting.

---

*The following is an email string from more than one contributor (names are removed)*

Thanks for sharing your concerns with fellow realtors.

Tonight's meeting packed Coloma Grange Hall with approximately 130 concerned citizens and county staff who lined the walls. Asst. CAO Kim Kerr and DOT Director Don Spear were present, as well as CA State Parks personnel, EDAC, RMAC and Chamber of Commerce representatives. The meeting went overtime yet there were still myriads of questions & concerns that failed to be properly addressed. Most were about impacts to our rural quality of life, transparency & accountability. Many residents believe this project is a "done-deal" just like the Hwy 49 bridge & realignment project.

County staff simply have NOT been providing accurate information to the public or to the Board of Supervisors. Expecting our public servants to respond appropriately is like getting blood out of a turnip. For example it's taken nearly FOUR YEARS for Supervisor Ron Briggs to recently commit to a joint meeting on February 13th concerning DOT-CIP and MGD Park-related issues. Kim Kerr's written response to specific DOT-CIP issues was due 9/1/12 yet the matter has remained obfuscated and perpetually diverted.

Citizens need to speak up during the Board of Supervisors meetings. That is the ONLY place their voices really count, plus they are video-taped for the public record. It helps to show up in numbers...provided of course that the BOS Chairman actually permits sufficient opportunity for the public to speak concerning DOT-CIP issues. (Hint: Video of the Tuesday BOS Item #17 was a public mockery [http://eldorado.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=2&clip\\_id=161](http://eldorado.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=161) .)

Thanks again for your support.

---

I am a realtor in Fair Oaks, and have major concerns of what is happening to the County I Love. I belong to the Sacramento County Association of Realtors and Live in El Dorado County. I have copied the El Dorado County Association of Realtors, one Board Member, and the president of the El Dorado County Women in Real Estate. My Activities in El Dorado County is as a resident before that of a Realtor. Of course I'm concern, but there are people in El Dorado County who claim to be "Leaders" who need to know your critical concerns. Since I left the Association of El Dorado County Realtors it appears "The Golden Rule" may have been pushed back to survive the greatest recession of my lifetime. We are all so busy recovering from this economic crash, we overlook the obvious.

---

As real estate agents the negative impacts of 4 major CIP bridge projects upon rural property values should be of interest to you. Of even greater concern is the lack of transparency & accountability of our elected public servants. Hope to see you at Coloma Grange Hall this evening, 6:30-8:00 PM.

The HISTORIC Mt. Murphy Rd. Bridge Capital Improvement Project is a rather big deal TONIGHT 6:30-8:00 PM at Grange Hall in Coloma.

Sure would be great to see citizens show up and voice their concerns about the pre-determined outcomes made by our elected representatives & public servants. I hope to see you there.

---

Thank you for getting back to me so quickly. I want to post something on the Facebook Page: What's happening on the Divide about the meeting.

I plan on attending, although I was scheduled to be some where else. I feel it is that important. Hope to see you tomorrow.

On 2/6/2013 1:35 PM, Melody Lane wrote:

The Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project public workshop is being held tomorrow at the Gold Trail Grange Hall in Coloma, 6:30 - 8:00 PM.

Whole point of the matter has to do with the fact that local residents are the LAST to know about such major projects, their true cost and the repercussions. This particular CIP project will personally impact both the lower and upper boundaries of my private property and subsequently the security & property values of neighboring parcels. Easements & eminent domain factor into the bigger picture of this \$8M project igniting concerns about the lack of transparency & accountability of DOT, BOS, CAO and other department heads. Politics as usual--the decisions appear to have already been made behind closed doors PRIOR to any public input. You may be familiar with the socialist Delphi Technique described in Alynski's Rules for Radicals that has been employed.

As you are probably aware, Supervisor Briggs has been nefariously evasive about this for several years. There are actually 4 bridge projects involved.

The attached transcript of my presentation to the BOS yesterday may give you greater insight as to the issues, but the HISTORIC Mt. Murphy Bridge was a primary focus of public comments.

Cris Daly @ Mtn. Democrat was also provided a copy of the 4-page list of comments handed to the Board Clerk for BOS distribution (attached).

The point is, these public comments rarely are heard where they really count: in front of the BOS. Please feel free to call me for further details.

---

What is the latest on this? I heard you are having some kind of meeting tomorrow? Where? When?  
Thanks for all your work

---

Greetings Neighbors,

As most of you know, last night was the first in a series of public workshops held at Gold Trail Grange and presented by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation in

regards to the Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project. I am just passing this on from my own information gathered at the meeting last night. You can visit the project website at: [www.edcgov.us/bridgeprojects/](http://www.edcgov.us/bridgeprojects/) , <http://www.edcgov.us/MtMurphyBridge/>

For questions or comments:

Email: [mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us](mailto:mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us)

Call: [\(530\) 621-5900](tel:5306215900)

After introductions of DOT staff, Project Overview and discussion of the current bridge conditions, existing sufficiency issues, maintenance and funding, the public was invited to give their input. There were many concerns voiced ranging from accessibility during construction to use of materials and design and site location. I hope that whatever the outcome, replacement or repair, this presents a golden opportunity for us to work with DOT and get the best possible bridge to serve our needs, enhance the beauty of our community and carry us into the next century.

---

I sent this to the email address provided on the county website, but was sent back a message saying it was undeliverable. Please pass along our appreciation to all the officials (including yourself, of course!) involved in last night's meeting.

Begin forwarded message:

Hi...I wasn't able to attend last night's meeting but my husband did. I just wanted to pass along his feedback that the presenters/moderators did an excellent job fielding the questions/comments and keeping the meeting focused, despite the somewhat 'charged' topic. I was sorry to hear of the confrontational nature of some of the more outspoken folks from our community. We live on the river, off of Bayne Road, and regularly use the bridge. Seeing the constant flow of RVs, kids, pets, etc. during the summer I am amazed no one (to my knowledge) has been seriously injured on the bridge. In fact, I've always thought this bridge was ripe for a lawsuit. I'm glad to know a new bridge is in our future and appreciate that you are soliciting input and involving the community, as challenging as that may be!

I'm interested to hear how this project evolves and look forward for future opportunities to provide input.

Best Regards,

---

Thank you for the informative meeting last night. Some questions and comments after reviewing the notes I have are included:

Questions:

1. If the existing bridge is to be rehabbed is a detour needed or is there some means to add on/rehab the bridge and have traffic flow at the same time?
2. What are the alternatives as a detour if the bridge must be closed?

3. Where are the potential areas for a new bridge?
4. How wide will the new bridge be?
5. Can the existing bridge be rehabbed and a suspension type bridge be added for peds and bikes? Can both be included in this project or will the 2nd bridge have to get new funding?
6. Will any sort of recreational access be included in the new bridge? See Streets and Highway Code:

1809. Before any bridge on a city street is constructed over any navigable river, the legislative body of the city, after a study and public hearing on the question, shall determine and shall prepare a report on the feasibility of providing public access to the river for recreational purposes and a determination as to whether such public access shall be provided. *(Added by Stats. 1972, Ch. 972.)*

7. Can any of the yearly \$590,000 from SMUD money be used for this project? (These are 50 years of mitigation funds from the UARP relicense)
8. Were traffic counts done as an average or at set times? I.E. If they were done in winter you are not getting an accurate count as opposed to summer.
9. When is the next meeting?

Comments:

1. This project should have zero negative impact on the community, meaning that construction, placement, ease of use, etc. should be equal to the existing bridge. This precludes moving the bridge to a relatively distant site as this would impact noise, traffic flow would be changed, existing residents may be impacted, and you may be creating an attractive nuisance which creates more use, impact, etc. to a new location.
2. Any use of Scott Road, which is a private dead end one lane gravel road, is a non starter. There are 14 houses on the road with at most 3 cars each. The addition of 100-300 additional cars (including RV's, trailers, etc) is not acceptable. The road enters Marshall on a blind curve and is extremely dangerous. The condition of the road is less than acceptable except for very minimal local residential use.
3. If a detour is needed, the County recently chip and sealed Bayne Road which is a county road. Mt Murphy is also a county maintained public road. These detours are the only acceptable roads IMO. Use of any private road is unacceptable to the residents of Scott Road.
4. Under CEQA and NEPA any new uses (recreational access, etc) would have to be mitigated in some way since this would potentially add noise, visitors and traffic to the bridge and surrounding areas.
5. The State Park is public land and as such should be considered for any road/bridge relocation rather than condemnation or the purchase of private property easements.
6. I have signed the Stakeholder list and hope to be included in any discussions and meetings regarding the bridge.

At the meeting last night the figure of 280 cars per day average was used and the year given was 2009. Looking back at the most recent figures it shows that in Sep of 2011 there were 1134 cars counted (which is out of the peak use times of June-Aug to begin with).

The other years data show

2010--302

2009--280

2008--279

2007--345

all in Sep.

I feel it is a bit disingenuous to use the data from 2009 in an arguably off peak month for discussion about traffic on the bridge. If this is to be an open and honest process please let the public know all the data in order to make an informed decision. Thank you.

---

Nice job last night. I think you did a good job stating the facts, process and goals.

---

Thanks for the presentation last evening. Great job by the DOT staff!

I will add my comments to the mix.

My choice for locations would be at the current Mill Site or in the North Beach area, just past the boater staging area.

Any crossing up river would be a traffic control nightmare with people wanting to view Troublemaker Rapid (most popular rapid in the Western States). A bridge here may be in the Mt. Murphy views shed protected area anyway.

Of the downstream locations, my preference would be the North Beach location just north of the old bridge location (pics attached). I would require more road work to tie into Craver Rd., but it could shield traffic from the rest of the park. I believe that all the property is in the state park. Routing this through Park property and tying in at Carver on the Gallager field at Mt Murphy would be more tolerable to the Carver Rd residents as well.

Obviously any bridge will need a pedestrian lane as well.

Ok, I am done. Good luck!

---

Dear Mr. Smeltzer and Mr. Bane:

I realize that the Project Study Report will involve a decision matrix and several opportunities for public input. I have attached my preliminary recommendations after hearing public input and considering my local understanding of the project need.

Please keep in mind that the vehicle count (280) only tells part of the story. Children use the bridge to reach the gold panning area. Virtually all of the 70,000 children who visit Marshall Gold Discovery Historic State Park, each year walk across the bridge. The only

venue in the Sacramento Region which attracts more visitors is the King's basketball arena. Pedestrian traffic and vehicle traffic must be separated for public safety.

---

#### Mt. Murphy Bridge Project Recommendations

As a local resident of Coloma and an attendee at your Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project Public Workshop held Thursday, February 7, 2013, I make the following recommendations:

- 1) Replace the existing bridge at the current location with a one lane bridge and pedestrian walkway using similar design and core-10 steel members.
- 2) Provide temporary community access with a parallel pontoon bridge directly downstream at the Grange parking lot and tie it into the Mt. Murphy road alignment on the East side of the river. U.S. Navy SeaBees construct similar temporary, floating bridges to land military forces and large ,combat vehicles. This will reduce the access challenge during the construction phase. Include this feature in contract documents.
- 3) Construction is estimated to require 6-8 months and should be accomplished during the Summer and Fall months.
- 4) Using your \$300.00 per square foot cost figure and a 22 foot cross section, the low estimated construction cost, allowing for a four year delay and 12% construction cost escalation is \$4.3 million. This does not consider the cost of major modification to the approaches or additional right-of-way. The cost of the parallel by-pass and temporary easements is also excluded.

Thank you for conducting the workshop. I look forward to working with you at future public meetings.

---

The public meeting on February 7 was very interesting and well attended.

I just wanted to correct one item that came up in the discussion. There was reference to other historic bridges within State Park units being given to the State, including the historic truss bridge (now a bicycle/pedestrian bridge) upstream of Rainbow Bridge within Folsom Lake SRA. This truss bridge is one of the historic structures that spanned the river at this location and had been relocated in Siskiyou County I believe. The City of Folsom acquired the historic truss bridge, moved it back to Folsom, repaired/refurbished it and installed it upstream of the Rainbow Bridge. The City owns, operates and maintains the historic truss bridge, not State Parks. The bridge obviously connects to the State Park constructed and maintained paved bike path.

We are preparing a letter with our interests, concerns and recommendations regarding the Mt. Murphy Bridge replacement PSR and will be sending this soon. Thanks,