

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

NORTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
1385 8<sup>th</sup> STREET, SUITE 130  
ARCATA, CA 95521  
VOICE (707) 826-8950  
FAX (707) 826-8960



**F9b**

**1-22-0711 (Caltrans)**

**November 18, 2022**

**CORRESPONDENCE**

11/11/2022

California Coastal Commissioners and Staff  
Coastal Commission Meeting on November 18, 2022  
Monterey County Board of Supervisors Chambers  
Salinas, CA 93901

RE: Jack Peters Creek Bridge Widening and Rail Project (Application No. 1-22-0711)

Dear Commissioners,

We are residents of Mendocino, CA and would like to provide comments regarding the Jack Peters Creek Bridge Widening and Rail Upgrade Project currently on your 11/18/2022 agenda. This project will have an impact on our coastal communities and the Surfwood Estates neighborhood in which we live. We have participated in two Caltrans public virtual meetings and have read the staff report for Application Number 1-22-0711. We are not opposed to this project; however, we have concerns that we want to share with you.

Full Nighttime Closures – Emergency Services:

According to Caltrans, full nighttime closures are currently planned for 30 days during the project from 10:00 p.m. up to 6:00 a.m. We are concerned that the closures will have a negative impact on local emergency service response times. Emergency vehicles respond from the local hospital in Fort Bragg, located north of the Jack Peters Creek Bridge, and from the Mendocino Fire Protection District, south of the bridge. In the past, Caltrans has commented that there will be a “maximum of 15 minutes of delay” to move equipment and materials out of the way for emergency services. **Concern: A 15-minute delay could mean the difference between life and death during a fire or medical issue.**

Full Nighttime Closures – No Detour:

Caltrans is not planning on detouring traffic during the full nighttime closures of the bridge. This impacts locals and visitors that need to travel along SR-1 and across the Jack Peters Creek Bridge to their destinations during the nighttime closures. Locals and visitors recreate in the communities all along the Mendocino coast, even after 10:00 p.m. Also, locals travel to and from work during nighttime hours, i.e., restaurant workers, doctors, and nurses on nighttime shifts. These locals and visitors may need to cross the bridge to get to their destination during the night. Caltrans has replied in the past that “Residents will need to plan around the full closures”. **Concern: With no detours available, locals and visitors will not be able to travel to their destination during the bridge closures and will be stranded.**

New Pedestrian Bridge Leads to Unsafe Pedestrian Access:

This project includes a new pedestrian bridge over Jack Peters Creek. We are proponents of a new pedestrian bridge if some changes could be made for safer pedestrian routes to downtown Mendocino and the California Coastal Trail (CCT). Currently, the new pedestrian bridge will lead to unsafe routes for pedestrians, with special concern on the southern end of the bridge. Stepping off the southern end of the pedestrian bridge immediately connects to two roadways which lead to downtown Mendocino: *Lansing Street and SR-1*. Both of these options are dangerous for pedestrians.

*Lansing Street* is a narrow two-lane road which runs along the cliffs above the Pacific Ocean. The road is extremely unsafe for pedestrians because much of the road has little or **no** shoulder, causing pedestrians to walk in the roadway around blind curves. It was noted in the staff report that the pedestrian bridge will form part of the CCT; however, the bridge will **not** connect to the current CCT. On the southern end of the bridge, there will be a gap in the trail from the bridge to the CCT that picks up again on Heeser Drive, causing pedestrians to attempt the walk along Lansing Street to get to the trail. It was also noted in the staff report that a connecting trail could possibly be constructed in the future, but we do not know if this will actually occur, or if so, when that would happen. In the meantime, Lansing Street is a dangerous option for pedestrians to try to walk to the CCT or to downtown Mendocino.

*SR-1* is also a dangerous option for pedestrians to walk to downtown Mendocino from the new pedestrian bridge. This project extends south of the bridge to Larkin Road. But as you travel beyond Larkin Road toward the traffic light in downtown Mendocino, the shoulder narrows to approximately 2 feet in one section on the west side of the highway. Couldn't Caltrans widen the shoulder width all the way to the traffic light? Otherwise, pedestrians will be put at risk if they attempt to walk from the new bridge to downtown Mendocino.

**Concern: People may falsely believe that this new pedestrian bridge leads to a safe pedestrian route to downtown Mendocino or to the California Coastal Trail. The attempt to walk down Lansing Street or SR-1 may result in someone getting hurt or killed by vehicular traffic.**

In conclusion, we respectfully ask that the concerns listed above be addressed so the public will be ensured of safety during and after the construction of the Jack Peters Creek Bridge.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

*Carrice and Peter Marcovich*  
44800 Rosewood Terrace  
Mendocino, CA 95460

**From:** [Boyle, Walter](#)  
**To:** [Brownsey, Donne@Coastal](#); [Hart, Caryl@Coastal](#); [Turnbull-Sanders, Effie@Coastal](#); [Aminzadeh, Sara@Coastal](#); [Escalante, Linda@Coastal](#); [Wilson, Mike@Coastal](#); [Rice, Katie@Coastal](#); [Padilla, Stephen@Coastal](#); [Harmon, Meagan@Coastal](#); [Uranga, Roberto@Coastal](#); [Groom, Carole@Coastal](#); [Mann, Zahirah@Coastal](#); [Faustinos, Belinda@Coastal](#); [Rivas, Rick@Coastal](#); [Gedik, Tamara@Coastal](#); [Kraemer, Melissa@Coastal](#); [Ainsworth, John@Coastal](#); [Allen, Peter@Coastal](#); [Gray, Shana@Coastal](#)  
**Cc:** [boylegm@outlook.com](#); [rascalron@att.net](#)  
**Subject:** CDP 1-22-0711 Jack Peters Creek Bridge/Agenda item F9b  
**Date:** Friday, November 11, 2022 3:57:42 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

We are writing with comments and concerns related to CDP Application 1-22-0711 by The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to widen the bridge structure and upgrade the bridge railing of Jack Peters Creek bridge (Bridge No. 10-0150) located on SR 1 from PM 51.3 to PM 52.1 in Mendocino County. This application is to be considered on November 18, 2022 as agenda item F9b.

[Commission Staff: Please note the distribution list for this email letter was sent to all the commissioners with emails listed on the Coastal Commission website, as well as to Commission Staff (Executive Director, Senior Analyst, and North Coast Management Team) as instructed in the Public Hearing Notice Dated October 28, 2022. We would appreciate distribution to those Commissioners and alternates without listed email addresses.]

First, we would like to introduce ourselves. We (Gail and Walter Boyle) own the property directly adjacent to the proposed project site. Our new retirement home – built under Coastal Development Permit CDPM\_2018-0003 - was first occupied in December 2021. Our residence is located just a few hundred feet to the east and directly overlooking the Jack Peters Creek Bridge that is the subject of the proposed application. Our residence can be readily seen in Figure 7 on Page 49 of the Coastal Commission Staff Report.

We purchased this property and built this residence to take advantage of the beautiful coastal views, including the Bridge, and the abundant wildlife in Jack Peters Gulch. This provides a substantial amount of the value of this site, and was the reason we persevered thru the arduous, time consuming, and expensive process to obtain the required Coastal Development Permit and Mendocino County building permit. We thus have a unique and enduring interest in this project and its impacts on the peaceful use of our new home both during the construction period, and over the long term related to permanent changes to the landscape and environment directly adjacent to our property. We share concerns that have also been previously expressed by our neighbors and Mendocino residents related to the impacts of construction on access to emergency services, other disruptions during proposed full nighttime bridge closures, safety concerns related to speeding and the narrow roadways exiting the bridge to the south, and disruptions to local businesses in the town of Mendocino during the long construction period.

As we indicated in the letter to the Mendocino Board of Supervisors when we first learned of this project in June of 2020, we were aware of the existing narrow shoulders on the bridge, and we were supportive of efforts to improve safety and access that serve the public interest. We

are thus generally supportive of the proposed bridge widening and rail upgrade to address those issues.

We previously traveled to San Diego to appear before the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in March 2022 to testify about concerns related to this project, and they delayed the project approval to allow Caltrans an opportunity to subsequently meet with us and the community at 2 virtual open house meetings to address those concerns. However, based on the Coastal Commission staff report dated 10/28/2022 some important issues remain that do not appear to be adequately addressed. We ask the Commission to ensure that Caltrans modifies their proposal to address these concerns.

1. **Use of driven piles:** The use of pile driving was the primary reason we went to testify at the CTC meeting in March. We have a new home built on the steep hillside adjacent to Jack Peters Creek and the Jack Peters Creek bridge is in close proximity to this proposed project. Our house project required approval by the Coastal Commission in 2018, and that required an extensive and expensive geotechnical report which indicated, among other things, that the hillside was potentially unstable with prior landslides. We also pointed out at the CTC meeting that there was a recent large landslide on the hillside to the east of our residence. As we testified at the CTC meeting in March, we were most concerned that pile driving would provide seismic activity that could damage our new residence and further destabilize the hillside. Indeed, for our coastal development and Mendocino county permits, we were required to follow the geotechnical recommendations that required 33 drilled piers deep into bedrock in order to provide stability to our residence, as well as install an expensive bioswale system to prevent water erosion. As a result of our testimony, the Caltrans proposal was delayed by the CTC, and Caltrans agreed to meet with us, which they subsequently did at our home. We were provided with a geotechnical report by Caltrans which also indicated that pile driving was not appropriate for this site and that drilled piles – similar to those used for our home – should be used. We were subsequently assured by Caltrans that pile driving would not be used in either the expanded bridge supports or to stabilize the temporary trestle that would be used during construction. The use of drilled piles – similar to those used in the construction of our home - was suggested in the geotechnical report provided by Caltrans, and these were agreed to as the acceptable alternative. However, despite these assurances, the use of driven piles appears to remain in the description of the project and pile driving is discussed extensively in the staff report on page 18 (Item #7). **WE REQUEST THAT THE USE OF DRIVEN PILES BE PROHIBITED IN THIS PROJECT AND REMOVED FROM THE DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES - AS PREVIOUSLY AGREED TO BY CALTRANS - AND THAT THIS RESTRICTION BE STIPULATED IN WRITING TO THE CONTRACTORS INVOLVED IN THIS PROJECT.**
2. **Disturbance of our health and well-being during construction:** We certainly recognize that construction comes with some noise and disturbance. However, it is generally limited to daytime hours such that neighbors in close proximity to construction can have some peaceful quiet time in the evenings, and get restful sleep overnight. However, given the very close proximity of our residence to this project with our living space and bedroom directly facing the Bridge (plainly seen in Figure 7, p. 48 of the staff report), the proposal for nighttime work on up to 30 nights will likely prevent us from getting restful sleep during those nights, even with proposed downcast lights and best practices to minimize noise. We have noted extensive discussion in the proposal and staff report of the potential impacts of noise and lights on every species of animal in the vicinity of the project, with biologists to monitor these impacts, and mitigation strategies to minimize them. However, there is no mention of the impact on the human species directly adjacent to the project (particularly us, as well as our near neighbors) who will be

significantly impacted by noise and light during nighttime work. Unlike the sea lions and birds, our species (homo sapiens) cannot readily change our living areas without significant disruption. Again, we are supportive of this project from a public good standpoint, but we would like to hear some discussion of what accommodations are going to be made for the human species during construction, and have some monitoring of that as well. **WE REQUEST THAT IT BE STIPULATED THAT CALTRANS WILL NOT ALLOW ANY CONSTRUCTION TO OCCUR AT NIGHT OTHER THAN THE MAXIMUM OF 30 NIGHTS WHERE FULL ROAD CLOSURES ARE REQUIRED, AND THAT CALTRANS PROJECT MANAGERS WILL MONITOR THE IMPACT ON THE HUMAN SPECIES IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE PROJECT, AND IF SIGNIFICANT DISRUPTION OF HUMAN WELLBEING IS DETECTED OR REPORTED, THAT ACCOMMODATIONS BE MADE DURING NIGHTTIME WORK TO MITIGATE ANY SUCH DISRUPTION.**

3. **Vegetation Removal:** There is much discussion in the staff report and the Caltrans mitigated negative declaration of vegetation that will be removed and replanted, with reshaping of the north slope of the Jack Peters Creek to accommodate the required construction of the expanded bridge abutments and piers, and the temporary construction trestle. Notably, this area is directly adjacent to our property with significant infestation of invasive Black Acacia species on that slope which should be removed. There are also a number of previously felled and decaying trees in the Caltrans right-of-way where construction and road widening will occur that pose a fire hazard which need to be addressed. Finally, there are several trees on our side of that right-of-way (i.e., on our property), that are part of the natural beauty of our environment, and we wish to ensure they are preserved as much as possible. **We request that Caltrans be required to survey the areas directly adjacent to our property with us where the vegetation removal and reshaping are proposed to ensure invasive species are marked for removal in the landscaping plan, and that trees on our property are preserved as much as feasible.**
4. **Power lines:** According to the staff report (page 50), Caltrans offered PG&E a conduit to move their power lines under the bridge but PG&E indicated that moving their lines underground was cost prohibitive. Given the highly scenic area over the bridge, we would like to have this revisited, and believe PG&E should be compelled to underground their power lines crossing the bridge, as suggested by the Mendocino Land Use Plan (staff report page 46). **As it is technically feasible and a major objective of PG&E to underground their lines, we request that the Coastal Commission support Caltrans efforts to compel PG&E to take advantage of the opportunity to underground the power lines crossing over the Jack Peters Creek Bridge.**
5. **Public Safety:** While there is a well-reasoned rationale presented for upgrading the bridge structure particularly related to increased safe access for bicycle and pedestrian traffic crossing the bridge. There is also extensive discussion in the staff report about public safety risks related to increased vehicular speeding crossing the newly widened bridge structure and the previously coined 'bridge to no-where' descriptor conveying the risk to public safety posed by the perception of safety for pedestrians and bicyclists using the widened shoulders and pedestrian walkway exiting the bridge to the south. While we

appreciate the importance of balancing risk and cost, we continue to believe this project needs to be aligned with a widening of the shoulders on SR-1 to the south or incorporation of a pathway along Lansing street to join with the coastal trail on the Mendocino headlands. At present the shoulder on SR-1 leading to Mendocino via Little Lake Road to the south is very narrow and dangerous and there is virtually no shoulder on Lansing street. We believe there is thus a real danger posed by the new bike lanes and pedestrian walkway over the bridge, particularly for visitors who are not familiar with these hazards. **We request that the Coastal Commission compel Caltrans to widen the narrow shoulder on SR-1 to the south of the new bridge to Little Lake road to ensure safe passage for pedestrians and bicyclists into the town of Mendocino.**

We appreciate the hard work that Caltrans invests in maintaining the California roads and highways and the important work of the Coastal Commission to preserve the integrity and beauty of the California coast. Our requests above are a reflection of what we believe to be important remaining issues that need to be addressed and we sincerely hope they are taken in the positive spirit they are intended.

Sincerely,

Walter and Gail Boyle

44791 Baywood Drive  
Mendocino, California 95640  
(314) 324-3425

---

The materials in this message are private and may contain Protected Healthcare Information or other information of a sensitive nature. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that any unauthorized use, disclosure, copying or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender via telephone or return mail.

Public Comments about Jack Peters Creek Bridge (JPCB) Rehabilitation Project CDP 1-22-0711

To the Coastal Commission,

**History:** While the project limits are under the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and County of Mendocino, the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors (BOS) adopted a consolidated Coastal Development Permit (CDP) on 6-22-2021. This agenda item was adopted as a Consent Calendar item and even though locals (myself included) asked ahead of time that the item would be pulled from the consent calendar in order to discuss it, it was not granted. This item was not a routine and non-controversial item and warranted a discussion. Please see my comments, and also comments from the closest neighbors Gail and Walter Boyle, and their architect Ron Crawford.

[https://mendocino.granicusideas.com/meetings/312-board-of-supervisors-on-2021-06-22-9-00-am-amended-agenda/agenda\\_items/60cbb312f395e7d3780004eb-4-consent-calendar](https://mendocino.granicusideas.com/meetings/312-board-of-supervisors-on-2021-06-22-9-00-am-amended-agenda/agenda_items/60cbb312f395e7d3780004eb-4-consent-calendar)

In addition Walter Boyle submitted these comments: "I would like to formally request that you withhold consent of the consolidated coastal development permit involving the widening and upgrade of the Jack Peters Creek Bridge-CDP\_2021-0019. I find it very difficult to understand the need for this consolidated approach, which is particularly problematic in this COVID era which has limited public access to information and comment."

The California Transportation Commission held their meeting on 3-17-2022 after receiving the MND for the JPCB. They wanted to allocate \$19,830,000 to widen the bridge and replace the rail. Gail and Walter Boyle (who flew to San Diego to comment), Carrice Markovich and I spoke via zoom. They voted over Caltrans' resistance - deferred action, as per the request of adjacent property owners and others and scheduled for further hearing and possible action on the CEQA document at the 4-13-2022 meeting. Caltrans District 1 Deputy Director Mullen acknowledged that Caltrans had failed to provide both the required public notice of the MND and thereby the CEQA-required public comment period on the CEQA document and indicated that Caltrans would be holding a local public zoom meeting to receive comments.

The Albion Bridge Stewards which I am a member of, sent a letter to Caltrans District 1 Deputy Director Mullen with a copy to other staff and Melissa Kraemer at the Coastal Commission on 3-21-2022 asked for enhancement of public noticing, provide substantive opportunities for public participation, and give an opportunity to comment on the recirculated Draft MND.

Caltrans held a zoom meeting on 4-7-2022 giving one week notice. 48 people attended. Even though people asked that the MND would be reopened, and that Caltrans would agree to make any changes based on public comments nothing happened other than an offer of a future meeting that took place on 10-6-2022. The zoom meetings about this project are posted on the Caltrans web page.

<https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-1/d1-projects/jackpetersbridgewidening>

The California Transportation Commission received a four page letter on 4-11-2022 by Carrice and Peter Marcovich and a two page letter by Walter Boyle. Carrice and Peter Marcovich and Walter Boyle and the Coastal Commission addressed also the need for safe pedestrian improvements next to the JPCB.

<https://catc.ca.gov/-/media/ctc-media/documents/ctc-meetings/2022/2022-04/tab-3-lett-a11y.pdf>

<https://catc.ca.gov/-/media/ctc-media/documents/ctc-meetings/2022/2022-04/tab-3-pres.pdf>



These letters were very similar like the letter that the Coastal Commission sent on 1-14-2022 in response to the IS/MND. See electronic pages 237-243 of IS/MND. <https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-1/d1-projects/jackpetersbridgewidening>  
<https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/district-3/documents/environmental/01-43484-jack-peters-is-fed-2022-0218.pdf>

Caltrans's answers were very vague and evasive and basically stated that these issues would be addressed in the CDP application. See electronic pages 245-248.

**Public participation:** 48 people total were present during the first Caltrans zoom meeting, and 39 at the second one. Many of those were staff members. For the first meeting the public was asked to send questions ahead of time. Unfortunately many were duplicates so that there was basically no time left for answers to questions from people that were not sent in ahead of time. Unfortunately only 20 people got a formal notice of this project. Caltrans did indicate that they posted the meetings on twitter and facebook. Many people in this community, especially the older people who are concerned about this project do not subscribe to these social media sites. Many have no internet. Why were the community and property owners not involved during project design, as the federal project development manual requires?

The PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE – DIVISION 20 of the CALIFORNIA COASTAL ACT was designed to protect the “widest opportunity for public participation.” According to Section 65033 of the State Planning, Zoning, and Development Law (Government Code) the Legislature recognizes the importance of public participation at every level of the planning process. It is therefore the policy of the state and the intent of the Legislature that each state, regional, and local agency concerned in the planning process involve the public through public hearings, informative meetings, publicity and other means available to them, and that at such hearings and other public forums, the public be afforded the opportunity to respond to clearly defined alternative objectives, policies, and actions.

The CEQA Guidelines, at Title 14, California Code of Regulations Section 15201 about PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, or any of the CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21000 and after) contain many specific provisions about required notice of environmental documents, and opportunities for public comments on them relating to the a project proposal. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities.

**Project information:** It would seem that the public needs to be given a better chance to weigh in considering that the 1 way traffic lasting 305 days (2 seasons) and complete closure of Jack Peters Creek Bridge (JPCB) during 30 nights, other than for emergency personnel, will have a huge impact on our community as there are no feasible detours available.

On page 6 of 83 (electronic page) of the staff report Special Condition 1 A Construction Areas lists that: “no less than 30 days prior to commence of construction the Final Construction Plans shall give special attention to siting and designing construction areas when feasible to minimize impacts to public parking and public views. Staging areas shall limit, to the greatest extent feasible, transportation of materials into and out of Mendocino town limits. Construction is prohibited outside of the defined construction, staging, and storage areas.”

The IS/MND lists that: “Construction staging would take place on the east side of the widened roadway from approximately 650 feet north of County Road 500D south to the bridge, and at the northwest

corner of the intersection of SR 1 and Lansing Street. In addition, there are two potential staging areas within the unincorporated community of Mendocino, approximately 0.32 mile south of the project, with a three acre parcel off of Lansing Street and a two acre parcel off of Palette Drive (and adjacent to SR 1).” Approximately 17,500 CY of excavated material would be stockpiled on the USPS parcel (under a Temporary Construction Easement) adjoining Lansing Street approximately 2900-feet south of the intersection of SR-1 and Lansing Street, used as import borrow on the Salmon Creek Lead Abatement project, or temporarily stockpiled at an authorized disposal site. The contractor would be responsible for securing and environmentally clearing additional staging areas for equipment and material storage outside the project limits.

The map on page 300 of the Exhibits seems to show an additional possible staging or storage area (USPS property, Mendocino City Community Services District property, and Kimberly Peters property for import borrow for Salmon Creek Sandblast Waste project. As these areas were not clearly defined the people who live next to them were not given a chance to weigh in on the project. They should have been notified. Several people wanted to know how many people and within what area were notified about this project, but we have not received an answer yet. Decision on this project had been postponed by one month. Based on the road plan, the additional .6 miles stretch (3,168 ft.) of Highway 1 work area triggers noticing of the properties/owners adjacent to the Caltrans ROW boundaries in these stretches, as well as the ones to the north of PM 51.3 and to the south of PM 52.4, and not only people who live within 100 ft. of the area between 51.3 to 52.1.

How many and what pieces of equipment would be stored in these storage areas? Additional permits would have to be procured. Why is this information not available?

I understand that deficient rails with concrete spalls and exposed and corroded rebar, lack of adequate room for disabled vehicles or collision-avoidance maneuvers, as well as bicycle traffic and pedestrians cannot adequately be served without a widening and rail upgrade project. Does this mean that JPCB has to be widened by 17 ft.? Does it mean that the new rails and the proposed Midwestern guardrails need to destroy the view of the ocean in a tourist area on Highway 1 that qualifies to be a scenic Highway? Isn't 3ft. 6 in. excessive, especially considering that it would only protect pedestrians? To have 12 ft. total for pedestrians and bicyclists on the west side and 6 foot for bicyclists on the east side is not necessary. 4 ft. shoulders would suffice and a 4ft. area for bicyclists. Bicyclists could share the area designed for pedestrians. Many bicyclists prefer that as they are safer (protected by a guardrail). People in cars will not be able to see the ocean anymore. This serious aesthetic/visual effect was not addressed in the MND.

**Aesthetics/Visual Resources:** The project would have an effect on visual resources do to the out of character wide bridge, bulky tall guardrails, alignment shift, vegetation, and tree removal. The utility lines that were less visible before would now become dominant, leading to negative visual changes for many years to come. Trees in this salty and windy environment do not grow very well. The utility lines should be placed underground especially as all utility lines in Mendocino are underground. This was addressed in the letter from the Coastal Commission on page 240: “Consider project conformity with the LCP’s visual resource protection standards, which are more restrictive than the Coastal Act policies and require that new development in designated highly scenic areas (such as the western portion of the project site) be subordinate to the character of its setting. In particular, development shall be subordinate to the natural setting, minimize reflective surfaces, distractive lighting, and glare, and site power transmission lines underground (where technically feasible).”

AR-1 lists: "Aesthetic treatment to the bridges/guardrails/retaining walls would be included, such as tribal patterns, to address context sensitivity." Where can more information be found about retaining wall(s)? JPCB with the Midwest Guardrail System (MGS) will obstruct the view currently available of the ocean. Placing tribal pattern is not making it look less bulky. Instead of seeing the ocean people would see the MGS. Caltrans staff often like to use ornamental ideas to supposedly address context sensitivity. By choosing blue for the railing we are competing with the blue sky and the blue ocean (not subordinate). Choosing green as was chosen for the Noyo Bridge would be more appropriate.

The Mendocino County Supervisors during a meeting about another project on Highway 1 addressed the issue of guardrails and mentioned that Caltrans should look for a different guardrail with the Coastal Commission. The Coastal Commission in their letter from 1-14-2022 lists that Caltrans wants to use the Type 85 concrete barriers. That is not aesthetically pleasing. They also suggested using an alternative railing.

Special Condition on page 6 of 83 (electronic page) staff report B. Visual Elements lists that "the development shall be designed to be subordinate to the natural setting through measures such as (but not limited to) visually permeable design, minimizing reflective surfaces, and use of colors that blend in hue and brightness with the surroundings."

In the Caltrans brochure "Bridge Rails and Barriers A Reference Guide for Transportation Projects in the Coastal Zone" it is listed that: "Views both of and from the shoreline and scenic areas should be protected." "Whether a project is in an urban, rural, or natural setting, it must be in harmony with both community goals and the local environment and minimize coastal resource impacts."

Extending the two bridge abutments and two piers also affects aesthetics, along with the vegetation removal.

Community members asked Caltrans during both zoom meetings to choose the railing that was chosen at Noyo Bridge and the 10 Mile Bridge and not the decorative railing chosen for JPCB. Caltrans ignored the wishes of the community members. Locals had to fight for 12 years with Caltrans and the Coastal Commission to get the railing that was approved in other parts of the United States for Noyo Bridge. It was then also used for the 10 Mile Bridge. In addition Caltrans had to purchase Pomo Bluffs Park (Todd Point, Chicken Point) and donate it to the community to mitigate destroying the view from the new Noyo Bridge.

What is being offered as a mitigation for this project? Where is the compensatory mitigation report?

Instead of adding 17 ft. to JPCB, removing an enormous amount of dirt, and cutting an enormous amount of trees and bushes that provide habitat for threatened and endangered animals, it would be better to widen the bridge minimally. Widening requires more vegetation removal and excavation of slopes. Providing on-site restoration and off-site preservation does not address the damage caused on site like removing 150 mature trees next to the roadway.

The lights used during night time work also affects people, not only animals.

### **Biological Resources:**

**Animal Species:** 23 BR-2 lists information about day roosting bats, but not about night roosting bats. This information is important and is lacking as the bridge will be worked on during the night as well.

#### **“BR-4: Plant Species, Sensitive Natural Communities, and ESHA**

A Revegetation Plan would be prepared which would include a plant palette, establishment period, watering regimen, monitoring requirements, and pest control measures. The Revegetation Plan would also address measures for wetland and riparian areas temporarily impacted by the project.”

The plan needs to include a 1 year, 3 year, 5 year, and 10 year vegetation goal with photo simulations so that the community is insured that revegetation will occur according to the plan and not deferred indefinitely as is the case at the Albion River Bridge.

**Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA):** The Local Coastal Plan (LCP) requires a 100-foot buffer around ESHA's, including ESHA's comprising Sensitive Natural Communities (SNC's), unless it can be determined there is no adverse impact on the ESHA. There are two SNC's observed within the the Biological Study Area (Grand fir forest and bishop pine forest). Grand fir forest ESHA's contains habitat for sensitive species, including California Fully Protected (FP) white-tailed kite, and California Species of Special Concern, such as purple martin and Sonoma tree vole. A 100-foot buffer is not feasible around this ESHA because JPCB is within 5 ft. from the Environmental Study Limits on the north and south bank and there are areas that will suffer permanent impacts to the ESHA's.

Bishop pine forest ESHA's contain nesting habitat for sensitive species, including California Species of Special Concern such as purple martin and Sonoma tree vole.

I am concerned about the effect this project has on the ESHA's. Instead of 100 ft. buffer we have a 5 ft. buffer in one area.

Figure 2. Environmental Study Limits (ESL) and 100-foot Coastal Zone BSA Buffer on page 46 of 366 (electronic page) shows one of the Staging and Stockpiling Areas. I do not believe that all the residents living within that area or within any other Staging and Stockpiling Areas have been notified. Therefore this needs to be addressed before any action can take place.

What other temporary construction easements would be required for any other off-site construction staging areas other than the one by Lansing Street? Apparently on October 10, 2021 a biologist, and a revegetation specialist did an upland forest revegetation area assessment and reconnaissance survey of newly additional areas. Where can this information be found?

**Mitigation:** Compensatory mitigation is required for permanent impacts to ESHA's as a result of project activities. Permanent impacts total approximately 0.009 acre. The total amount of impacted aquatic resources include 0.063 acre of 3-parameter wetlands, 0.004 acre of Other Waters of the U.S. and State, and 0.072 acre of coastal riparian habitat. Some of these impacts could be restored or recreated on-site but would require additional off-site restoration at a 1:1 ratio through the purchase of a permittee-responsible mitigation site, and transference of that site to the Mendocino Land Trust (MLT). This site, Saunder's Landing, is located several miles north of Point Arena (Mendocino County).

The proposed project would result in 0.005 acre of permanent impacts to riparian habitat, and impacts to two Sensitive Natural Communities (SNC), which are Bishop Pine Forest 0.078 acres, and Grand Fir Forest 0.088 acres.

The Off-Site Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) is for the purpose of offsetting coastal wetland impacts associated with the Cleone Shoulder Widening Project (01-0G600), Jack Peters Creek Bridge Widening (01-43484), and Elk Creek Bridge Replacement (01-0E110) projects.

Off-site Mitigation for Waters of the U.S./State – Preservation at Saunder’s Landing: Preservation of approximately 0.600-acre of State and federal jurisdictional wetlands and non-wetland waters at Saunder’s Landing would occur as a result of acquisition of the parcels for MLT.

The article in the local newspaper, the Mendocino Beacon, from 4-14-2022 mentioned that the project may include removing invasive species. This would be a good mitigation, but unless required it will not happen.

**Hazardous Waste and Material:** “HW-1: Per Caltrans requirements, the contractor(s) would prepare a project-specific Lead Compliance Plan (CCR Title 8, § 1532.1, the “Lead in Construction” standard) to reduce worker exposure to lead-impacted soil. The plan would include protocols for environmental and personnel monitoring, requirements for personal protective equipment, and other health and safety protocols and procedures for the handling of lead-impacted soil. HW-2: When identified as containing hazardous levels of lead, traffic stripes would be removed and disposed of in accordance with Caltrans Standard Special Provision “Residue Containing Lead from Paint and Thermoplastic.”

Soil from this project is intended to be used at the lead remediation site currently reviewed by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) at Salmon Creek Bridge in Albion. The attempt to use lead-impacted soil to remediate an area that is lead impacted seems ridiculous and needs to be nixed.

In the staff report on page 11, # 6 is listed: “that the use of chemical pesticides shall be avoided, unless approved by the Executive Director as necessary and with appropriate minimization and mitigation measures.” This should not be tolerated.

The staff report on page 20 Special Condition 11 lists the need for a debris disposal plan. “2) A site plan showing all proposed locations for the temporary stockpiling of construction debris, soils and vegetative spoils, excess materials, and any other debris and waste associated with the authorized work at least 100 feet from wetland and riparian areas.” The public has a right to know before the project gets approved where the proposed locations for the temporary stockpiling will be.

“In addition the plan shall include, at a minimum, the following:

- 1) A description of the anticipated excess fill, vegetated spoils, debris, and waste material expected, which shall identify any hazardous materials.
- 2) A site plan showing all proposed locations for the temporary stockpiling of construction debris, soils and vegetative spoils, excess materials, and any other debris and waste associated with the authorized work at least 100 feet from wetland and riparian areas.” It seems that the public has a right to know this before the project gets approved.
- 3) A description of the manner by which the stockpiled materials will be removed from the construction site and identification of all debris disposal sites that will be used.
- 4) A schedule for removal of stockpiled materials from the construction site and temporary stockpile sites and identification of all authorized debris disposal sites that will be used for lawful disposal.”

How much grading and how much fill is needed for this project? How much soil will be transported? How many trucks are needed?

The public has a right to know before the project gets approved how much construction spoils and debris would be disposed, how many trucks would be filled, and where these materials get disposed?

**Noise:** With less vegetation and trees, noise will be more noticeable. Construction noise and traffic noise would definitely impact the owners of the property that is visible from the bridge (north-east of JPCB) and their neighbors. The night work would be even more noticeable as our area is very quiet at night. Using striping and raised round markers would contribute to increased noise. By notching the trestle into the hillside additional noise can be prevented. Pile driving would not be acceptable. Impact hammer activity will be happening up to eight days in total. Jack hammering would affect the listed fish species.

**“Traffic and Transportation** TT-1: Pedestrian and bicycle access would be maintained during construction. TT-2: The contractor would be required to schedule and conduct work to avoid unnecessary inconvenience to the public and to maintain access to driveways, houses, and buildings within the work zones. TT-3: A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) would be applied to the project.”

Traffic counts used for Traffic Mitigation are unclear and out-of-date. Caltrans is basing their plans for traffic mitigation on studies that were done in 2018. They have said that traffic counters that are utilized for this project are from a continuous count station at “PM 42.95”. It is my understanding that this location is at the junction of SR-1 and 128, approximately 11 miles from the Jack Peters Creek Bridge. This location is used to travel to/from the Mendocino coast and does not collect data for the local and visitor traffic in the immediate area of the Jack Peters Creek Bridge.

Many locals due to a shortage of rentals are commuting long distances. A radiologist at the local hospital is commuting from Manchester to Fort Bragg daily (34 miles one way). Many tourists are sleeping in hotels, motels, and Airbnb’s often far away from restaurants, cinemas, concerts, and/or recreation opportunities and would need to use the JPCB. We survive from the tourist economy.

There is no mention that Caltrans would be willing to support announcing an alternative route for people who need to get from south to north or north to south after 10pm on the 30 nights that the JPCB will be completely closed for traffic other than emergency vehicles with at least a 15 to 20 minute delay. A 15 to 20 minute delay could mean the difference between life and death. Anyone who lives or works anywhere between Point Arena and Mendocino has to drive over JPCB in order to get to the local hospital. This is true for people living west of Comptche as well. This is especially crucial if anyone would have a stroke. We are at a disadvantage already as we do not have a cardiologist in Fort Bragg.

Even with one way traffic the delay would be between 15 and 25 minutes.

Hwy 1 is an essential lifeline for residents of the Mendocino coast, is the main street for many communities, and is a popular choice for tourists using both motorized and non-motorized travel methods. It is also part of the Pacific Coast Bike Route (PCBR), which is internationally known and traveled. In addition, the California Coastal Trail follows sections of Hwy 1, including along Jack Peters Creek Bridge. Why is Caltrans not offering to connect the trail on the north and south side of JPCB like many requested? This would be a good mitigation. Why wait for an accident? We know that with wider roads cars drive faster. As there will be no shoulder at the end of JPCB along Lansing Street people would be in danger.

Caltrans made it clear during the two community zoom meetings that they refuse to look at a possibility for a detour route. Here are my reasons to propose a detour: Many people in this community are elderly and live on a limited income; the hospital in Fort Bragg serves communities as far south as Manchester, Elk, Albion, Little River, Mendocino, and Comptche (to the east); Covid has affected many businesses; the Coast has almost no housing available and affordable so many people live or work either north or south of the JPCB and need to get to work and back home; this area almost completely relies on tourism, tourism would be greatly affected, and also many tourists could not get to their sleeping quarters after exploring the local attractions and frequenting the local restaurants. The only alternative route starts 1 mile south of JPCB (Little Lake Road in Mendocino) and goes east on a curvy road full of potholes for 5 miles, where it turns north and becomes a dirt road for 1 mile (408) and then turns west (Road 409) for 4 miles. Speed limit on these roads is no more than 40 miles per hour. It would take approximately 30 minutes during the day. At night, or during bad weather it would take more time. There are no signs currently clearly labeling Road 409, or Little Lake Road. People could easily get lost and end up at a private property, on Highway 20 via dirt roads, or via dirt roads at the Mendocino Woodlands Camp next to Big River. The intersection of Road 409 and Hwy 1 is located 2 miles north of JPCB. If this detour would be offered the road would have to be in good shape all the way.

Caltrans loves to widen as many bridges, roads, and downtown areas as possible. Plans are being worked on to remove Salmon Creek Bridge, and possibly Albion River Bridge, and replace them with a wider bridge. Pudding Creek Bridge, Hare Creek Bridge, and Little River Bridge will be widened. Gualala and Cleone got widened. Caltrans wants to widen the Highway 1 south of Salmon Creek Bridge and widen the road through Richardson Grove.

We are not told if any collisions have occurred on the bridge or how many vehicles have stalled on the bridge?

**Utilities and Emergency Services:** There is no mention to put power cords underground. This is something that Caltrans should tell PG&E to do considering that in the town of Mendocino all electrical cables are placed underground. It would approve the aesthetics tremendously.

**“Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff WQ-1:** The project would comply with the Provisions of the Caltrans Statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit (Order 2012-0011-DWQ) as amended by subsequent orders, which became effective July 1, 2013, for projects that result in a land disturbance of one acre or more, and the Construction General Permit (Order 2009-0009-DWQ). Construction may require one or more of the following temporary construction site BMPs: (only include those relevant to the project). Clearing, grubbing, and excavation would be limited to specific locations, as delineated on the plans, to maximize the preservation of existing vegetation.”

I believe that all examples listed in the IS/MND in regards to **Mandatory Findings of Significance** are being effected by this project.

#### **Cumulative effect:**

What the cumulative effect of all the Caltrans projects that are happening along the coast at the same time and also in the near future is concerned was not addressed in the IS/MND. Work will be taking place in Albion to widen and straighten Highway 1, and deal with drainage issues at Highway 1. Caltrans also wants to replace/remove Albion River Bridge; replace Salmon Creek Bridge; deal with the sandblast waste abatement at Salmon Creek; replace the Elk Creek Bridge; widen the [Gualala](#)

Downtown area; rehabilitate the Hare Creek Bridge; widen the Pudding Creek Bridge and upgrade the rails; and widen the Cleone Shoulder, etc. The IS/MND did not evaluate the cumulative effects of all these projects.

Caltrans was negligible by not informing the community about this project. Many neighbors who should have been notified were not. It took the closest property owner and his wife to fly to San Diego and get the attention of the California Transportation Commission and postpone the promise to spend \$19,830,000 and prompted Caltrans to offer 2 zoom sessions. For the first one they asked people to submit questions ahead of time and read them all (even if they were duplicates) so that people who did not send in their questions ahead of time basically had no chance to ask their questions.

The fact that the Coastal Commission did not get any written comments in preparation for this staff report is also related to the fact that only a few neighbors are aware of this project.

**Conclusion:** I am concerned that the new project manager is not familiar with our area.

Even though Caltrans' IS/MND did not list any significant effects on the environment I see many. People who followed the presentation of the California Transportation Commission were under the assumption that the MND would be recirculated. Most people affected by this project were not aware of the formal public comment period of the MND. Doing zoom meetings after the fact does not change the situation unless the MND gets recirculated. Also all the public comments did not change the MND.

As many people who live close by to the area were not notified the MND should be recirculated again and Caltrans should take all the comments into consideration and rewrite the MND.

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel

Albion, California

11-11-2022