

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION: **RECORD OF MEETING**

MEETING TITLE: **PARTNERING MEETING: LAST CHANCE GRADE ENGINEERED FEASIBILITY STUDY**

MEETING DATE: 5/29/14

TIME: 1000 - 1200

LOCATION: YUROK KLAMATH TRIBAL OFFICE. KLAMATH, CA

Facilitator

Brad Mettam

Meeting initiated by:

Caltrans District 1

Attendees

Brad Mettam
Talitha Hodgson
Kevin Tucker
Jason Meyer
Jeff Pimentel
Carlton Schrieve
Rosie Clayburn
Isaac Kinney
Crista Stewart
Bobbie McGray
Kevin Mealue
Jeff Bomke
Steve Prokop
David Roemer
Suntayea Steinruck
Matt Simmons

Titles / Affiliations

Deputy District Director, Caltrans
Project Management, Caltrans
Advance Planning, Caltrans
Environmental Planning, Caltrans
Advance Planning, Caltrans
Advance Planning, Caltrans
Yurok Cultural Resources Specialist
Yurok Transportation Planner
Elk Valley Rancheria, THPO
Elk Valley Rancheria, COO/CFO
Elk Valley Rancheria, Environmental Service Specialist
California State Parks
National Park Service
National Park Service
Smith River Rancheria, Tribal Heritage Preservation
Local Assistance, Caltrans (minutes)

Notes:

I. INTRODUCTIONS:

Introductions and opening statements. A brief review of the last meeting followed.

II. GUIDELINES/AGENDA/PREVIOUS MEETING SUMMARY:

Caltrans updated the Partners regarding the existing conditions at Last Chance Grade (LCG). Caltrans will be including real-time monitoring in upcoming projects on LCG.

III. ROUNDTABLE UPDATE

- A. Partners provided updates on any Last Chance Grade communications and/or new developments.
1. Partners updated the group on the current status of their review of the Partnering Memorandum of Understanding.
 2. Caltrans indicated to the Partners that at the conclusion of a presentation of constructible alternatives, that the Partners would be able to determine what alternatives need to be studied further.
 3. Caltrans updated the team about sources of more accurate surface data.

IV. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

- A. Update on the status of the Memorandum of Understanding
1. Caltrans summarized what input they had to date and requested additional comments from the partners regarding the MOU that have not already been expressed.
 2. The updated version and the original MOU will be sent to the group for one final review.

V. CALTRANS REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE

- A. Caltrans Advance Planning Engineering Analysis To-Date
1. Caltrans gave an informal presentation of the alternatives that were part of previous studies. Caltrans identified the numerous challenges identified with the historical alternatives:
 - a. Excessive Grades – Caltrans tries to design routes at 6% or less. Route 101 at LCG is currently at approximate 6% grade. Nearly all the historical alternatives had grades steeper than 6%.

Challenges Continued...

- b. Environmental Impacts – Many of the historical studies did not usually take old growth redwood impacts into consideration.
 - c. Geotechnical Issues – Many of the historical alternatives were still within the limits of the LCG landslides.
 - d. Engineering Assumptions – A list of reasonable design assumptions were provided to the team that was used to refine historic alternatives and develop constructible and feasible alternatives.
2. Caltrans described in detail the surface data sets that were used to review and analyze the alternatives for feasibility.
 3. Caltrans stressed to the partners that the alternatives were all preliminary and further refinement of the alternatives would commence once Partner consensus was obtained on how to proceed.

B. Discussion and Questions Concerning Alternatives

1. Costs of Alternatives. Cost estimates were rough estimates based upon cost-per-mile figures.
2. Tunnels vs. Bridges. Tunnels are on the order of 10 times more expensive than other structures such as bridges.
3. Number of Lanes. Caltrans was not looking at any scenario that would involve four lanes.
4. Partners Preferences. Partners had the following preferences:
 - a. Utilize structures to eliminate large cut and fill impacts to old growth habitat wherever possible.
 - b. Minimize length of alternative routes and resultant increases in travel time.
5. The Partners identified additional information they would like to see for each of the alternatives.

C. The Partners decided preliminarily what alternatives were reasonable to continue to study further.

1. The alternatives that the group identifies will involve more detailed study from all the Partners.
2. The Partners decided as a group to keep four alternatives on the table for more detailed review. This means that they will all be looked at equally. No alternative will be selected for the Engineered Feasibility Study. Additional alternatives may result from the upcoming public/Stakeholder process. This study is in very early in the life of a project and only establishes feasibility; it does not identify a project.
3. Four alternatives were identified by the partners for further study in addition to maintaining the existing route at LCG.

VI. FUTURE MEETINGS

- A. Future meetings will cover finalizing the MOU, study checkpoints, study deliverables and specialist meetings.

ACTION ITEMS

- Schedule specialist meeting.
- Schedule MOU teleconference with partners.
- Update partner administrative and interested parties.
- Research relinquishment options. (Including what was done at Devil's Slide)
- Provide alignments in GIS format to partners.
- Provide costs of existing programmed projects to LCG to partners.
- Send revised MOU to partners.

Meeting concluded at 12:10pm.

Next meeting – June 19th, 2014 // 1400 – 1500 // Teleconference

Specialists meeting – July 17th, 2014 // 1000 – 1400 // Elk Valley Rancheria