

Chapter 4 Coordination and Public Participation

4.1 PUBLIC INTERACTION AND COMMENTS

In March 2002, letters were mailed to various members of the public and agencies, including local historical societies and historic preservation interest groups. The letter briefly described the project and historic Tower Bridge, and solicited comments and information. In February 2003, additional copies of the letter were sent to representatives of the following organizations and groups:

- California State Railroad Museum,
- Capitol City Preservation Trust,
- Sacramento Design Review and Preservation Board,
- Old Sacramento Management,
- California Office of Historic Preservation,
- Native American Heritage Commission,
- Sacramento History and Science Commission, and
- Sacramento Heritage.

Public outreach also included the following efforts:

- November 7, 2001 – presentation before the Sacramento Design Review and Preservation Board (DRPB) (informational);
- January 23, 2002 – meeting with State Historical Building Safety Board (SHBSB) director and Caltrans representative;
- January 29, 2002 – meeting with SHBSB director and Caltrans representative;
- March 2002 – informational letters sent to 174 identified individuals and organizations; an additional 11 letters were sent in February 2003;
- December 9, 2002 – public workshop in West Sacramento (over 35,000 invitees and over 100 attendees);
- December 10, 2002 – meeting with Sacramento City/County Bicycle Advisory Committee (SACBAC) (informational);
- December 13, 2002 – meeting with SHBSB executive secretary;
- December 18, 2002 – meeting with Sacramento DRPB (informational);
- February 6, 2003 – meeting with Sacramento City/County Commission of History and Science;

- February 13, 2003 – meeting with group of Sacramento midtown architects;
- February 25, 2003 – meeting with Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA);
- March 3, 2003 – meeting with Sacramento Old City Association (SOCA);
- March 18, 2003 – contacted Sacramento Art Deco Society via e-mail – no response;
- May 21, 2003 – meeting with WalkSacramento;
- September 18, 2003 – meeting with Sacramento City Disabilities Advisory Commission; and
- September 29, 2003 – field review with Sacramento Southern Railroad.

Caltrans prepared and circulated a detailed Initial Study and NOP of an EA/EIR in January and February 2004. Comments received on the Initial Study and NOP are contained in Appendix A.

4.2 AGENCY COORDINATION

The following agencies were consulted regarding the proposed project:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
- U.S. Coast Guard,
- National Marine Fisheries Service,
- State Water Resources Control Board,
- Regional Water Quality Control Board,
- California Department of Fish and Game,
- State Lands Commission,
- California Department of Water Resources,
- City of Sacramento,
- City of West Sacramento,
- Sacramento County,
- Yolo County,
- Regional Transit,
- YoloBus,
- Native American Heritage Commission,
- California State Historic Preservation Officer, and
- City of Sacramento Design Review and Preservation Board.

4.3 PUBLIC AND AGENCY CONCERNS

As described above, Caltrans has solicited input from the public and agencies throughout the preliminary design of the project. Issues and concerns expressed by the public and agencies at one-on-one meetings, formal presentations, comments on the Initial Study, and other input in the process include the following.

4.3.1 Federal Agency Comments

- **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:** The range of alternatives considered in the environmental document should include alternatives that avoid impacts to wetlands or other waters of the United States; every effort should be made to avoid project features that require the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States.
- **U.S. Coast Guard:** Provided that the project will not appreciably change the appearance of the bridge, nor the existing vertical and horizontal navigational clearances, a Coast Guard permit is not required and the Coast Guard need not participate in the NEPA review process. The walkway is approved, subject to several Coast Guard conditions..
- **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:** Several federally listed endangered and threatened species are in the project area. Trained biologists familiar with the habitat requirements of species on the list should conduct surveys for the species, and the project must comply with the Endangered Species Act of 1973.
- **National Marine Fisheries Service:** Several federally listed species under the jurisdiction of NMFS are likely to be present in the project area. Potential impacts from bridge projects include removal of riparian vegetation, disturbance of stream channel and banks and encroachment into floodplains, degradation of water quality, and pile driving. The project should include avoidance and minimization measures to minimize impacts.

4.3.2 State Agency Comments

- **State Historic Preservation Officer:** Tower Bridge is listed in the NRHP. Based on the preliminary design drawings, it appears that the project would result in a finding of adverse effect to the historic structure. Caltrans is required to take all reasonable prudent and feasible measures to eliminate or mitigate the adverse effects of the project on the bridge.
- **State Historical Building Safety Board:** Tower Bridge qualifies as an historical structure under the definition given in the Health and Safety Code, Section 18955. The State Historic Building Code shall be used to preserve the original elements or features of the structure.
- **Department of Water Resources:** The Tower Bridge project encroaches into the Sacramento River Adopted Plan of Flood Control, which is within the jurisdiction and under the authority of the Reclamation Board. The California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Waters, Article 3, requires that a Board permit be obtained

before the start of any work, including excavation and construction activities, where the Reclamation Board has jurisdiction.

4.3.3 Local Agency Comments

- **City of Sacramento and City of West Sacramento:** The Tower Bridge is the transportation spine for the economic and recreational center of the Riverfront. Widening the Tower Bridge to provide safe access to either side of the river will encourage the use of the pedestrian loop and trail system and, thereby, will greatly influence the economic viability and overall success of the Riverfront. Preserve the historic integrity of the Tower Bridge and widen the sidewalks.
- **City of Sacramento Design Review and Preservation Board:** Minimize changes to the bridge; design the project to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

4.3.4 General Public Comments

- **Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates:** The bridge is not a good place to ride (potholes, no striped bike lane). Minimize conflicts between bikes and pedestrians. We are also concerned about the high cost of the project. There are alternatives to improve conditions for cyclists and pedestrians without widening the sidewalks.
- **City of Sacramento's Disabilities Advisory Board:** We are concerned about the narrow width of the sidewalk and the conflicts it creates between pedestrians and bicyclists. Individuals in wheelchairs have an exceptionally difficult time on the sidewalks when met by a bicycle.
- **WalkSacramento:** Reduce vehicle speeds; reduce the number of lanes over the bridge to two lanes or provide bicycle lanes on the pavement when the sidewalk is widened; require bicyclists to dismount and walk bikes over the bridge if they are using the sidewalk; more dedicated pedestrian width is necessary; restriping/narrowing of existing lanes would allow width for a bike lane and would aid in reducing speeds across bridge; consider directing traffic to use Pioneer Bridge instead of Tower Bridge; paint bicycle logos on the street to demonstrate to vehicles that bicyclists use the roadway as well; do not encourage the new pedestrian bridge as an alternative to increasing the dedicated pedestrian width on the Tower Bridge.
- **Sacramento Art Deco Society:** Was interested in any modifications and wants to be informed of all phases and/or any changes/improvements made to the Tower Bridge.
- **Sacramento Commission of History and Science:** The historic elements of the bridge should be preserved; it may be necessary to blend new concrete with the historic light-weight concrete to produce a safe and smooth surface; historic

components that have been removed (light standards on both approaches) should be restored. A plaque, kiosk, or other historic marker should be part of the final project design.

- **Native American Representative:** Cultural resources could be encountered during construction.
- **Lincoln Highway Association:** Widening the sidewalks cantilevered on the outside of the truss is the most appropriate of the solutions proposed at public hearings.

These comments were reviewed by the multidisciplinary PDT throughout the preliminary design process. Numerous design changes and modifications were made throughout preliminary design in response to these concerns.

