

## ***Mt. Murphy Bridge Replacement Project***



# **Final Environmental Impact Report**

SCH#: 2015012056

**Prepared For:** El Dorado County Department of Transportation  
2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville CA 95667

**Contact:** Attn: Bridge Project Coordinator

Phone: 530-621-5900

**Prepared By:** SWCA Environmental Consultants  
6355 Riverside Blvd, Suite C, Sacramento CA 95831

**Contact:** Jeffery Little  
Phone: 916-427-0703

**May 2022**



El Dorado County Department of Transportation. 2022. *Mt Murphy Road Bridge Replacement Project Final Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants, Sacramento, CA.

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Final Environmental Impact Report.....	1-1
1.2 California Environmental Quality Act .....	1-1
1.3 Purpose of this Document .....	1-2
1.4 Organization of the Environmental Impact Report .....	1-3
1.5 Intended Use of the Environmental Impact Report .....	1-3
<b>Chapter 2 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR .....</b>	<b>2-4</b>
2.1 Comment Letters Received.....	2-4
2.2 Master Responses.....	2-5
2.3 Comments and Responses – Agencies.....	2-7
2.4 Comments and Responses – Other Organizations .....	2-15
2.5 Comments and Responses – Individuals.....	2-22
<b>Chapter 3 Changes and Errata to the Draft EIR .....</b>	<b>3-46</b>

## List of Figures

### Figure 3-15. Project Impact Map

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

---

### 1.1 Final Environmental Impact Report

This is the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) that has been prepared for the proposed Mt Murphy Road Bridge Replacement Project (proposed Project). As explained below, the Final EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act to disclose to decision-makers and the public the potential adverse physical changes to the environment that could occur if the Project is approved. The Final EIR incorporates the Draft EIR and responds to all of the comments received on both of those documents.

### 1.2 California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.) requires public agencies to consider the potential adverse environmental impacts of proposed projects and to disclose the significance of those impacts. Public agencies must consider both direct impacts and reasonably foreseeable indirect impacts. No discretionary project that may have a significant adverse impact on the environment can be approved without the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) and the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures. The proposed Project is a discretionary project subject to CEQA.

According to Section 15002 of the State CEQA Guidelines, below are the basic purposes of CEQA.

- Inform government decision makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- Identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.
- Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governing agency finds the changes to be feasible.
- Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

The process of preparing an EIR involves the following steps.

- Issuing a notice of preparation (NOP) soliciting the comments of public agencies and interested organizations and individuals regarding the scope and content of the EIR. El Dorado County (County) issued an NOP for the Draft EIR on January 21, 2015. A copy of the NOP is in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The comments received from agencies and the public in response to the NOP are also included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. CEQA does not require the lead agency to respond to the comments received during review of the NOP. The County considered all of these comments in preparing the Draft EIR.
- Conducting a scoping meeting. A scoping meeting was held on January 28, 2015 at the Gold Trail Grange Hall, 319 State Highway 49, Coloma, CA from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. to offer additional opportunity for input prior to preparation of the Draft EIR.



- Preparing a Draft EIR and releasing it for public review and comment for a period of at least 45 days. The Draft EIR for the Project was available for a review period of 45 days from January 10, 2022 through February 25, 2022 for public agencies and interested organizations and individuals to review. Copies of the Draft EIR were available at the El Dorado County Placerville Library at 345 Fair Lane in Placerville and at the County's website at: <http://www.edcgov.us/Government/DOT/CEQA.aspx>. A virtual public meeting was held on January 26, 2022 via a Zoom web meeting with access via phone from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. to present the EIR, answer questions, and accept comments on the Draft EIR.
- Preparing a Final EIR. The Mt Murphy Road Bridge Replacement Project Final EIR incorporates revisions to the Draft EIR made in response to the comments received during the review of the Draft EIR, written responses to comments, and copies of the comments themselves. The County Board of Supervisors will certify the adequacy of and consider the Final EIR prior to taking action on the Project.
- Preparing a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP). The Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Plan lists the mitigation measures to be incorporated by the County and specifies the implementation and monitoring responsibilities for each of those measures. It is a stand-alone document that is approved along with a project. The MMRP guides construction and operation of the Project to ensure that impacts are mitigated wherever possible. If the Board of Supervisors approves the Project, it must adopt the MMRP.
- Adopting findings. If the Board of Supervisors approves the Project, it will adopt a set of findings that describe how each significant impact identified in the Final EIR will be addressed (i.e., whether the impact would be mitigated, would be mitigated by another agency, or would be significant and unavoidable). If the County chooses not to approve any of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR, then the findings will also explain why those alternatives are infeasible.

CEQA establishes a process for analyzing a project's potential impacts. The Final EIR is not a permit and CEQA does not mandate that a proposed project be approved or denied. CEQA's purposes are to ensure that public agencies make a good faith effort at considering and disclosing the potential environmental impacts of projects to decision-makers, the public, and other agencies, and implement actions that will reduce or avoid potential significant impacts (i.e., mitigation), when feasible.

The County Board of Supervisors will use the Final EIR to inform itself of the Project's impacts before taking action. It will also consider other information and testimony that will arise during deliberations on the Project before making their decision.

## 1.3 Purpose of this Document

This Final EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2015012056) has been prepared according to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3) to evaluate and disclose the potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project. This Project would construct a new bridge over the South Fork American River to replace the current bridge, including constructing new roadway approach segments on Mt Murphy Road to connect to the new bridge (see Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR, *Project Description*). The County may adopt all or portions of the project after certifying the Final EIR.

## 1.4 Organization of the Environmental Impact Report

The Final EIR is organized in the following chapters.

- Chapter 1, *Introduction*, this is the introduction to the Final EIR. The discussion reflects the CEQA process through completion of the Final EIR. It is also new to the Final EIR.
- Chapter 2, *Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR*, contains the comments received on the Draft EIR and the County's responses to those comments, as well as master responses.
- Chapter 3, *>Revisions*, describes and analyzes revisions to the proposed Project since circulation of the Draft EIR.
- Chapter 4, *>Changes*, contains the changes made to the Draft EIR. Changes are indicated using underline for added text and strikeout for deleted text and an explanation of the reason for the text change is provided.
- *Attachments* contain supplemental information.

## 1.5 Intended Use of the Environmental Impact Report

This Final EIR is a two-part document, consisting of the Draft EIR and this document, the Final EIR, which contains the comments received on the Draft EIR, the responses to those comments, and the errata or revisions made to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR, as a whole, will be considered by the County Board of Supervisors prior to taking final action on the Project.

## Chapter 2

# Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

---

This chapter lists the comments received on the Draft EIR, provides copies of the individual comments, and responds to each comment related to environmental issues. Most of the comments received raised similar issues about the Project and its alleged environmental impacts. The County has prepared master responses to address the most frequently raised issues. When an individual comment raises an issue discussed in a master response, the response to that individual comment will cross-reference to the appropriate master response (e.g., “see Master Response 1”).

The Master Responses address the following topics:

- Master Response 1: Public Concerns Regarding Road Improvements
- Master Response 2: Public Concerns Regarding Coloma Resort Impacts
- Master Response 3: Public Comments Regarding Proposed Bridge Design Features

## 2.1 Comment Letters Received

During the 45-day public comment period for the Draft EIR (January 10 to February 25, 2022), 18 comment letters were received. Each letter was placed into one of four categories (Agencies, Tribal Organization, Other Organizations, and Individuals) and given a unique number, as listed in Table 2-1 below. As noted in the table, an additional nine comment letters were received after the close of the public comment period, and no response to these comments is required. For this reason, the County has not prepared written responses in the Final EIR to comments received after the end of the comment period.

**Table 2-1. Comment Letters Received on the Draft EIR**

Comment Letter Number	Name of Commenter	Date of Letter
<b>Agencies</b>		
A-1	Caltrans	2/25/2022
A-2	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	2/18/2022
A-3	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	2/18/2022
<b>Other Organizations</b>		
O-1	Gold Trail Grange	2/13/2022
<b>Individuals</b>		
I-1	Paul Bado	1/28/2022
I-2	Paul Bado	1/31/2022
I-3	Edwin Bickford	1/25/2022
	Supervisor Parlin’s response to Edwin Bickford	1/31/2022
I-4	Robin Center	2/24/2022

Comment Letter Number	Name of Commenter	Date of Letter
I-5	Jim Klotz	2/23/2022
I-6	Ray and Marcia LeVitt	2/24/2022
	Ray and Marcia LeVitt	2/27/2022
I-7	Gary Philbin	1/14/2022
I-8	Robert Phillips	1/29/2022
I-9	Jake Prowse	2/23/2022
I-10	Rusty and Shannon Sage	2/25/2022
I-11	David Thomas	2/25/2022

## 2.2 Master Responses

### 2.2.1 Master Response 1. Public Concerns Regarding Road Improvements

Multiple comments were received expressing concern over the existing conditions of the adjacent roadways to the Mt. Murphy Bridge Project and requesting that additional improvements be performed to these roadways. These adjacent roadways include Mt. Murphy Road, Bayne Road, and SR 49 as roadways that are in need or would benefit from performance improvements (i.e. additional widening of the travel way, constructing turn pockets at specific intersection points, drainage improvements, etc.), or roadways that may be congested during peak hours or specific conditions. There was also a concern raised over emergency evacuations or during bridge closures, and how future conditions may impact these roadways after the Mt. Murphy Bridge Project is complete.

The Mt. Murphy Bridge Project is a Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Project with bridge safety as the primary purpose and need. The HBP program has constraints on roadway improvements, and funding from this program is limited on these roadway improvements. This does not however, preclude other future separate projects (with separate or different funding), from improving these roadway locations. Some of these adjacent roadways are outside County right-of-way (ROW), such as SR 49, which is operated and maintained by Caltrans.

Additionally, the Project does not propose changes to the planning and development in the area or to the growth anticipated in the area, it only seeks to meet the current design standards within the Project with current estimations for future growth. Based on these conditions, the Project alone should not have an effect on anticipated growth rates or traffic volumes adjacent to its location.

For comments regarding safe travel conditions during emergency evacuations and/or bridge closures during construction, the Mt. Murphy Bridge Project proposes to maintain traffic on the bridge crossing through construction by staging the Project. During the first stage of construction, one lane of the new bridge will be built downstream, and alongside the existing bridge enabling traffic to continue on the existing bridge in its current configuration. During the second stage of construction, traffic shifts onto the constructed bridge segment completed during the first stage while the existing bridge is removed and replaced with the new bridge segment. The final stage would then consist of closure pours between the two bridge segments and constructing the new

bridge approaches. While intermittent lane closures and flagging during construction will at times be needed, long term bridge closures should not occur as part of the proposed Project. As a contingency, however, an emergency evacuation and response plan will be required as a contract required submittal from the Contractor during construction to ensure worker and public safety in the case of such an event.

## 2.2.2 Master Response 2. Public Concerns Regarding Coloma Resort Impacts

The Coloma Resort is located northeast (upstream) and adjacent to the proposed Project and consists of many RV and campsites. Multiple comments were received concerning the congestion and queuing of large vehicles and users of the Coloma Resort along SR 49, Mt. Murphy Road, and onto existing Mt. Murphy Bridge. These comments ranged from concerns of local traffic impacts during Resort peak hours, to recommendations to construct additional turn pockets to better accommodate Resort traffic, to recommendations to relocate the Coloma Resort entrance. There were also requests to require the Resort to construct offsite or neighboring parking, implement more stringent ROW easements, and/or add additional provisions into the Resorts special use permit associated with mitigating traffic impacts.

As detailed in Master Response #1, the primary purpose and need of the Mt. Murphy Bridge Project is to address the safety and performance of the bridge crossing. Roadway improvements beyond the constraints or limits of the Project, or requested modifications to Conditional Use Permits for neighboring users are not the primary purpose nor do they address the primary need of the HBP program and/or Mt. Murphy Bridge Project. This does not, however, preclude other projects or considerations outside this Project from evaluating opportunities to improve traffic flow and performance for users through or neighboring the Project area.

## 2.2.3 Master Response 3. Public Comments Regarding Proposed Bridge Design Features

Multiple comments were also received regarding design features of the proposed Project and recommendations for changes and/or modifications of some items. These recommendations included: relocating the pedestrian sidewalk from the upstream side of the bridge to the downstream side, deleting or removing the truss towers and cables (to improve river view shed), and to reevaluate opportunities to retain the existing bridge by building alongside and converting the existing bridge to a pedestrian bridge.

As detailed in the Draft EIR and the many cited engineering documents (including the *Structural Rehabilitation Study*, the *Alternatives Study*, the *Alternatives Feasibility Study*, and the *Structural Advanced Planning Study*), many alternatives and design features have been evaluated to ultimately arrive to the proposed Project. These analyses not only involved extensive field and engineering study, but also included elaborate coordination and review by key stakeholders, funding agencies, regulatory agencies, and the public to ensure the proposed Project was thoroughly evaluated. As summarized in the Draft EIR, and detailed in these reports, the existing bridge is not feasible for rehabilitation as nearly all members require replacement. Additionally, alternatives to construct off-alignment adjacent to the existing bridge were also evaluated and determined to result in greater impacts to neighboring resources, sensitive areas, and require removal and relocation of many

features further exacerbating these resources impacted. As a result, the least impact alternative was determined to remain on alignment and constructed in stages.

Bridge type and aesthetic features were also extensively studied and evaluated based on visual and resource impacts and ultimately determined that the proposed Project resulted in the least impact that also helped mitigate the removal of the existing bridge. During environmental study of the bridge crossing history it was discovered that multiple past bridge types, including a timber suspension pedestrian bridge, a multi-span timber (that was later replaced with concrete) and the existing truss bridge have existed at the site. Through multiple iterations, and this extensive coordination with key stakeholders to include the State Parks, funding agencies, and OHP, the proposed bridge Project design and aesthetics were determined to best reflect the prior bridge history and least impact the surroundings. This solution also involved public coordination and outreach in addition to the work and assessment of a bridge architect. As evidenced by public feedback through multiple Project public meetings, the currently proposed Project includes features and aesthetics that are well supported by key stakeholders and the public.

As detailed in the Draft EIR, the proposed Project's view shed has been extensively evaluated for visual impacts associated with multiple key observation points adjacent to and within the Project to assess the pre-project versus post-project changes. The findings associated with this evaluation determined that the visual impacts associated with the proposed Project are less than significant.

The pedestrian walkway has been located on the upstream side of the bridge to best meet the pedestrian activities resulting in the high count data discussed in the traffic study. As seen in the Project's traffic study, the pedestrian count on the bridge is predominately due to the State Park's interpretive program, which includes destination points at Bekeart's Gun Shop and continues to the Coloma Resort. Since both these locations are located along the upstream side of the bridge, the pedestrian walkway was also located on the upstream side of the bridge. The proposed Project includes crosswalks between Bekeart's Gun Shop and the Grange Hall, and between the Coloma Resort and the ADA Parking area, recognizing that there will be some pedestrians crossing to access facilities to the north (downstream) side of the bridge.

## 2.3 Comments and Responses – Agencies

Comment letters from two public agencies were received (see Table 2-1 at the beginning of this chapter). A copy of each of the letters and responses to the provided comments follow this page.

## Response to Comments and Responses – Agencies

### Comment Letter A-1, Caltrans, 2/25/2022

2/25/22, 2:07 PM

Edcgov.us Mail - Mt. Murphy Bridge Replacement DEIR



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

#### Mt. Murphy Bridge Replacement DEIR

1 message

Dosanjh, David@DOT &lt;David.Dosanjh@dot.ca.gov&gt;

Fri, Feb 25, 2022 at 2:06 PM

To: "mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us" &lt;mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us&gt;

Cc: "YOUNT, KEVIN J@DOT" &lt;KEVIN.YOUNT@dot.ca.gov&gt;

Dear El Dorado County Department of Transportation:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review process for the project referenced above. We reviewed this local development for impacts to the State Highway System (SHS) in keeping with our mission, vision, and goals, some of which includes addressing equity, climate change, and safety, as outlined in our statewide plans such as the California Transportation Plan, Caltrans Strategic Plan, and Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure.

Caltrans does not have any comments at this time on the Draft EIR circulated for review. A-1-1

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on any changes related to this development.

Thank you,

**David Dosanjh**

Transportation Planner

Regional Planning Liaison – Placer County and Tahoe Basin

Caltrans – District 3

Division of Planning, Local Assistance & Sustainability

(530) 565-3905 – M-F 8:00am-4:30pm

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725774483577558421%7Cmsg-f%3A1725774483577...> 1/1

### Response to A-1, Caltrans

**A-1-1:** Comment noted.

## Comment Letter A-2, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2/18/2022

2/28/22, 11:09 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - Comment Letter for 2015012056



Jon Balzer &lt;jon.balzer@edcgov.us&gt;

---

### Comment Letter for 2015012056

---

**Hendricks, Greg@Waterboards** <Greg.Hendricks@waterboards.ca.gov>

Thu, Feb 24, 2022 at 3:52 PM

To: "jon.balzer@edcgov.us" &lt;jon.balzer@edcgov.us&gt;

Cc: "Yang, Houa@Waterboards" &lt;Houa.Yang@waterboards.ca.gov&gt;

Hello,

Attached is the comment letter for the above project. Please respond to this email confirming receipt, thank you.

Greg Hendricks  
Environmental Scientist – 401 Water Quality Certification and Dredging Unit  
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Ph: 916-464-4709  
[Greg.Hendricks@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Greg.Hendricks@waterboards.ca.gov)

---

**2015012056.pdf**  
219K

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=47da1edf74&view=pt&search=all&permmsgid=msg-f%3A1725690571725605057&simpl=msg-f%3A1725690571725605057> 1/1



## Comment Letter A-2, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2/18/2022



### Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

18 February 2022

Jon Balzer  
County of El Dorado  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667  
[jon.balzer@edcgov.us](mailto:jon.balzer@edcgov.us)

#### COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, MT. MURPHY ROAD BRIDGE PROJECT, SCH#2015012056, EL DORADO COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 01 January 2022 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Draft Environmental Impact Report* for the Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project, located in El Dorado County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

A-2-1

#### I. Regulatory Setting

##### Basin Plan

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of

DENISE KADARA, ACTING CHAIR | PATRICK PULUPA, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 | [www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley)

## Comment Letter A-2, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2/18/2022

Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project  
El Dorado County

- 2 -

18 February 2022

Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/basin\\_plans/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/)

### **Antidegradation Considerations**

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at:

[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/basin\\_plans/sacsjr\\_2018\\_05.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_2018_05.pdf)

In part it states:

*Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.*

*This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.*

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

## **II. Permitting Requirements**

### **Construction Storm Water General Permit**

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml)

## Comment Letter A-2, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2/18/2022

Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project  
El Dorado County

- 3 -

18 February 2022

### **Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits<sup>1</sup>**

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/storm\\_water/municipal\\_permits/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/)

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/phase\\_ii\\_municipal.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml)

### **Industrial Storm Water General Permit**

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ. For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/storm\\_water/industrial\\_general\\_permits/index.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml)

### **Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit**

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

### **Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification**

If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic

<sup>1</sup> Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.

## Comment Letter A-2, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2/18/2022

Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project  
El Dorado County

- 4 -

18 February 2022

General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/water\\_quality/certification/](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality/certification/)

### **Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State**

If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/waste\\_to\\_surface\\_water/](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/)

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/water\\_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf)

### **Dewatering Permit**

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/water\\_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf)

## Comment Letter A-2, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2/18/2022

Mt. Murphy Road Bridge Project  
El Dorado County

- 5 -

18 February 2022

For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf)

### **Limited Threat General NPDES Permit**

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board\\_decisions/adopted\\_orders/general\\_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf)

### **NPDES Permit**

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/>

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4709 or [Greg.Hendricks@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Greg.Hendricks@waterboards.ca.gov).



Greg Hendricks  
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse unit, Governor's Office of Planning and Research,  
Sacramento

## Response to A-2, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

**A-2-1:** This letter describes the laws and regulations under the purview of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The letter does not make Project specific comments.

### **Comment Letter A-3, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Duplicate), 2/18/2022**

The county received a duplicate comment letter from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The letter was sent through the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse unit and was date stamped March 2, 2022 (by the unit). The letter is identical to Comment Letter A-2 and no further response is provided.

## **2.4 Comments and Responses – Other Organizations**

One comment letter from a non-governmental organization was received (see Table 2-1 at the beginning of this chapter). A copy of the letter and responses to the comments follow this page.

**Comment Letter O-1, Gold Trail Grange, 2/13/2022**

2/14/22, 7:55 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Mt. Murphy Bridge EIR Comments

LETTER O-01



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

**Fwd: Mt. Murphy Bridge EIR Comments**

1 message

**Gold Trail Grange** <goldtrailgrange@gmail.com>

Sun, Feb 13, 2022 at 7:52 PM

To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Cc: Bubba Kite &lt;bubbakite@hotmail.com&gt;, Vickie and Tim Longo &lt;timvickie@timlongo.com&gt;

Please find attached to this email comments from Gold Trail Grange on the Mt. Murphy Draft EIR. The comments were reviewed and voted on by members at our February 9, 2022 Business Meeting and are the authorized comments of the Gold Trail Grange.

Sincerely,  
Austin Smith  
President

**Mt Murphy Bridge DEIR Comments.GTG.pdf**  
2680K<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1724709085513128032%7Cmsg-f%3A1724709085513...> 1/1



## Comment Letter O-1, Gold Trail Grange, 2/13/2022



Gold Trail Grange #452  
PO Box 16  
Coloma, CA 95613  
goldtrailgrange@gmail.com

February 13, 2022

Gold Trail Grange comments on the Mt Murphy Bridge Draft Environmental Impact Report as authorized by members; Gold Trail Grange Business Meeting, February 9, 2022.

***The Grange Hall is the closest structure to the Mt Murphy Bridge Project and the most heavily impacted site. The Draft EIR does not adequately address several crucial impacts to the Grange Hall structure and on member activities in several areas.***

#### ARSENIC CONTAMINATED SOIL and DUST:

"Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 Arsenic Containing Soil

Contract provisions will require soil excavated from the west bank of the South Fork American River be kept in separate from other spoils and disposed of as Nonhazardous waste at a Class II or Class III landfill depending on facility acceptance standard."

"Sources of fugitive dust would include disturbed soils at the construction site and trucks carrying uncovered loads of soil. These emissions would predominantly occur during grading and earthmoving activities."

***As the proposed staging site, will contaminated soil be stored on or adjacent to the Grange and how will arsenic contaminated dust be mitigated during loading and removal to prevent dust infiltration of the Grange Hall?***

O-1-1

#### REDUCTION of POTENTIAL VIBRATION IMPACTS on BUILDINGS:

"The construction contract will specify a maximum peak particle velocity (PPV) threshold (anticipated to be approximately 0.12 inches per second for transient sources and 0.08 inches per second for continuous/frequent intermittent sources at the historic buildings (the receiving structure) within the MGDSP during active construction of the Project)."

"Wooden structures, as in the case of the Gold Trail Grange Building, have weathered over the years and the structure itself has become susceptible to movement. The vibration study concluded that the use of vibratory or impact construction equipment (e.g., impact pile driver and vibratory roller) has the potential to damage nearby historic structures."

***There is no assessment nor plan to mitigate impacts on the Grange Hall during the Project. The Grange Hall is less than 25 feet from the Project construction zone and 50 feet from the Bridge span. Use of pile drivers and compaction equipment will exceed the 0.12 in/s PPV on the Grange Hall. How will the project contractor protect the Grange Hall from damage during construction?***

O-1-2

#### POTENTIAL CONFLICTS WITH RECREATIONAL USERS DURING CONSTRUCTION:

"Prior to commencing construction, the construction limits and detailed plans for relocating existing recreational activities will be coordinated through MGDSP and Coloma Resort staff."

***The DEIR does not recognize, nor assess and address the impacts of the Project on recreational activities that regularly take place at the Grange and its SFAR access adjacent***

O-1-3



## Comment Letter O-1, Gold Trail Grange, 2/13/2022

**to the Project. The Grange Staff requires coordination and agreement to any impact or relocation on our recreational activities.**

### ACCESSIBILITY and RECREATIONAL VALUE THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION

The Project will not result in permanent impacts to the Gold Trail Grange driveway and parking lot. During construction the driveway and parking lot of the Gold Trail Grange will be temporarily affected. The Project will likely require construction of a retaining wall near the existing toe of the fill prism associated with the current bridge approach. The location of the driveway in relation to the Mt. Murphy Road/SR 49 will remain the same. Pending Caltrans direction, the Grange driveway entrance can be reconfigured so that it is isolated from SR 49. Under the proposed condition vehicles would no longer turn directly from SR49 into the driveway nor would vehicles turn directly from onto SR49 from the driveway. Under the proposed conditions vehicles would turn from SR49 onto Mt. Murphy Road and then immediately into the Grange driveway. Vehicles wishing to turn onto SR49 from the driveway would first have to turn onto Mt. Murphy Road and then complete the turn onto the highway. Following construction, the Grange driveway and parking lot will be accessible and usable. The proposed Gold Trail Grange driveway configuration would also eliminate the blind corner that currently exists at the Grange building. This improvement will avoid potential pedestrian vs. vehicle conflicts by moving the pedestrian crossing away from the Grange building and providing a protected refuge with clear line of sight for both pedestrians and motorists."

**The proposed changes to the Grange driveway do not work as a practical matter. They would require all Grange vehicles and those with trailers turning from southbound Highway 49 to make a U-turn in a crosswalk into two directions of oncoming traffic crossing in front of or between vehicles at a stop sign. We reiterate, as stated in our letter of October 16, 2018 to Supervisor Ranalli and Mr. Balzer, the Project Manager, Gold Trail Grange does not agree to any changes to our prescriptive rights of ingress and egress to State Highway 49.**

O-1-4

### VEGETATION REMOVAL

"Approximately 34 native trees and 33 non-native trees and other vegetation would be removed to provide workers and equipment access. Following construction, these areas would be regraded and revegetated in agreement with the El Dorado County ORMP (where applicable), MGDSP, and the Coloma Resort where applicable or lands are under their management."

**Vegetation removal on Gold Trail Grange property is not addressed in the DEIR contrary to site plans and statements by EDC staff. How will the lost shade trees on Grange property, a primary source of our summer cooling, be replaced?**

O-1-5

### Environmental Setting

"There are six recreational destinations in or adjacent to the Project area: the MGDSP, Coloma Resort, Henningsen Lotus Park, Ponderosa RV Resort, American River Resort, and the SFAR. ...the Gold Discovery Loop trailhead in front of the Grange (not a MGDSP property). Construction activities may discourage users from using the trail, since the trailhead is adjacent to the Grange, where construction staging would be located behind the building. These temporary limits to the recreational use of the area are not impacts to the environment and, further, would not adversely affect trail use overall since there are many other locations to intercept this trail near the Sutter's Mill Replica parking area."

**Impacts on recreation at the Grange site are not addressed. Both the trailhead and Grange river access are adjacent to the Project and members will be impacted by the loss of our trail river access. How will our access to both trails and the SFAR be mitigated?**

O-1-3



**Austin Smith**  
President



**Bubba Kite**  
Vice-President



**Tim Longo**  
Executive Comm

## Comment Letter O-1, Gold Trail Grange, 2/13/2022



Gold Trail Grange #452  
PO Box 16, Coloma, CA 95613  
October 16, 2018

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

Dear Supervisor Ranalli and Mr. Balzer;

The Gold Trail Grange would like to thank John Balzer and the El Dorado County Community Development Agency Transportation Division for including the Gold Trail Grange throughout the Mt. Murphy Bridge discussions. With the recent announcement that the bridge site has been selected to be along current Grange property, we would like to review our past concerns and needs around the bridge project.

The proposed Mt. Murphy Bridge Project design, as shown through the recent video presentation, would result in a complete loss of mature trees and shrubs on the south side of the Grange Hall. The loss of these plants will have a negative impact on the Grange property. These trees and shrubs provide much needed shade, noise reduction, and privacy to our property.

O-1-5

The proposed retaining wall that replaces this foliage would transform the side of the Grange/Community Hall from a greenbelt to a concrete barrier. This would have very negative effects on our current environment. It would:

- expose the south facing Grange Hall,
- increase the internal temperature of our building that holds community events,
- eliminate a noise barrier to the road, and
- remove the quaint attraction of our Grange Hall.

To offset this harm, we feel it is very important to have a new driveway on the north side of the Grange Hall. This had previously been proposed but is not shown in the current plan. A north driveway will significantly improve safety while maintaining access to the Grange. It will also provide space on the south side of the Hall to re-establish much needed new trees and shrubs to help compensate for the loss of our greenbelt, creating a softer and safer corner at the intersection.

O-1-6

Please note that the Gold Trail Grange Board will not agree to any governmental taking of our property that reduces or impairs our historical ingress and egress rights to Highway 49. While we are firm in this position, we are more than willing to find alternatives that meet the needs of the EDC Department of Transportation Mt. Murphy Project, and California State Parks visitor safety, while retaining our full ingress and egress rights.

The Grange Hall plays an important role as it is the Community Hall for the Coloma-Lotus Valley. The Mt. Murphy Bridge Project is also very important to the safety of our community and the Gold Trail Grange supports the project. It is critical that the Grange property not be negatively impacted by the bridge project. We appreciate your understanding that attempting to work with all members of the community is important to finding a fair solution. We look forward to future discussions on this matter.

Sincerely,

Bubba Kite,  
Chair, Bridge Advisory Committee  
Gold Trail Grange

## Response to O-1, Gold Trail Grange

**O-01-1:** As detailed in HAZ-1, any arsenic-containing soil excavated from the Project site will be kept separately and properly disposed offsite. In the event that arsenic-containing soil is excavated and temporarily stockpiled onsite for later off haul, it will only be located in safe designated areas with engineered controls to properly protect contaminants from discharge. Stockpile and material management are typically addressed through Contractor work plan submittals and covered as part of the Project's Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Additionally, mitigation for contamination due to fugitive dust onsite is also addressed under the Contractor's Fugitive Dust Plan and the associated County permit that includes mitigation measures such as use of water trucks for designated activities, monitoring, and dust suppression efforts to ensure proper protection.

The comment asserts that the Draft EIR has not adequately considered impacts associated with arsenic-containing soil to the Grange Hall, however, as discussed above and detailed within the environmental document, no changes to HAZ-1 are necessary to account for arsenic-containing soil specific to the Grange Hall property. In the event that the Gold Trail Grange has additional concerns specific to arsenic-containing soil, activity constraints can be further discussed in the right-of-way (ROW) phase.

**O-01-2:** As detailed in the Draft EIR, vibration impacts were evaluated during the geotechnical studies on this site based on soil conditions, proximity of sensitive receptors, and proposed Project activities. The findings associated with the site investigation determined that there would be no pile driving, and vibratory compaction equipment would be limited in designated areas within the proposed Project design and construction contract. Additionally, a vibration Monitoring and Mitigation Plan will also be required as a Contractor submittal during construction to further ensure that vibration impacts to neighboring sensitive receptors are minimized.

The comment asserts that the Draft EIR has not adequately considered or assessed impacts associated with vibration activities to the Grange Hall during construction, however, as discussed above and detailed within the environmental document, no changes or additional study are warranted specific to the Grange Hall property.

**O-01-3:** As detailed in the Draft EIR, recreational activities to include adjacent trail users, river users, and other users along the South Fork of the American River (SFAR) and adjacent to the Project, were extensively evaluated and discussed. Although recreational activities are not considered an environmental impact under CEQA, they were extensively considered and discussed for informational purposes, resulting in multiple voluntary minimization measures (refer to REC-1 through REC-4 for details) designed to minimize potential Project conflicts with recreational uses. Additionally, and as acknowledged by the commenter, most of these activities occur adjacent to the Project, and locations of potential conflict with construction activities will be relocated and coordinated "prior to commencing construction." The proposed avoidance measures will reduce the Project footprint and impacts on neighboring activities whenever possible. For those recreational activities that remained in conflict with construction activities, relocation efforts to include detailed plans and coordination with MGDSP, Coloma Resort, and Gold Trail Grange (as applicable) would be required as acknowledged within the Draft EIR. It should be noted that no formal facilities exist for recreationists including an established boat launch or trail head locations within the Gold Trail Grange property.

The comment asserts that the Draft EIR has not adequately considered or assessed impacts associated with recreational activities to the Grange Hall during construction, however, as discussed

above and detailed within the environmental document, no changes are warranted specific to the Grange Hall property. Details associated with the relocation of recreational activities to include plans, coordination, and agreements for items typically performed on the Gold Trail Grange property will be further discussed and detailed in the right-of-way (ROW) phase.

**O-01-4:** As detailed in the Draft EIR, and discussed to the Gold Trail Grange Board members in a meeting on January 17, 2019 (after receiving the Gold Trail Grange letter), the proposed improvements to the Grange driveway would result in minimal changes from its current configuration with a similar level of performance and improved safety. As presented in the meeting on January 17, 2019, all turning movements from Mt. Murphy Road would be achievable in both pre-project and post-project conditions. In addition to sharing engineering documents evaluating this information, it was also surveyed in the field and staked to assist with visualizing the proposed roadway features adjacent to the driveway and walked in the field during the meeting. The driveway configuration would remain in its current location with minor grade adjustments and with a similar width. The proposed Project would however, improve line of sight for turning vehicles on Mt. Murphy Road as seen through the video renderings, engineering documents, and field surveys.

It was also discussed that SR49 is under Caltrans's jurisdiction (not part of the County ROW) and direct access from SR49 to the Grange Hall driveway is not an item the County has oversight in the final determination. While this Project does not directly propose changes to the SR49 access of the Grange Hall driveway, Caltrans will have final determination on this point of access.

**O-01-5:** As detailed in the Draft EIR, vegetation removal to include inventories of tree removals and habitat impacts were extensively discussed in the environmental document including mitigation for these impacts. The commenter suggests that vegetation removal impacts to the Grange Hall have not been adequately addressed in the Draft EIR, as there are shade trees that provide a primary source of cooling in the summertime and asks how this will be mitigated when removed. It should be noted that most of the trees identified for removal near the Grange Hall property are located on County ROW (especially the larger trees), and that they are located in a position that would provide shade to the Grange Hall during the morning to noon hours in the summer, but would have little to no impact on shading the Grange Hall during the afternoon and evening hours (during the summer months) when temperatures and sun exposure are at their greatest. As a result, no changes to the Draft EIR are warranted specific to vegetation removal impacts to the Grange Hall. In the event the Gold Trail Grange has additional concerns or requests specific to shade loss, aesthetics, privacy, noise, etc. as a consequence of tree removals on their property this can be further discussed in the ROW phase.

**O-01-6:** As discussed and presented in the meeting with the Gold Trail Grange Board members on January 17, 2019, relocation of the Grange Hall driveway to the north of the property was considered and evaluated but determined to be infeasible due to significant environmental impacts. While relocating the Grange Hall driveway to the north may provide circulation and access benefits to the Grange, it would also result in significant impacts to many sensitive resources, including (but not limited to): relocation of Gold Discovery Trail, impacts to potential buried historic resources identified within the State Park area (and adjacent to the original Sutter Mill site) and within the location of the driveway, and tree and vegetation removals on State Park lands (and removals that are estimated to have a far greater impact on thermal heating of the Grange during afternoon and evening exposure). In addition, a new driveway would also require an encroachment to SR 49 and within Caltrans ROW with a significant fill to achieve proper approach and line of sight. As a result, these items of concern would likely not only cause greater impacts to sensitive State Park resources,

but also result in the Project having a greater impact on its overall surroundings thereby reducing the overall Project effectiveness and performance at protecting the environment.

## 2.5 Comments and Responses – Individuals

Comment letters from eleven individuals were received (see Table 2-1 at the beginning of this chapter). A copy of each of the letters and responses to the provided comments follow this page.

## Comment Letter I-01, Paul Bado, 1/28/2022

1/28/22, 10:07 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - New Mt. Murphy Bridge Comment

LETTER I-01



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### New Mt. Murphy Bridge Comment

1 message

El Dorado County <edcquestions@edcgov.us>  
To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Fri, Jan 28, 2022 at 9:49 AM

The Mt. Murphy Bridge Comments and Questions form has been submitted from a visitor to the El Dorado County website.

#### Form Responses

The information that was submitted is below:

##### Full Name

Paul Bado

##### Email Address

paul.bado@me.com

##### Address

5080 Sagebrush Road

##### City

Garden Valley

##### State

California

##### ZIP Code

95633

##### Phone Number

5303037009

##### Comments, Questions or Suggestions

Hello there. I live just above the Mount Murphy Road Bridge off of Sagebrush road and occasionally use the bridge when I go to Coloma. I have attended previous public meetings for the last few years regarding this bridge replacement and I support all of your current plans for its replacement. Since a recent 40 billion dollar infrastructure bill just passed thru congress for roads and bridges, I assume that El Dorado county will be getting some of that money. Since you are replacing this bridge, can some of this infrastructure money be used for improvements of the dirt portion of Mounty Murphy Road to the top of the hill into Garden Valley? This is a potential emergency evacuation route for the people in the immediate area. Replacing the bridge will also most likely put more traffic on this road and these improvements will be needed. Are there any plans for improvements to this roadway? If not, I urge you to do some improvements to it. Is this in the works? Thank you.

I-1-1

##### Attachments

(no attachments added)

Form URL: [https://www.edcgov.us/government/doi/webforms/pages/mt\\_murphy\\_bridge\\_comments\\_and\\_questions.aspx](https://www.edcgov.us/government/doi/webforms/pages/mt_murphy_bridge_comments_and_questions.aspx), ID: 3

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thred-f%3A1723221568574410719%7Cmsg-f%3A1723221568574...> 1/1

## Response to I-01, Paul Bado

**I-01-1:** Refer to Master Response #1 regarding road improvements.



## Comment Letter I-02, Paul Bado, 1/31/2022

2/7/22, 2:22 PM

Edcgov.us Mail - Re: Mount Murphy Road Bridge and Roadway.

LETTER I-02



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### Re: Mount Murphy Road Bridge and Roadway.

1 message

BOS Four &lt;bosfour@edcgov.us&gt;

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 2:06 PM

To: Paul Bado &lt;paul.bado@me.com&gt;

Cc: TD-MtMurphybridge-m &lt;mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us&gt;

Hi Paul,

Thank you for sending in your concerns.

We have cc'd the Mt Murphy Bridge project email address for a response.

*Sincerely,**Shelley Wiley*

Assistant to Supervisor Lori Parlin, District IV

Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado

Phone: (530) 621-6513

[Sign Up for District IV Email Updates](#) [Follow Us on Facebook](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s), except as otherwise permitted. Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

On Mon, Jan 31, 2022 at 9:01 AM 'Paul Bado' via BS-BOSFour-m <bosfour@edcgov.us> wrote:  
Supervisor Parlin and the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

I've been keeping updated with the planned construction and attending all of the public meetings on the Mount Murphy Road Bridge replacement over the past few years.  
I live just above the bridge off of Sagebrush road in Garden Valley and routinely use that bridge and roadway in Coloma.

I assume El Dorado county will be getting it's share of the recent 40 Billion dollar federal infracture bill that was designated for bridges and roadways. Since Mount Murphy road Bridge is now scheduled for replacement in spring of 2024, can El Dorado county take some of that federal money and do some improvements of the dirt portion of Mount Murphy Road?

I believe that bridge replacement will cause more traffic to use that dirt portion of Mount Murphy road. That part of Mount Murphy Road is also considered an evacuation route for the people who live in that immediate area of Garden Valley and has been used in the past for wild-land fires and flooding evacuation. I am a retired firefighter and we have had to occasionally use that portion of the roadway for access for fire apparatus for emergencies.

The current condition of that roadway is pretty poor and dangerous for drivers. It definitely needs some improvement. This roadway has needed improvement for many years now and has been mostly ignored except for some occasional grading and light coating of ground asphalt in places.

As part of the bridge replacement, can El Dorado county do some improvements to this dirt portion of Mount Murphy Road?

Can some widening and drainage improvements be done along with a better roadway base put down on it?  
Thank you.

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1724143773961439110%7Cmsg-f%3A1724143773961...> 1/2

**Comment Letter I-02, Paul Bado, 1/31/2022**

2/7/22, 2:22 PM

Edcgov.us Mail - Re: Mount Murphy Road Bridge and Roadway.

Paul Bado  
5080 Sagebrush Road  
Garden Valley, Ca 95633  
530-303-7009

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1724143773961439110%7Cmsg-f%3A1724143773961...> 2/2

**Response to I-02, Paul Bado**

**I-02-1:** Refer to Master Response #1 regarding road improvements.



## Comment Letter I-03, Edwin Bickford, 1/25/2022

1/25/22, 1:22 PM

Edcgov.us Mail - Mt Murphy and Bayne rd

LETTER I-03



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### Mt Murphy and Bayne rd

1 message

Edwin C Bickford &lt;edwinbickford@gmail.com&gt;

Tue, Jan 25, 2022 at 1:00 PM

To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Please Please please, be sure that Mt Murphy rd and Bayne rd are safe and traversable by TWO LANE traffic **BEFORE** you close the bridge for replacement. The last bridge closure was an absolute nightmare for those of us that had to use these roads as their only exit. Please do not put us through that again

I-3-1

Ed and Kari Bickford  
536 river rd  
coloma

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1722961847579817910%7Cmsg-f%3A1722961847579...> 1/1

## Response to I-03, Edwin Bickford

**I-03-1:** Refer to Master Response #1 regarding road improvements and Project staging and maintaining traffic.

## Comment Letter I-03, Supervisor Parlin's response to Edwin Bickford, 1/31/2022

1/31/22, 8:37 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - Re: Mt Murphy Bridge replacement

LETTER I-03.1



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### Re: Mt Murphy Bridge replacement

1 message

BOS Four &lt;bosfour@edcgov.us&gt;

Mon, Jan 31, 2022 at 8:32 AM

To: Edwin C Bickford &lt;edwincbickford@gmail.com&gt;

Cc: TD-MtMurphybridge-m &lt;mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us&gt;

Hi Ed and Kari,

I hear your concerns regarding a potential bridge closure. My understanding from prior staff presentations to the Board of Supervisors is that the 1st lane of the new bridge will be built while the existing bridge is in place. That allows for the 1st lane of the new bridge to be opened while the existing bridge is dismantled to make room for the 2nd lane of the new bridge, which results in minimal bridge closures, if any. I have copied our Mt. Murphy Bridge team on this email to confirm my recollection. I-3.1-1

Our staff is very good about updating the webpage for the Mt. Murphy Bridge project, which is here: <https://www.edcgov.us/mtmurphybridge>

Thank you for your email.

### Lori Parlin

El Dorado County District IV Supervisor

Phone: (530) 621-6513

✉ Sign Up for District IV Email Updates

f Follow Us on Facebook

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s), except as otherwise permitted. Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

On Wed, Jan 26, 2022 at 1:58 PM Edwin C Bickford &lt;edwincbickford@gmail.com&gt; wrote:

Please Please please, be sure that Mt Murphy rd and Bayne rd are safe and traversable by TWO LANE traffic **BEFORE** you close the bridge for replacement. The last bridge closure was an absolute nightmare for those of us that had to use these roads as their only exit. We understand that the last closure was unplanned and not your fault. This time however there is time to plan accordingly. Please do not put us through that again

Ed and Kari Bickford  
536 river rd  
coloma

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1723488592894038569%7Cmsg-f%3A1723488592894...> 1/1

## Response to I-03, Supervisor Parlin's response to Edwin Bickford

I-03-1: Supervisor Parlin's response is included.

## Comment Letter I-04, Robin Center, 2/24/2022

2/25/22, 7:51 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - New Mt. Murphy Bridge Comment

LETTER I-04



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### New Mt. Murphy Bridge Comment

1 message

El Dorado County <edcquestions@edcgov.us>  
 To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Thu, Feb 24, 2022 at 10:50 PM

The Mt. Murphy Bridge Comments and Questions form has been submitted from a visitor to the El Dorado County website.

#### Form Responses

The information that was submitted is below:

**Full Name**  
 robin Center

**Email Address**  
[robinmcenter@gmail.com](mailto:robinmcenter@gmail.com)

**Address**  
 561 Toad Road

**City**  
 Coloma

**State**  
 California

**ZIP Code**  
 95613

**Phone Number**  
 5309571463

#### Comments, Questions or Suggestions

I am interested in any building materials to be native to the river channel (like granite vs limestone or serpentine such as was used as fill along the river at Ponderosa Park (1,000 Trails?). And that any landscape similarly be native vegetation. I want access throughout construction without wait times on Bayne Rd. And monitoring of Coloma Resort traffic so that locals are not stuck behind caravans if RV's etc going into the resort. Whatever mitigation (costs) for the resort impacts on the bridge also be collected as agreed upon. Thank you for addressing my concerns!

I-4-1

I-4-2

I-4-3

**Attachments**  
 (no attachments added)

Form URL: [https://www.edcgov.us/government/dot/webforms/pages/mt\\_murphy\\_bridge\\_comments\\_and\\_questions.aspx](https://www.edcgov.us/government/dot/webforms/pages/mt_murphy_bridge_comments_and_questions.aspx), ID: 6

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725716858361019972%7Cmsg-f%3A1725716858361...> 1/1

## **Response to I-04, Robin Center**

**I-04-1:** The use of “native” materials to possibly include (but may not be limited to) site rock, vegetation, etc. will continue to be considered and implemented for reuse in the proposed Project when possible.

**I-04-2:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project staging and maintaining traffic. While wait times during intermittent lane closures and flagging during construction should be at a minimum, there is anticipated to be some minor delays during parts of the Project schedule. These intermittent lane closures will be planned and coordinated whenever possible to minimize public impacts.

**I-04-3:** Refer to Master Response #2 regarding Coloma Resort impacts.

## Comment Letter I-05, Jim Klotz, 2/23/2022

2/23/22, 8:58 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - New Mt. Murphy Bridge Comment

LETTER I-05



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### New Mt. Murphy Bridge Comment

1 message

El Dorado County <edcquestions@edcgov.us>  
 To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Wed, Feb 23, 2022 at 8:57 AM

The Mt. Murphy Bridge Comments and Questions form has been submitted from a visitor to the El Dorado County website.

#### Form Responses

The information that was submitted is below:

#### Full Name

Jim Klotz

#### Email Address

[guitarten11@gmail.com](mailto:guitarten11@gmail.com)

#### Address

P.O. Box 74, [381 Mules Ear Road](#)

#### City

Coloma

#### State

California

#### ZIP Code

95613

#### Phone Number

530.919.8180

#### Comments, Questions or Suggestions

I have 2 concerns: The first - the north end of the current bridge is often backed up from vehicles entering the campground. The campground should remove their gate so multiple vehicles can enter without backing up traffic on Mt Murphy road. Second, Bayne Road has seen a significant increase in traffic and I fear the new bridge will make it worse. Any studies on adverse effects of increased traffic?

I-5-1

I-5-2

#### Attachments

(no attachments added)

Form URL: [https://www.edcgov.us/government/dot/webforms/pages/mt\\_murphy\\_bridge\\_comments\\_and\\_questions.aspx](https://www.edcgov.us/government/dot/webforms/pages/mt_murphy_bridge_comments_and_questions.aspx), ID: 5

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725573838028549807%7Cmsg-f%3A1725573838028...> 1/1

## **Response to I-05, Jim Klotz**

**I-05-1:** Refer to Master Response #2 regarding Coloma Resort impacts.

**I-05-2:** Refer to Master Response #1 regarding road improvements.

## Comment Letter I-06, Ray and Marcia LeVitt, 2/24/2022

2/24/22, 7:30 PM

Edcgov.us Mail - Mt Murphy Bridge EIR Comments

LETTER I-06



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### Mt Murphy Bridge EIR Comments

1 message

**Ray** <rayandmarcia@earthlink.net>  
To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Thu, Feb 24, 2022 at 7:11 PM

#### Comments on the Mt Murphy Bridge EIR

To the Bridge Project Coordinator:

1. Consider putting the pedestrian walkway on the downstream side of the bridge. This will eliminate the need for a crosswalk on the Coloma Resort end, as the resort can put a path under the bridge for guests to access the bridge on the downstream side. Having the crosswalk as presently planned would make it dangerous for pedestrians to cross Mt. Murphy Road to access the Gallagher Field portion of the State Park when RVs are entering or leaving the resort.

I-6-1

2. The bridge should be built without the Truss Towers and cabling. Although we appreciate the attempt to tie the design to historic bridges at the site, the new design is too different from those historical designs, so it would be best for the viewshed to eliminate any vertical elements.

I-6-2

3. The EIR considers the impact of bridge construction on the Coloma Resort, but fails to consider the impact of the Coloma Resort on both the existing and the new bridge. The fact is that on busy weekends, RVs entering the resort regularly block the current bridge and often even block highway 49, causing State Park staff to perform traffic control, and causing frustration to residents who have to use the bridge to access mail, work, shopping, etc. The new bridge will not solve this problem. One lane of the bridge will still be blocked at times, depending on the day of the week. The Coloma Resort must be made to provide parking on resort grounds for 6 to 8 RVs prior to their check-in stop. This could be accomplished by them moving their gate much further into the resort and widening the access so there is side by side parking for registering guests. Alternatively, the resort could move its entrance several hundred feet further northeast and create an off-street parking area along Mt. Murphy Road for their registering guests. Either way, the resort should not be allowed to use the Mt Murphy bridge to queue their arriving guests. El Dorado County should review the Coloma Resort's Special Use Permit conditions and enforce them.

I-6-3

Respectfully submitted,

Ray and Marcia LeVitt, PO Box 405, Coloma

February 24, 2022



**Comments on the Mt Murphy Bridge EIR.docx**  
14K

I-6-4

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725703049440565085%7Cmsg-f%3A1725703049440...> 1/1



## Comment Letter I-06, Ray and Marcia LeVitt, 2/24/2022





## Comment Letter I-06, Ray and Marcia LeVitt, 2/24/2022



## **Response to I-06, Ray and Marcia LeVitt**

**I-06-1:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project design features.

**I-06-2:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project design features.

**I-06-3:** Refer to Master Response #2 regarding Coloma Resort impacts.

**I-06-4:** The file attached to the email contains the same text in the email and two pictures.

**Comment Letter I-06, Ray and Marcia LeVitt, 2/27/2022**

2/28/22, 8:15 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - Photos to add to Mt Murphy Bridge EIR



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

**Photos to add to Mt Murphy Bridge EIR**

1 message

**Ray** <rayandmarcia@earthlink.net>  
To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Sun, Feb 27, 2022 at 12:14 PM

Please add these photos to the discussion of Coloma Resort Bridge Impacts. This is a typical Friday afternoon. With the new bridge the pickup could get across, but there is another vehicle behind the trailers who would be stopped. It is much, much worse on holiday weekends. I-6-5

Thank you,

Ray and Marcia LeVitt, Coloma

**2 attachments**

**Resort Gate backup.jpg**  
3897K



**Traffic stopped on Mt Murphy Bridge.jpg**  
3963K

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725948619368865532%7Cmsg-f%3A1725948619368...> 1/1

**Response to I-06, Ray and Marcia LeVitt**

**I-06-5:** The email resends the two pictures included with the 2/24/2022 email.

**Comment Letter I-07, Gary Philbin, 1/14/2022**

1/14/22, 10:34 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - Mt. Murphy Bridge

LETTER I-07



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

**Mt. Murphy Bridge**

1 message

Gary Philbin <gphilbin@gmail.com>  
To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Fri, Jan 14, 2022 at 10:18 AM

Hello-

I feel it is completely wrong to demolish a piece of historical history. Build a new bridge- yes. Tear down history instead of repurposing it as a footbridge- NO. Once it is gone, it is gone. Not everything has to be brand new. There is a definite need for better access across the river, but to do so at the expense of destroying history in the middle of California's most important State Park is not only short sighted but just plain wrong. I am very disappointed in all involved who have chosen this path, and all involved who are permitting it to happen. Shame on you, shame on us for letting this happen.

I-7-1

Regards, Gary Philbin

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1721955062158502036%7Cmsg-f%3A1721955062158...> 1/1

**Response to I-07, Gary Philbin****I-07-1:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project design features.

## Comment Letter I-08, Robert Phillips, 1/29/2022

1/31/22, 8:09 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - New Mt. Murphy Bridge Comment

LETTER I-08



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### New Mt. Murphy Bridge Comment

1 message

El Dorado County <edcquestions@edcgov.us>  
To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Sat, Jan 29, 2022 at 8:11 AM

The Mt. Murphy Bridge Comments and Questions form has been submitted from a visitor to the El Dorado County website.

#### Form Responses

The information that was submitted is below:

**Full Name**  
Robert Phillips

**Email Address**  
[Rephillips42@gmail.com](mailto:Rephillips42@gmail.com)

**Address**  
[7127 Beach View Drive](#)

**City**  
Lotus

**State**  
California

**ZIP Code**  
95651

**Phone Number**  
(no value entered)

#### Comments, Questions or Suggestions

Why not make the new bridge next to the old so historically significant relics are preserved? Also can be a safe foot bridge.

I-8-1

**Attachments**  
(no attachments added)

Form URL: [https://www.edcgov.us/government/dot/webforms/pages/mt\\_murphy\\_bridge\\_comments\\_and\\_questions.aspx](https://www.edcgov.us/government/dot/webforms/pages/mt_murphy_bridge_comments_and_questions.aspx), ID: 4

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1723306026130601615%7Cmsg-f%3A1723306026130601615%7C> 1/1

## Response to I-08, Robert Phillips

**I-08-1:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project design features.

**Comment Letter I-09, Jake Prowse, 2/23/2022**

2/23/22, 7:51 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - pedestrian traffic

LETTER I-09



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

**pedestrian traffic**

1 message

**Jake Prowse** <jakeprose@gmail.com>  
To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Wed, Feb 23, 2022 at 7:32 AM

the bridge works fine, the people walking across it cause the most issues. A walking bridge attached to the side would fix the problem. I-9-1

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725568507732031826%7Cmsg-f%3A1725568507732...> 1/1

**Response to I-09, Jake Prowse**

**I-09-1:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project design features.

## Comment Letter I-10, Rusty and Shannon Sage, 1/26/2022

1/26/22, 12:35 PM

Edcgov.us Mail - Mt Murphy Bridge DEIR Questions

LETTER I-10



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### Mt Murphy Bridge DEIR Questions

1 message

Rusty Sage &lt;rustysage@hotmail.com&gt;

Wed, Jan 26, 2022 at 12:23 PM

To: "mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us" &lt;mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us&gt;

Thank you for keeping this project moving along.

I have read through portions of the DEIR and have a couple of questions, I am a homeowner who lives off River Rd and access/utilize this bridge on a daily basis, and an active Grange Member.

- Will the public or stakeholders be able to view and comment on the Traffic Management Plan? When is this expected to be completed? I-10-1
- How will RV's and large vehicle traffic be managed during the construction, will certain ones (height or weight limitations) not be allowed? Additional personnel to make sure traffic doesn't back up to 49? I-10-2
- it states that construction will begin in 2024; would this be in the spring of '24 and complete in the fall of '25? what is the limitation from getting started in '23? I-10-3
- When is the county expecting to go out to bid for this project? I-10-4
- Has detailed design been completed? I-10-5
- Is the county going forward on any take permit(s)? I-10-6
- Where is the construction area staging located? I-10-7
- Will a fire staging area be planned for in the case of a fire? I-10-8
- Will there be an emergency response plan be created and will this include residential safety evacuation if an emergency occurs during the build? I-10-9

Thank you for these answers and look forward to this project moving forward.

Rusty & Shannon Sage

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1723050099341729230%7Cmsg-f%3A1723050099341...> 1/1

## Response to I-10, Rusty and Shannon Sage

**I-10-1:** The Traffic Management Plan is a Contractor submittal that will be based on requirements from the Project's environmental document and other related site requirements that are included in the construction contract documents. Since it is Contractor submittal it is not usually reviewed and commented upon directly by the public during construction, however, the requirements contained within the construction contract documents are typically based on the coordination and feedback from the public during Project's environmental process.

**I-10-2:** Refer to Master Response #1 regarding staging and maintaining traffic during construction. Additionally, it should be noted that during the first stage of construction, load and height constraints will remain as they currently exist during construction. The second stage of construction may include some constraints similar to the existing conditions depending on the details of Project schedule and bridge configuration. Considerations of traffic backing on SR49 during construction or as a consequence of construction, will be covered in the Contractor's Traffic Management Plan and additional flaggers or other mitigation may be required depending on circumstances.

**I-10-3:** The estimated construction date of 2024 is an approximate "early" start date of spring 2024 based on "best case" scenarios of completing the environmental clearances by fall 2022, and completing right-of-way (ROW) by fall 2023 with the Project beginning the advertisement process in the winter of 2023. This schedule would not include any potential delays in final environmental clearances, ROW agreements, funding authorizations, utility relocations, etc.

**I-10-4:** As discussed in Response I-10-3, pending environmental clearances, ROW agreements, funding authorizations, utility relocation schedules, etc. the Project may begin advertisement to bid as early as winter 2023 for a construction start in spring 2024.

**I-10-5:** The Project design has currently progressed through advanced planning studies and bridge type selection, however, final detailed design will not begin until after environmental clearances have been completed.

**I-10-6:** Project permit applications will not be submitted until after environmental clearances have been completed and the ROW process is underway.

**I-10-7:** The Project has considered multiple construction staging areas to include the area behind the Gold Trail Grange and possibly locations neighboring the Coloma Resort.

**I-10-8:** The Project will require a fire protection plan (that details mitigation efforts) and an emergency evacuation and response plan (that includes both worker and public safety protection and response measures) as part of the Contractor's submittals within the construction contract documents.

**I-10-9:** Refer to Response I-10-8 for details regarding the Contractor's emergency evacuation and response plan submittal.



## Comment Letter I-11, David Thomas, 2/25/2022

2/28/22, 8:08 AM

Edcgov.us Mail - Mt. Murphy Bridge EIR

LETTER I-11



Shanann Findley &lt;shanann.findley@edcgov.us&gt;

### Mt. Murphy Bridge EIR

1 message

'David Thomas' via TD-MtMurphybridge-m &lt;mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us&gt;

Fri, Feb 25, 2022 at 4:58 PM

Reply-To: David Thomas &lt;thomasdavid@mac.com&gt;

To: mtmurphybridge@edcgov.us

Please use this document to supersede an earlier draft that was unintentionally sent earlier today.

El Dorado County Department of Transportation  
Attention: Mt. Murphy Bridge EIR  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA

Please incorporate and fully consider the following comments with regards to the DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT for the MT. MURPHY ROAD BRIDGE (No.25C-004) OVER THE SOUTH FORK AMERICAN RIVER REPLACEMENT PROJECT (SCH # 2015012056)

While we look forward to one day having the existing bridge replaced it is evident from the Draft EIR that more consideration needs to be addressed on at least two important and vital elements of the project.

#### 1. Traffic/Pedestrian use, efficiency and safety:

One would assume there is criteria in the design and engineering of the project to construct a bridge that meets and/or exceeds the needs of its intended use. A primary element of the project must be to avoid conflicts of congestion of traffic approaching the bridge from both south (Highway 49) and north (Coloma Resort/Mt. Murphy Road) approaches and departures. It is also critical to the design and engineering to avoid conflicts between motor vehicles and pedestrians. The current design misses these basic criteria in several ways.

Traffic from Highway 49 is often backed up in attempting to make the turn onto Mt. Murphy Road. This is caused by the lack of a turn lane on eastbound Highway 49 and conflict with pedestrians crossing at the uncontrolled intersection of Mt. Murphy Road and Highway 49. Many times Park Officials have been seen directing traffic to avoid congestion at this intersection. As pedestrian use increases this congestion will undoubtedly follow suit.

I-11-1

Where in the Draft EIR has this been adequately considered?

As vehicles continue across the bridge, the current proposed design and engineering compound an already existing condition of congestion to the departure on the north side of the bridge structure at Coloma Resort. The design creates a significant issue between local traffic flow, Coloma Resort traffic, and pedestrians at this confluence of cars, trucks towing trailers, motor homes, and pedestrians. It is imperative to rethink and alter several of the proposed design elements to avoid these issues.

Coloma Resort has a significant impact on traffic flow on and off of the bridge. The entrance to Coloma Resort at the north end of the bridge commonly causes delays in traffic. It is simply because there is little room or accommodation for vehicles to exit Mt. Murphy Road as they wait to check in to the resort. It is not uncommon for several recreation vehicles to arrive simultaneously literally blocking the flow of traffic.

I-11-2

I suggest the Engineering Staff consider the following changes to the proposed design that will most easily prevent and avoid these conditions:

Modify the Conditions in the Special Use Permit for Coloma Resort to be required to accommodate ALL approaching resort traffic to clear Mt. Murphy Road of congestion while waiting to check in. This should emphatically be done on their property, not on a public road.

OR

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725785319890744463%7Cmsg-f%3A1725785319890...> 1/3

## Comment Letter I-11, David Thomas, 2/25/2022

2/28/22, 8:08 AM

Edogov.us Mail - Mt. Murphy Bridge EIR

Exercise the Counties Right to use the 25' Right of Way with Coloma Resort on Mt. Murphy to construct a turn lane into the Resort along with requesting or requiring Coloma Resort to relocate the entrance to the resort several hundred feet north of the departure end of the bridge. This turn lane could be long enough to accommodate several vehicles thus clearing congestion from the roadway.

I-11-2  
(cont.)

Either of these two modifications are effective in eliminating and preventing traffic congestion on Mt. Murphy Road.

Pedestrian/vehicle conflicts can be addressed at both ends of the proposed bridge in a simple and cost effective way.

By simply moving the pedestrian walkway in the proposed design from the upstream side of the bridge to the south side of the bridge offers many advantages and addresses these concerns.

I-11-3

From the State Parks pedestrian traffic consider the following. Where is most of the parking in the Park relative to the bridge. I would argue it is downstream. Where is the State Park property on the north side of the South Fork American River, downstream. By having the pedestrian walkway on the downstream side of the bridge it becomes unnecessary for pedestrians using the bridge to cross Mt. Murphy Road to fully enjoy and utilize the Park. It becomes a direct link to the Parks features with no conflict between pedestrians and traffic. I would also surmise as future use of the park increases and, with a new two lane bridge, the the park will develop a parking area on the north side of the river. Visitors parking there can easily cross over to the south side without having to cross Mt. Murphy Road.

For pedestrians from Coloma Resort a path or stairs could be integrated into the design by having the path cross under the bridge and approach the bridge from the downstream side. Simple, enjoyable, and very effective.

The Coloma Resort quests should be encouraged to access the bridge on this path to avoid crossing Mt. Murphy Road. Among ways to prevent Resort users from crossing Mt. Murphy Road would be to install a roadside barrier or a simple fence to discourage pedestrian crossing.

Another benefit to having the walkway on the downstream side of the bridge is that it allows visitors to the State Historic Park to look downstream to the monument of the actual gold discovery site. The view of the valley and river is enhanced without a campground and associated noise and fewer homes in the view shed. It is a much more reflective view which is in harmony with the history of the valley thus enhancing each persons Park experience.

### 2. Esthetics and Historical considerations:

In light of the historic significance of the Coloma Valley in California's history it is vital that the bridge design blends into the view shed of Coloma as much as possible. The design should not distract from the visitors or residents experience and blend in with the surrounding area as much as possible. Let's be very clear, the new replacement bridge will be three times as wide as the existing bridge. It will be massive and it will be a dominant visual element in this historic place for at least the next hundred years.

I-11-4

The notion that the bridge should reflect characteristics of past bridges is worthy of consideration only if it actually DOES create as sense of the past. A lot of thought has gone into the concrete portion of the new structure that does offer visual cues to the existing bridge in context and structure.

Where the design seems to depart from these esthetics is in attempt to incorporate the entry portals and the suspension elements into the design. In Section 4-42 is says

"The entry portal can provide a stand alone architectural feature or can be utilized in conjunction with other aesthetic treatments provided so overall architectural goals are achieved without over-decorating the bridge".

These elements appear visually out of context from past bridges as the eye has no sense of contextual reference. What the eye sees is a bridge. As illustrated in the design images they arguably look out of scale in size and dimension. The suspension elements are certainly not necessary structurally and look like they don't belong.

As an alternative I would like the county to assemble a local group of community members look into and discussing what options might better suit this project.

Among the options could be redesigning the elements, eliminated the elements, and creating an interesting railing with steel that is in harmony with the concrete work.

There could easily be a QR code to let visitors open up a link to the history of the bridge with photos, videos and even design and construction images.

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725785319890744463%7Cmsg-f%3A1725785319890...> 2/3

## Comment Letter I-11, David Thomas, 2/25/2022

2/28/22, 8:08 AM

Edgov.us Mail - Mt. Murphy Bridge EIR

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to these documents.

Sincerely,

David Thomas  
PO Box 24  
Coloma, CA

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=81aa7064fa&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1725785319890744463%7Cmsg-f%3A1725785319890...> 3/3

## **Response to I-11, David Thomas**

**I-09-1:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project design features.

**I-11-1:** Refer to Master Response #1 regarding road improvements.

**I-11-2:** Refer to Master Response #2 regarding Coloma Resort impacts.

**I-11-3:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project design features.

**I-11-4:** Refer to Master Response #3 regarding proposed Project aesthetics and design features.

## Chapter 3

# Changes and Errata to the Draft EIR

---

This chapter describes revisions that have been made to the Draft EIR. Underlining indicates where additions were made to the original text. ~~Strikeout~~ indicates where the original text was deleted.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 provides that a Final EIR must include, among other things, the Draft EIR or a revision of the draft. This chapter identifies the text changes that have been made to the Draft EIR. The changes are arranged by the chapter or section of the Draft EIR in which they are found and referenced by page number. For the reader's convenience, the changes are presented in the context of the paragraph in which they are found. Additions are shown as underlined text; deletions are shown as strikethroughs.

Based on the comments and responses, no changes to the text of the Draft EIR were identified, except minor clarification to the Transportation (Section 3.17) associated with analysis for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

### Revised Text

The following text is added to the "Environmental Setting" (Section 3.17.1.2, of the Transportation Section 3.17) after Table 3-29 "Traffic Operations Results – SR 49/ Mount Murphy Road:"

"Under the County's adopted vehicle miles travelled threshold of significance for transportation projects (County resolution 088-2021), a project to replace an existing transportation asset, such as a bridge, that does not add additional motor vehicle capacity is presumed to have less than a significant impact on VMT and therefore does not require an induced travel analysis. Here, additional analysis for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and/or induced travel analysis should not be needed as the Project involves replacement of an existing bridge facility to current safety and design standards, and would not increase vehicle capacity. Rather, vehicle capacity is limited by the existing road system in proximity to the bridge. Replacement of the existing one lane bridge would not change the amount of traffic on Mt. Murphy Road because it is not a new development or growth inducing project. The Project does not increase the capacity of Mt. Murphy Road and is not anticipated to increase operational related vehicle miles travels (VMT). The existing road system is described in Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 within Chapter 4 Alternatives. Further, a discussion of potential traffic impacts is included in Section 3.17 Transportation. For those reasons, use of the County adopted vehicle miles threshold of significance is appropriate for this Project, and under that threshold this Project is presumed to have less than a significant impact on VMT and therefore does not require an induced travel analysis."

### Revised Figures

Figure 3-15. Project Impact Map was based on the Natural Environment Study, approved by Caltrans in 2019, showed a larger temporary impact footprint in Gallagher Field. The County reduced the temporary footprint as shown on the revised Figure 3-15.



