

**LATE DISTRIBUTION 02-03-14**

EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Bucks Bar Bridge - Please Support the new DOT proposal**

1 message

**wines@dkcellars.com** <wines@dkcellars.com>

Sun, Feb 2, 2014 at 2:09 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Cc: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Please accept this email for the public record in SUPPORT of the pending DOT plan for the replacement of the Bucks Bar Bridge. Their proposal to build a replacement bridge upstream from the current bridge and keep the existing bridge open during construction is exactly what the south county businesses and public requested in 2010 public hearings.

Closure of the bridge would cause at least an \$1M impact in the Fair Play wine region over the course of a six month construction and more than double that if construction spanned to a second construction season. Personally, over 55% of our clients visit our tasting room via this bridge based upon a 2 month survey.

The second factor is about fire safe evacuation in case of a catastrophic fire or disaster. There are only 4 ways in and out of the Fair Play, Somerset, Grizzly Flats and Mount Aukum area. One of them is back up Omo Ranch Road to CA 88 which is illogical. Thus with the bridge closure the options would be through Pleasant Valley or through Amador County. It seems the local fire departments have not comment on this project at the Bucks Bar Bridge as it is on the boundary for their service area. In other words, no impact. However, it is a very real issue to the citizens of the south county.

It is also important to thank Matt Smeltzer and his team for listening to the public and putting together a project plan that meets the needs and wishes of the residents.

Please support this project with this approach with a yes vote.

David and Kim Pratt  
dkcellars

7380 Vineyard View Drive  
Fair Play, CA 95684  
530-620-1132

David Wright and Susan Jones  
owners of  
5611 Bucks Bar Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

mailing address:  
1573 49<sup>th</sup> Street  
Sacramento, CA 95819

Board of Supervisors  
El Dorado County  
330 Fair Lane, Building A  
Placerville, CA  
via email to [edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

Dear Ms. Santiago, Mr. Nutting, Mr. Veerkamp, Mr. Briggs, and Mr. Mikulaco:

Thank you for hearing our plea to make the preferred Bucks Bar Bridge reconstruction project the “30-mph,” replace-in-place alternative.

We are the riverfront landowners immediately adjacent to the bridge -- on the north-east quadrant of the bridge-river crossing, sometimes called the log cabin. Our property is 2.4 acres and adjoins Bucks Bar Road within the project area. We bought this property because we love the riverfront, the rocky knoll with grinding rocks under the trees, and the tranquil rural character of the area in general.

*Property.* The so-called “40-mph” alternative alignment would cross the river on our property substantially upstream of the current bridge. This would not only take a significant and very beautiful and appealing chunk out of our property, but would reduce the riverfront appeal and natural values, and impact native American cultural resources, namely grinding stones, at the least. It was mentioned that the grinding rocks could be avoided by having the bridge be suspended over them, but that hardly preserves their natural setting.

*Speed.* And why? Bucks Bar Road does not need a 40 mph bridge – as far as speed goes it’s like putting lipstick on a pig. There are curves and grades in very close proximity to the bridge on both sides that are not safe at such a speed. Further, Bucks Bar Road has a charming country road character, and a big fast bridge would not enhance that charm.

*Safety.* There is definitely a safety problem with the existing alignment, which is why we do not oppose the 30-mph, 2-lane replace-in-place alignment. However, please hear us when we say, as drivers who have not been highly familiar with Bucks Bar Road for many many years, that the safety issues with the current alignment are not all due to the bridge. Warning signage on the road is not enough in our opinion and experience; the

first sign southbound comes only 320 feet before the stop line to allow northbound traffic passage (not 350 as the sign says). This is on an appreciable downgrade, as well. There is something the Board can do right now to improve the safety of that alignment and that is to mandate a repeating sign be placed at a far greater distance before the bridge, and a sign on the southbound approach saying “Be Prepared to Stop.” We strongly urge the Board to take this safety step today.

Because of the lax signage, we feel the safety needs for a two-lane bridge, while real and significant, are probably less than have been estimated: better signage could prevent some accidents, especially for drivers less familiar with the road.

A two-lane, 30-mph bridge, on the current alignment, with good warning signs, will be a safe bridge, with the continuing context of a steep, twisting, low-speed country road along both north and south approaches.

*Safety and traffic during construction.* Little has been said about the safety of the construction workers but there’s a great deal of impatient traffic on Bucks Bar Road and for the off-alignment alternative, bridge workers are going to interfere with and be at risk from that traffic throughout the project. It’s a narrow space with no shoulders, or room at grade off to either side to work in. We wonder if area drivers are really aware what they may be asking for – the 1-lane Bucks Bar Bridge for many months at rush hour with a major construction project too??

*Cost and Project Duration.* The bridge contractors will get the job done much more quickly if they do not have to work around continued traffic on the road and bridge. A faster job means much less impact to local residents. And the Transportation Division has been clear that the bridge costs per se, to the federal grant, will be much less for the 30-mph replace-in-place alignment.

*Noise.* We are very concerned about noise at our house. Traffic noise already is the major disturbance to an otherwise very peaceful and restful place. Road noise increases greatly as traffic speeds up. A faster, “40-mph” bridge closer to our house (and braking noises as speeders encounter the 20-mph curve just north of the bridge) would greatly disturb our peace.

*Attractive nuisance left behind.* Under the 40-mph alternative, the present bridge would be removed and its right of way (ROW) would have to be addressed. At present there is little place to park and no good access to the river, so there is not a lot of temptation to trespass. Clearing the old ROW would change that situation dramatically and potentially create a great attraction to the water. If it were fenced, the fence would have to be frequently maintained and trash regularly removed. Parking would cause hazards along the road and swimming is often dangerous in the currents, eddies, and rocks below the old bridge. It would be better not to create this attractive nuisance in the first place.

*Detour.* It has been said that the required detour for a replace-in-place alternative would take an 15 extra minutes. We drove the detour last week and it is mainly on larger, faster

roads and takes only 12 minutes to cover in total. Bucks Bar Road takes 8-9 minutes, so the detour is only 3 to 4 minutes longer, and on safer roads. As for tourism, we think it's most likely a tourist headed for the wineries will blithely follow a couple of detour signs and get where they're going in no time.

*Summary.* We believe that the 40-mph alternative would sacrifice the concrete good of the few – ourselves and other immediately affected landowners -- for the less-tangible to downright speculative good of the many. We are strongly for the 30-mph, replace-in-place alternative which would have minimal effects on adjacent land, resources, and property, including our land, be safer for construction workers and drivers, and would only slightly and temporarily affect other citizens.

Sincerely,

[Signed,]

David Wright  
Susan Jones



LATE DISTRIBUTION 02-03-14

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

February 4, 2014 agenda, item #25

1 message

Valerie Zentner <valeriez@edcfb.com>

Mon, Feb 3, 2014 at 9:37 AM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Cc: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Attached are the Farm Bureau's comments on the proposed Bucks Bar Bridge replacement as recommended by staff in Item #25 of tomorrow's agenda.

*Valerie Zentner, Executive Director*

El Dorado County Farm Bureau



**Bucks Bar Bridge alignment e-ltr.pdf**

33K

January 31, 2014

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

Attention: Supervisor Norma Santiago, Chair

Subject: Bucks Bar Bridge Replacement

Reference: February 4, 2014 Agenda, Item #25

Dear Madam Chair,

In our letter of June 30, 2011 the El Dorado County Farm Bureau expressed concerns about the Bucks Bar Bridge replacement project being proposed because of the negative effects of a long-term road closure on our rural businesses. We appreciate the efforts of staff in meeting with the members of the public, noting the very real concern of the unintended consequences of the initial project proposal and adapting the approach to address those needs.

The proposed alignment for bridge replacement delineated in Item 25 addresses the concerns we had noted about long term road closures. Although we recognize that short term closures may be required, we request that public information notices about those closures be announced broadly and early. We also request that the County continue to work with the businesses in the affected areas to coordinate the timing of those closures to help mitigate any negative effect on them, just as was done when the Echo Summit closures were required.

Again, we appreciate the efforts of the county to mitigate the impacts of these road improvement projects on our rural communities. Should you have questions or need anything further regarding this proposal, please do not hesitate to contact our Executive Director, Valerie Zentner, at 622-7773.

Sincerely,



James E. Davies, President

cc: Ron Mikulaco, County Supervisor, District 1  
Ray Nutting, County Supervisor, District 2  
Brian Veerkamp, County Supervisor, District 3  
Ron Briggs, County Supervisor, District 4