**Meeting Purpose and Overview:**

The Amador County Department of Transportation and Public Works is currently undertaking the environmental clearance and engineering design for the replacement of four bridges within the county including: Fiddletown Road Bridge over North Fork Dry Creek, Bunker Hill Road Bridge at Rancheria Creek, Old Amador Road Bridge at Rancheria Creek, and Bell Road Bridge at Big Indian Creek.

The County and the project team hosted a Community Open House meeting with residents adjacent to the Fiddletown Road Bridge to share information about the project and address potential issues and concerns.

**Publicity & Noticing**

Community open house post cards were mailed to more than 100 local residents and businesses. In addition, notification flyers were sent via e-mail to vicinity residents and businesses.

**Open House Format**

Approximately 20 community members attended the open house which included a presentation by Dennis Haglan with Drake Haglan and Associates. Information stations included bridge design highlights; detour and construction impacts considerations; environmental analysis; and traffic calming concepts. Attendees were encouraged to visit the stations where project team members were available to answer questions and discuss the project. Attendees were given a project informational sheet and a comment card to provide input. Comment cards could be turned in at the open house, or returned via email, fax, or mail.

**Community Input:**

The following comments were submitted on comment cards:

**General comments:**

* Build it as quickly as possible, as efficiently as possible.
* I am in favor of allowing Dennis and his group to limit the project duration to a reasonable time that will be necessary to build a beautiful and functional bridge.
* I hope that the roadway of the new bridge can be finished in a way that will render it as free of winter ice as our modern concrete technology allows. Icy spots would be quite dangerous for drivers approaching the bridge downhill from upcountry. I would not be surprised to hear that Dennis already plans to include this idea in his contracts with the people who will be building and/or installing the actual roadway.

**Traffic calming and speed:**

* Speed of cars in Fiddletown is the #1 issue and the new bridge cannot facilitate speeders.
  + I like the idea of a speed sign if keeping the signage within the town aesthetics.
  + I like the idea of a covered bridge to slow thing down. Timber-framed covered bridge could be seen at the West end of Fiddletown.
* We also want it as narrow as possible because its narrowness is the only thing that slows the “speeders” down. Speed is our #1 concern.
* It would be best, should all of us slow down; however, we all need to understand that building a new bridge will not be likely to stop speeders. I should hope that we would all be happy with the inclusion of a few measures that could encourage drivers to drive more slowly. The design team has already revealed several of these measures for our approval. Personally, I like better signage and the installation of painted road markings.

**Aesthetics and bridge width:**

* We don’t want it replaced at all, but if it has to be replaced we want it as “county” looking as possible to fit in our little community.
* I think that finishing the exposed concrete sides with rock and using heavy timbers to finish the rails would go a long way to produce a bridge that we would all find to be both beautiful and respectful of the history that still lives and is preserved in Fiddletown. I am also looking forward to seeing some pictures of tasteful and historically appropriate arched railings that could result in a slower traffic flow.
* Dennis appears to be willing to negotiate with Caltrans to allow us to build a narrow bridge. I feel that making the new bridge as narrow as Caltrans would allow would be both necessary and desirable, should we wish to respect the limited space available on the site, the needs of the adjoining property owners, and our desire to build a bridge that would not encourage drivers to speed. I believe that Dennis heard these concerns. After Dennis talks with Caltrans, we will certainly have a more realistic idea what to expect in terms of the prospective size of the new bridge.

**Construction and detour:**

* I would definitely vote against the temporary detour.
* I have a great concern about putting in a temporary bypass during construction and taking up 28 feet from private property. The damage to this property will take years to restore, plus what it would do to that property during the construction time.
* We don’t want to lose any of our very old English walnut trees or a new corral fence so a detour would greatly impact our property.
* I favor a two-lane detour as indicated in the map that Dennis Haglan presented at the December 11th meeting. After talking with Dennis, I conclude that he is willing to negotiate with the owners of the property involved.
  + Should these property owners ultimately be comfortable with the two-lane detour that Dennis discussed, I would fully support this plan as my first choice.
  + I would also support a narrower one-lane, traffic-light controlled detour, should this plan turn out to be the only detour that the property owners will approve.