

## **Additional FAQs**

### **Q26: Can Fairfax save money and time using a prefabricated steel superstructure?**

A:26: At the community workshop, we discussed the option of a steel bridge. The concept included a prefabricated bridge. CIC worked with Excel Bridge Company, a steel bridge prefabricator, and consulted with them for the Meadow Way project. They gave us a verbal quote of approximately \$130 K to deliver the typical shell of a prefabricated steel bridge to the site. The bridge will have to be delivered in 2 or more segments due the difficulty of transporting a 21' wide X 70' long bridge in one piece. It would then have to be put together, painted and erected at the site. CIC used \$180 K in its cost estimate for these reasons. The steel bridge alternate in the Bridge Type Selection Report, posted on the project web site, shows this line item among 33 or so overall construction items.

The majority of the costs for the steel bridge is similar to the other options which is the construction of the concrete bulkheads to support the bridge. The overall cost of the three bridge alternates were pretty close, approx. \$2,000,000, as various construction items compensate for each other among the three alternates. Please note the entire construction cost for all three options is federally funded. Steel will be faster to build because of prefabrication.

At the meeting, we also indicated we would explore the possibility of constructing the bridge in one season. The construction season in the creek is typically July to Oct. 15<sup>th</sup>. However, the entire project will not be possible to complete within a 3.5-month season, regardless of the bridge type. That being said, CIC is looking into ways to possibly stretch the construction season from April 15<sup>th</sup> to Oct. 15<sup>th</sup> with the concept of completing in one season. A one-season construction project would require the bridge to be made of steel. It appears from the on-line survey that majority of the residents prefer a concrete bridge. To complete a project in one season would most likely require a contractor to work 6 days a week and longer days, which would require the payment of overtime. We also agreed to discuss with Caltrans the concept of receiving funding to cover the additional costs associated with completing the project in one season, if possible.

### **Q27: Why is the bridge being recommended to be moved from its current location to the middle of the right-of-way (ROW)?**

A27: We are recommending the new bridge be located in the middle of the ROW for four (4) primary reasons:

- 1) The primary reason for locating the bridge in the middle of the ROW (i.e. road) is to avoid having to move the bridge later due to potential discrepancies in ROW. We recognize there are discrepancies in the width of Meadow Way (refer to recorded surveys) at various locations along the road. By placing the new bridge in the middle of the ROW it ensures the bridge is not impacted by any discrepancies since it is wholly within the Town owned ROW under any scenario.
- 2) Locating the new bridge in the middle of the ROW seems the most fair approach as it would place the bridge equal distances from the adjacent property owners.
- 3) The new location actually aligns better with the existing roadway. Currently, when you turn off Meadow Way from Cascade you make a slight jog in the road to cross the bridge (see diagram on page 3 of this document)
- 4) Hydraulically, the location of the bridge in the middle of the road is better for the creek flows. This adjustment provides a better transition to downstream of the bridge once the flows negotiate the S-turn at the upstream approach to, and through, the bridge opening.

**Q28: How was the consultant, CIC, selected?**

A28: The Council authorized the issuance of a RFP for bridge design services in March 2013. The design services were for five bridges including Meadow Way. The selection process followed Caltrans (i.e., federal) guidelines. Five firms responded to the RFP. The selection panel consisting of three consulting engineers, one Caltrans engineer, and the Town Manager interviewed the five firms. The panel recommended CIC as the firm best suited for the project. The Council awarded the contract to CIC for Meadow Way Bridge in September 2013.

**Q29: What is the status of NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act) and CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) processes? Who are the lead agencies and why? Who are the primary contacts?**

A29: The NEPA and CEQA environmental studies have been moving in a very preliminary fashion. NEPA is needed because federal dollars are involved and the CEQA is required by state law. Caltrans and the Town conducted the Preliminary Environmental Scoping (PES) process for the bridge in 2014. The PES is a document that indicates what environmental studies/technical memorandums must be prepared for the project. The PES was approved by Caltrans in January 2015 and recently posted on the web site. Please note that little work has been done pursuant to the PES since we could not begin the various environmental studies until the bridge type, its footprint and the larger area of construction were established. However, now with over 61% of the neighbors voting for a concrete arch bridge, and over 67% for a conventional, living retaining wall, we anticipate the project will be submitted to the Town Council in fall 2016 for final concept approval. After this point, CIC and WRA (environmental subconsultant) will determine the Area of Potential Effect (APE) map, get its approval from Caltrans, and begin the environmental studies in earnest.

With regard to regulatory agency leads for NEPA and CEQA, the following applies:

- Regarding NEPA, the contact at Caltrans is Hugo Ahumada (Hugo\_Ahumada@dot.ca.gov, 415-622-8790). Mr. Ahumada states the following with regard to the state agency's role in NEPA: "When federal money is used to fund local transportation proposals in California, Caltrans assumes environmental review responsibilities under NEPA pursuant to a Memorandum of Agreement executed between Federal Highway Administration and Caltrans. Because the Town of Fairfax has applied for federal funding in support of the Highway Bridge Program (HBP), Caltrans will assume the lead agency role pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act."
- The lead for CEQA is the Town of Fairfax and the Town's environmental team conducts the studies and prepares reports on Town's behalf. The draft and final environmental document (ED) will be reviewed for approval by the Town's Planning Department. The PES for Meadow Way bridge requires an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). These types of projects do not require a scoping meeting. Scoping meetings are fairly common when an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), matching a far more complex project, is required. That being said, we can discuss the PES requirements at the next meeting for the project and we continue to be receptive to input provided on the project. Towards that end, we will inform the neighborhood residents via email when the draft IS/MND is available for public comments. This will be in addition to the statutory notification requirements.

In terms of an in-house environmental contact for the project, questions can be directed by email to the project manager, Nader Tamannaie ([ntamannaie@califstructure.com](mailto:ntamannaie@califstructure.com)), and, as before, any inquiry can be made through this project web site. The latter method will more easily enable several project lead

persons, who would confer on the question, to see it readily. Nader will then respond back after vetting the question with responsible parties.