



I-580 Freeway Extension Project Pleasant Valley Community Meeting Summary

ATTENDEES: SWG Members (See attached sign-in sheet)
PMT Members
Local Residents
Todd Montgomery/NDOT
Peter Booth/NDOT

Cindy Potter/CH2M HILL
Bill Crawford/CH2M HILL
Michelle Searle/CH2M HILL

MEETING DATE: December 21, 2006

DATE: January 8, 2007

NEXT MEETING: The date for the next Community Meeting will be determined once more construction methods information is available.

On Thursday, December 21, 2006, the members of the I-580 Freeway Extension Stakeholder Working Group (SWG), Project Management Team (PMT) and local residents participated in a Community Meeting at the Pleasant Valley Elementary School, 405 Surrey Drive, Pleasant Valley, Nevada. This meeting solicited comments for proposed construction changes for the Galena Creek Bridge and provided an opportunity for the community to meet and ask questions of the new contractor, Tommy Fisher of Fisher Sand & Gravel.

1. Introduction

Todd Montgomery, NDOT Project Manager, provided an introduction and then introduced Tommy Fisher of Fisher Sand and Gravel (FSG). Todd stated that the purpose of the meeting was to introduce the contractor's proposed construction methods change including the change in use of the BLM property at Galena Creek to the community and receive input before any substantial engineering is done on the proposal.

2. New Contractor

Tommy Fisher, President of FSG, explained that FSG is the prime contractor and will be using a subcontractor, CC Meyers, to construct the Galena Creek Bridge. He let the attendees know that CC Meyers wants to build the Galena Creek Bridge in a manner that is different from what is shown on the plans. CC Meyers wants to place an engineered earth fill over Galena Creek, then build the bridge on conventional falsework. The earth fill would be approximately 100 feet tall, 200 feet wide at the top, 600 feet wide at the bottom and have a side slope of 1.25:1 with a culvert at the bottom to perpetuate the Galena Creek flow.

Tommy Fisher went on to say that FSG is going to start work in mid-January 2007. If this modified construction method proposal to NDOT is approved, he anticipates construction of the culvert and fill would take 2 months (depending upon weather) and construction of the two arches for the Galena Creek Bridge would take 600 days. The fill would be in place until the end of 2008 and then it would take a few months to remove falsework and fill.

3. Q&A

Note: This question and answer section is not documented in strict chronological order, but rather it combines related discussions that took place at different times during the meeting.

Q: *What would be the size of the culvert opening for flood control?*

A: The span of the culvert would be 30-feet to span over the normal high water.

Follow up discussions:

The critical stream zone is 30 feet either side of the creek. The structure foundations and other required support structures would be within the riparian zone.

The floods of 1986 and 1997 caused extreme problems. There were flash floods with walls of water. We would like to see the culvert placed higher to protect the stream and riparian corridor.

Floods last January created debris flow. Mud from the construction site moved down the hill and into the property just below the site. The property owner is still cleaning it up. Todd Montgomery noted this was a valid concern.

What are the 100 and 500 year flows? What is scouring potential? What are the water levels or depths associated with these flows?

Tommy Fisher said they would look into this and see what they can do. He said they have access to pumps to pump out any water that may back up behind the fill and could place a backhoe on the upstream side of the fill to remove any debris that collects.

Q: *What is the method shown in the plans, and as we have been shown all along, now being abandoned?*

A: Tommy Fisher said they are looking at the fill option because the construction of the Galena Creek Bridge has the biggest impact on the project. He said that if using a fill to build the bridge can save time and is safer; he is interested in doing it this way.

Tommy Fisher also showed another alternate method to constructing the arch by building a trestle bridge over Galena Creek. This option would require auguring large piles into the bottom of the creek and sides of the canyon. This option would also have a large impact on the canyon walls.

Follow up discussions:

The fill method would have a big effect on the stream after construction as the vegetation will be gone and there will be a lot of debris. Tommy Fisher indicated the contract requires him to place riprap on the sides of the Galena Creek canyon after the bridge is built. The fill method would allow FSG to build the slope protection more efficiently because it is built from the top down as the fill is removed.

The fill method looks like it will cause more noise in the area because trucks will have to go down and back up the hill instead of just going across the bridge. Tommy Fisher acknowledged that there could be a temporary increase in noise.

Q: *Where is the proposed fill located in relation to the canyon and other properties? Is it located within NDOT's right-of-way?*

A: The fill is centered on the bridge but is slightly offset to the east.

Author's note: Tommy Fisher's statement that the fill would be within NDOT right of way needs clarification. The proposed fill is expected to extend beyond permanent right of way into the easements set up for construction and the special BLM easement established for the conveyor system.

Follow up Discussions:

Do you have overhead pictures of the fill location? We want to keep it away from the neighborhood as far as possible. Tommy Fisher said they did not have an overhead picture, but would provide something.

Q: *How are the fill slopes going to be protected from erosion?*

A: Tommy Fisher said they would follow all erosion control requirements set up for the contract.

Q: *How is scouring of the footings going to be handled.*

A: Tommy Fisher indicated they would cement the footings into the side of the canyon walls.

Questions unrelated to the fill method:

Q: *Who is going to make sure the rocks on the hill are safe?*

A: Tommy Fisher indicated that he was responsible for the local neighborhood's safety.

Q: *Is there a rockfall protection plan for the project?*

A: Yes, the contract requires a rockfall protection plan and it can be made available for review.

Q: Where is the staging area for the project?

A: Tommy Fisher indicated the main staging area would be north of Pleasant Valley near the Ormat property. He did indicate CC Meyers might consider use the property previously used by Kraemer for their operations. He will talk to CC Meyers about this.

Q: Will wells be affected?

A: The Department of Water Resources (DWR) manages well water and might be better equipped to address this question. However, we do know as a condition to obtaining access to well water from the DWR the previous contractor was required to monitor wells within the local area to determine possible impacts to water levels.

Q: Will this project turn into another Spaghetti Bowl? The project already built (Contract 3148) was a waste of money.

A: Tommy Fisher stated he wants to be a good neighbor. He stated that he has the knowledge and a very good understanding of the project. Tommy said he will spend a lot of time on preparation work to get the job done right.

4. Next Steps

Todd explained that discussing construction concerns would be an ongoing process, and additional community meetings will be held as more information becomes available.

Todd brought the meeting to a close and the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.