

BIG SUR BYWAY ORGANIZATION (BSBO) – SPECIAL MEETING

FINAL MINUTES for Wednesday, August 21, 2024
10 a.m. – 12 p.m.

FINAL MEETING MINUTES – August 21, 2024, 10am

Call to Order: Martha Diehl called the meeting to order at 10:06am

Roll Call

District/Region	Representative	Attendance
Highlands Resident	Mark Grandcolas	Present Left at 11:28am
Mid Coast Resident	Martha Diehl, Chair	Present
Big Sur Proper/Valley Resident	Matt Glazer	Present
South Coast Resident	Sarah Harvey	Present via Zoom
Resident At Large	Katie Moon, Vice Chair	Absent
Caltrans	Darron Hill, Chad Stoehr, or Alternative	Darron Hill & Chad Stoehr Present
U.S. Forest Service	Parker Erickson, Jason Field, or Alternative	Parker Erickson & Jason Field Present
CA State Parks	Marcos Ortega or Alternative	Marcos Ortega Present
Big Sur Chamber	Rick Aldinger or Alternative	Rick Aldinger Present

Staff Present: Mary Kelley Crnich, See Monterey, Member Relations Specialist
Taylor Price, County of Monterey, Associate Planner
Katie Scariot, County of Monterey, Assistant Planner

Guests Present: Mauricio Arias, California State Assembly, Field Representative
Steve Beck
Colleen Courtney, County of Monterey, Chief of Staff
Mike Doig
Steffanie Gamecho, Point Lobos Foundation, Executive Director
Marcus Foster, Keep Big Sur Wild
Brian Lyke
Eric Mathewson
Katie McAndrews
Alyssa Rendon, See Monterey, Community Relations Director
Dan Shaw, California State Parks

Patte Kronlund

- Martha Diehl stated needing to authorize Sarah Harvey to join remotely.
- Taylor Price requested that Ms. Harvey confirm her location, reason for being remote, and to confirm that no one under the age of 18 was present.
- Ms. Harvey responded that her current location was the South Coast, the reason for being remote was the current road conditions, and that no one else was present.
- Ms. Diehl welcomed the Highlands Resident representative, Mark Grandcolas.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items:

- Steve Beck said at Big Sur Byway Organization (BSBO) and Big Sur Multi Agency Advisory Council (BSMAAC) meetings he normally rants about the changing landscape of Big Sur specifically regarding the jubata grass. He stated in the past he would ask for a plan or action and had been largely unsuccessful. He noted that pampas grass changes ecology and aesthetics. Mr. Beck stated that he observed spraying done of pampas grass in July 2024 in the Hurricane Point region. He observed a huge area between Big Sur River and El Paso on the north that had been treated. Mr. Beck has been trying to identify who did this and noted that the effort is proof of the control of jubata grass and wanted to express his gratitude.
- Darren Hill confirmed this work was done by Caltrans.
- Marcus Foster said since county ordinance 1362 was passed there has been no activity regulating or enforcing the ordinance. He commented on the lack of enforcement and mentioned the Garrapata State Park pedestrian death. Mr. Foster commented on increased visitation and noted the chokepoint at Point Lobos. Mr. Foster noted the increased trail work and expressed concern that people would see the trail work causing them to pull over more frequently or stay at chokepoints longer. Mr. Foster noted the aspect of visual access. He noted public safety and recreational scenic drivers than building parking lots and infrastructures and cited the Coastal Act's public safety component.

Agenda, Additions, Deletions, and Corrections

- Ms. Diehl called for agenda additions, deletions, or corrections.
- Mr. Price confirmed no edits to the agenda were received.

Approval of Minutes

- A. Approval of Minutes of September 6, 2023 (Attachment 1)
- Ms. Diehl called for any discussion of the minutes.

- *A motion was made to approve the minutes as presented by Rick Aldinger, second by Mark Grandcolas. Darren Hill abstained. Katie Moon was absent. The motion carried.*

Scheduled Matters

1. BSBO 2024 Regular Quarterly Meeting Schedule, upcoming meeting dates
Continue 2024 meetings at Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District and continue to offer hybrid option.
Suggested Dates for 2024:
 - November 20, 2024
 - Ms. Diehl reviewed BSBO 2024 Regular Quarterly Meeting Schedule upcoming meeting dates and to continue 2024 meetings at the Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District and continue to offer the hybrid option. Ms. Diehl stated that the suggested date for 2024 was November 20, 2024.
 - Ms. Diehl called for comments.
 - *A motion was made to approve the BSBO 2024 Regular Quarterly Meeting Schedule upcoming meeting dates and to continue 2024 meetings at the Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District and continue to offer the hybrid option by Rick Aldinger, second by Mark Grandcolas. Katie Moon was absent. The motion carried.*
2. BSBO 2025 Regular Quarterly Meeting Schedule, upcoming meeting dates
Continue 2025 meetings at Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District and continue to offer hybrid option.
Suggested Dates for 2025:
 - March 5, 2025
 - June 18, 2025
 - September 24, 2025
 - November 19, 2025
 - Ms. Diehl reviewed BSBO 2025 Regular Quarterly Meeting Schedule upcoming meeting dates and to continue 2025 meetings at the Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District and continue to offer the hybrid option. Ms. Diehl stated the suggested dates for 2025 were March 5, 2025; June 18, 2025; September 18, 2025; and November 19, 2025.
 - *A motion was made to approve the BSBO 2025 Regular Quarterly Meeting Schedule proposed meeting dates and to continue 2025 meetings at the Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District and to continue to offer the hybrid option by Rick Aldinger, second by Mark Grandcolas. Katie Moon was absent. The motion carried.*
3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair
 - Ms. Diehl announced the election of chair and vice chair.
 - There was a discussion regarding the nominations for the election of chair and vice chair.

- *A motion was made to appoint Martha Diehl as BSBO Chair by Marcos Ortega, second by Mr. Grandcolas. Katie Moon was absent. The motion carried.*
- *A motion was made to appoint Katie Moon as BSBO Vice-chair by Matt Glazer, second by Mr. Aldinger. Katie Moon was absent. The motion carried.*

Other Matters

4. Receive a verbal update on the Bixby Bridge Emergency Task Force
 - Ms. Diehl stated the Emergency Task Force was formed out of a discussion of issues at Bixby. Ms. Diehl said that this group [BSBO] asked (BSMAAC) to form an emergency task force to focus on an immediate issue and noted that it is not in any way to discount other issues that we know are a problem.
 - Colleen Courtney stated that Mauricio Arias, a staff member of Assemblymember Dawn Addis, is leading the Bixby Bridge Emergency Task Force and that Ms. Courtney is supporting. Ms. Courtney noted working with the county to prohibit parking on Old Coast Road. She stated as far as she knows, they have not heard back from the Coastal Commission, which means they are approved and moving forward. Ms. Courtney noted that they have met as a task force over the last year or so. She expressed gratitude to Randy Ishii, Taylor Price, Craig Spencer and others for their contributions toward this effort. Ms. Courtney noted that this effort is phase one and is a pilot initiative that is tied to the timing of Rocky Creek repairs.
 - Mr. Arias thanked Supervisor Adams office and Ms. Courtney for this effort. He stated before the last (BSMAAC) meeting the stakeholders, and even some Coastal Commissioners themselves came out to visit the site. Mr. Arias stated it was critical for them to see the level of how bad it can get the bridge. He said someone blocked the entry way to Old Coast Road in front of them. Mr. Arias praised the county for passing the emergency ordinance. He reiterated what Ms. Courtney said, that it's a pilot. He also reiterated what Ms. Courtney said and noted some unintended consequences may occur, but that it's a step in the right direction in terms of the effort and trying to mitigate some of that congestion. He expressed gratitude to all the agencies involved in the effort. Mr. Arias noted they had about three days to kind of garner some letters of support and were able to get about six letters from stakeholders. Mr. Arias stated a thank you to everyone who took part in this emergency ordinance.
 - Mr. Price confirmed Mr. Ishii, from Public Works, Facilities, & Parks in the County of Monterey, had not heard from the Coastal Commission unless there was something last minute, they did not receive an appeal.
 - Ms. Diehl stated she informally spoke to the County Public Works staff unofficially and they stated they were hopeful that it would be within the next three weeks or so.
 - Mr. Aldinger stated that Mr. Foster talked about roadside camping. Mr. Aldinger noted that a lot of time, energy and resources were spent. Mr. Aldinger stated to Mr. Foster's point that without enforcement it is not effective. Mr. Aldinger stated my question to the task force is enforcement a part of the task force's plan or discussion.

- Mr. Arias responded to Mr. Aldinger's question and responded yes. Mr. Arias stated that on the county side there is one more officer prioritizing the Big Sur area. Mr. Arias noted the last time he checked in with (CHP) there are extra hours specifically in the Big Sur area through a state grant. He added there are financial barriers to getting a full-time officer out there and that he was unable to speak for the department. Mr. Arias stated they are advocating for the area and to increase patrolling.
- Mr. Ortega noted that he received a complaint from Keep Big Sur Wild and that he personally went out and wrote tickets. He stated to characterize that there is no enforcement is not correct. He added that every agency is going to have their issues. He noted from the State Parks perspective there is a staffing issue that they are facing on a statewide level and are dealing with by paying people overtime. Mr. Ortega noted advocating for increased signage via the signs committee as there are instances when he is enforcing where people do not see the signage and suggesting increased signage.
- Mr. Glazer asked if the road is a county road and clarified that state agencies still have enforcement rights.
- Ms. Diehl responded that it does depend on the spot. She stated that at the Bixby location she knows the Highway Patrol and Sheriff's department are working closely together throughout that day. Ms. Diehl added that they're not saying the line is here and go beyond it.
- Mr. Aldinger clarified that he agrees with what Ms. Diehl just said. He noted that local agencies such as State Parks, (CHP,) Forest Service have boots on the ground and do care about the community. Mr. Aldinger clarified that his comments were directed towards ensuring those local boots on the ground [agencies] have the resources they need to do their work effectively.
- Mr. Grandcolas stated he has observed traffic cones and asked if using cones was a possibility.
- Ms. Diehl stated there is an effective discussion to be had. She noted the balance between views and signs. She noted that many cones are ad hoc and privately owned.
- Mr. Foster commented that the neon orange cones are ugly cones. Mr. Foster thanked Mr. Ortega for going down and enforcing the camping at Garapata State Park and noted that he misspoke earlier about enforcement. He asked Caltrans about no pedestrians on the bridge from a public safety standpoint. He noted that he thinks that pedestrians should not be allowed on a bridge with no shoulder.
- Ms. Diehl stated there are a number, perhaps a dozen parallel parking only signs where we're talking about. She added that we're talking about changing the signs and not adding signage which should release some of that concern. Ms. Diehl added I think they may put some signs on the K rails themselves too, which would be down further and slightly less visible.
- Mr. Glazer stated but the parallel signs will have to come down, so it's going to be a trade.
- Ms. Diehl stated opportunities for electronic education, not signage. Ms Diehl stated she would put Alyssa Rendon on the spot and added that I am sure there are people at See

Monterey who are good at that. Ms. Diehl asked for any hope for digital help via GPS and or device regarding sending messages such as parking and other messaging.

- Ms. Rendon stated that Rob [Rob O’Keefe] has been pushing for more regulations. She stated we can promote regulations such as the fine for parking which we promoted. She stated See Monterey will continue safe and responsible messaging. Ms. Rendon noted that she would follow up with Ms. Courtney and Mr. Arias on the subject. She noted they are looking into geolocation but that geolocation in the Big Sur area is hard.
- Mr. Grandcolas suggested cameras where it says no parking so that police know when individuals are parked at the “No Parking” signs. He added that he often sees cars parked illegally without tickets.
- Ms. Diehl expressed excitement that something physical is happening. Ms. Diehl noted the chokepoints that Mr. Foster had noted earlier and added that her hope from this body would be that everybody is all right as we support the emergency task force to advocate that the task force moves forward with the chokepoints identified.
- Mr. Arias stated that was a great idea and asked for confirmation of chokepoint locations.
- Ms. Diehl confirmed the chokepoint locations were: Soberanes, Garrapata, Julia Pfeiffer Burns, Point Lobos, and Sycamore Canyon.
- Mr. Foster said Soberanes, regarding vehicle accidents, is the most dangerous area.
- Mr. Glazer stated no objection but a question of perpetuity. He asked if the group as a board could adopt a record of support or adopt a perpetual motion to keep these emergency task forces going.
- Ms. Diehl responded to Mr. Glazer that a motion was needed.
- *Mr. Glazer moved that the Big Sur Byways Organization continue to support the existing Bixby Bridge Emergency Task Force and requested that the task force expands to choke points as identified now, and in the future.*
- Ms. Diehl asked for any discussion.
- Mr. Hill stated where you narrow things down it slows things down; he noted that you may get more collisions, but they are generally not fatal or serious injury. He stated I am concerned that if you are looking to not keep Soberanes choke down there are other alternatives such as narrow lanes. He added to keep drivers thinking “I need to go slow.” He noted that if parking is eliminated there's a very real possibility that it's open and you're going to get higher speeds on both ends of it, and all the way through in total. He said I would be hesitant to just eliminate chokepoints; he added that chokepoints are an opportunity if you use them right. He added you can Google chicanes as an example. He noted that the straighter the road, the faster people drive and the wider the road, the faster people drive. Mr. Hill noted with the chicanes example it is within a residential neighborhood or business area where the car is forced over and back with the narrow curves and things like that and it's been shown to be effective lower speeds. He added chokepoints could be the impetus to do something.
- Ms. Diehl stated that widening is not an option in the Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP.)

- Mr. Glazer stated a point of order that there is a motion and a second for the motion.
 - Mr. Hill stated that it was a discussion.
 - Mr. Glazer added to counter your point a little bit that he thinks that is exactly what we bring to the table. Mr. Glazer noted that if this organization continues to support a task force's existence, then that conversation can happen in the practical. He added I am not saying to eliminate chokepoints but that I do not know what the answer is, and we need to continue to have that conversation. Mr. Glazer added to take that off the table or to lose it in missing a year of meetings, that is why I am saying to perpetuate the motion so that we can continue to meet.
 - Mr. Grandcolas stated that California is looking at passing a law that automatically slows down your car when driven past the speed limit.
 - Mr. Hill stated that it could help but for decades in the future as you have older cars on the road still.
 - Ms. Diehl said typically speed is not the issue but the interaction of all the people who are using the road in different ways. She stated that the task force brings all the players together: Caltrans, law enforcement, landowners and the county to have a conversation and see what others say about it. Ms. Diehl noted if she understands it [the task force] is not in favor of any particular solution.
 - Mr. Foster said the solution to the problem at Soberanes is in the Land Use plan to not expand existing facilities when there is not adequate and safe parking.
 - Mr. Price asked for a point of clarification, if the motion could be restated.
 - Ms. Harvey stated that she was having a hard time hearing [via Zoom] and that the audio just shifted in the last five minutes.
 - Ms. Diehl apologized for the audio issues and asked if there were any online comments.
 - Mr. Price stated that he believed Brian Lyke unmuted.
 - Mr. Lyke confirmed that he did not have a comment.
 - *Mr. Glazer moved that the Big Sur Byways Organization continue to support the Bixby Bridge Emergency Task Force and to continue the expansion of considerations of chokepoints identified. Mr. Grandcolas seconded the motion. Katie Moon was absent. The motion carried.*
 - Ms. Diehl stated we had an item and a motion and asked for other discussion regarding that update.
5. Receive a verbal update from Caltrans on the Big Sur Bridge Railings
- Mr. Hill stated that Caltrans submitted the appeal.
 - Ms. Diehl asked about the timing.
 - Mr. Hill responded he thinks we have 49 days to respond.
 - Mr. Glazer asked for any update on the Castro Canyon Bridge railing project.

- Mr. Hill responded he add no update [on the Castro Canyon Bridge project] and that he will note that project.
 - Mr. Glazer noted that it is the bridge in front of Deetjen's.
 - Mr. Foster asked has the Coastal Commission weighed in at all on the Bridge Rail project in the past.
 - Mr. Hill responded no, not really. He added that they have been aware but no, not formally.
6. Receive a verbal update from Caltrans on the Rocky Creek Slip Out Emergency Project Permanent Structure
- Chad Stoehr provided a verbal update and gave a presentation on the Rocky Creek Slip Out Emergency Project Permanent Structure. Mr. Stoehr presented the incident, the location and particulars, the temporary stabilization rock dowels and shotcrete facing. He stated the temporary stabilization was completed on May 17, 2024, six weeks after the incident occurred. Mr. Stoehr stated the permanent repair viaduct structure is similar to the 2011/2012 viaduct structure. He noted the permanent repair viaduct structure is full width, 3-span, 200 feet long. Mr. Stoehr stated the permanent repair viaduct structure is 12-foot travel lane in each direction and a 4-foot-wide shoulders in each direction. He then stated some of the challenges associated with the project: material variability north to south, existing Rocky Creek Bridge to viaduct railing transition, access/height and steepness of slope, existing utilities and public notification/press releases during construction. He reviewed construction particulars: construction started in July 2024, mobilization and installation of steel H-piles for soldier pile and lagging cutoff wall, day and night work up to seven (7) days per week, intermittent overnight closures of HWY 1 at project site (10pm to 6am Sunday through Thursday;) anticipated completion in Summer 2025 (based on conditions encountered during construction,) and visit the District 5 website <https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-5/district-5-current-projects/05-1s160>. He provided verbal and visual updates of the viaduct construction. Mr. Stoehr asked for questions.
 - Mr. Beck said just south of the slip out on the inland side of the road there has been a seep of water for forever and is still seeping.
 - Mr. Stoehr responded that it is new to his knowledge and that he is not aware that this project is influencing it. He stated he will look into it.
 - Mr. Beck clarified the seeping was coming from the north bound lane.
 - Mr. Beck stated his second question was regarding the stoplight. He noted that before Car Week, he was stopped at the light for a half hour or so. Mr. Beck noted waiting for long periods of time. Mr. Beck stated he is sure there are safety factors but is wondering if that could be monitored to see if the lag time could be shortened.
 - Mr. Stoehr stated that individuals in Caltrans are in communication of traffic signals and noted through the course of this work that equipment is getting through.
 - Mr. Hill commented on having to account for cyclists and the assumption that a cyclist can be there.

- Mr. Beck responded for everyone hundred cyclists there is one cyclist.
- Mr. Hill responded that they must assume a cyclist is there.
- Mr. Glazer received many comments from Big Sur residents who are grateful for the turnaround and getting it done by Memorial Day. He stated to take that back to your team and added that where we do have our critiques and concerns there is a huge amount of gratitude for the work that is being done and that even though you are a state agency, you are human people doing the work. He said there has been buzz about the h piles going in. He stated a comment for the consideration of the project management is the personnel tend to be littering the site. Mr. Glazer said I think the name is Ally Associated Traffic Draw and added he could not recall the name of the organization. He noted it is becoming enough where people have noticed and that it has become apparent in some of the other project sites. He stated but otherwise overwhelming gratitude for this moving forward and keeping us moving and keeping businesses open and for keeping us successful.
- Mr. Stoehr thanked Mr. Glazer for his input.
- Ms. Diehl asked for any online comments.
- Mr. Price stated that Harmony had unmuted and was unclear if there was a comment.
- Harmony stated that she is at the light four days a week. She said the light's timing has been great aside from after 9am on Saturday and Sunday and at sunset. Harmony added that it has really helped Bixby traffic.
- Ms. Diehl asked when the design criteria is for what it will look like.
- Mr. Stoehr stated he does not have a specific date, but it will be soon and is currently being worked on.
- Ms. Diehl stated just as a personal opinion, that she would hope that the viaduct railing design is not considered to be a success aesthetically. She noted that there have been comments on aesthetics since the start and that there are people involved who regret having their name associated. She said it's been brought to her attention for years as culturally inappropriate. She stated as we look forward to the design I wanted to get that in as early as possible because we know how quickly accelerated the process has to be.
- Mr. Stoehr responded that regarding the railing on this viaduct is the ST75 railing.
- Ms. Diehl stated when we look at how it relates to the existing bridge.
- Mr. Stoehr stated there was a lot of discussion and input from the project development team. The railings will be ST75 railing and added that the railing on the viaduct is separate from the adjacent Rocky Creek Bridge railing.
- Ms. Diehl responded that structurally she understands but that she was referring to the historical, cultural, aesthetic, visual aspects. She added that we have a lot of history and visual resources on this corridor.
- Mr. Stoehr stated that it is similar to the 2011 2012 repair and will receive a stain on it.
- Mr. Glazer stated I imagine we can anticipate the aesthetic of a new viaduct next to a historic bridge.

- Mr. Stoehr responded that at the termination of the ST75 railing, you need a concrete end block. He stated that the concrete end block will probably range in length, based on the proximity that we are to the existing Rocky Creek bridge, but the railing will be similar.
- Ms. Diehl stated it's replacing a historic masonry structure which is protected under everything we can protect as part of our cultural heritage.
- Ms. Diehl asked Mr. Stoehr if he was familiar with the bridge and railing that fell through.
- Mr. Stoehr confirmed he was familiar and clarified it is the one that looks existing rock wall.
- Ms. Diehl confirmed that was correct. She noted that those are protected in our aesthetic corridor design and stated that it seems to her to have significant cultural and visual concerns.
- Mr. Stoehr responded that they have a team of individuals on our project development team who are specifically working with regards to the archaeological and historical aspects of the project and working with their headquarters division on that. He said they have that understanding and expertise regarding the archeological, historical impacts and what they are ultimately held to. He noted they do not have the visual fully perfected at this point.
- Ms. Diehl stated because of the ongoing railing discussions she is just mindful of what happens if things get too far before we raise the issue. Ms. Diehl stated she feels like the decision has already been come up with and we find ourselves in an adversarial position when we want to be in a partnership position. Ms. Diehl stated from her point of view the result they have come up with is not a good result. She noted that now she must criticize that rather than say how to move toward something appropriate. She noted not only this situation but in general trying to find a way for us to be more helpful and less adversarial. Ms. Deihl stated right now she is in an adversarial mode because that is not something that I think is appropriate treatment in that location.
- Mr. Glazer asked if there is an opportunity for this organization to contribute to the design application in this process before it gets too far. Mr. Glazer asked Ms. Diehl if that is what he had heard her ask. Mr. Glazer asked Mr. Stoehr if there is an opportunity for us to make a comment or notice to the public rather than oppose a design that's being put forward.
- Mr. Stoehr responded to Mr. Glazer the design is already established already structurally has been perfected. He noted those plans are there, we are in construction and have a contractor on board. Mr. Stoehr stated that the plans have already been finalized essentially. Mr. Stoehr stated this being an emergency project we are in the mode and in the process of being able to design and perfect that design as we're bringing a contractor on board and doing a handful of things all at the same time, to be able to get this done as quickly and effectively as possible. Mr. Stoehr noted as he was stating their archeological folks at the district level as well as at the headquarters level have taken into consideration what is out there right now and what they are ultimately being held to with regards to the requirements and moving the project forward. He noted that taking these comments is acceptable by them and that he can take those comments back, but he thinks he sees what [Ms. Diehl] was getting at that the design is to the point at which it's going into construction, already in construction and has been finalized.
- Mr. Hill commented that he would ask a different question. Mr. Hill asked if you didn't want steel, what would you prefer. He offered a wall that looks like rock but it's going to be 36

inches high or a bridge rail like what was not supported for Garrapata the 86H. He added you can see through it, but you are not going to see through as much as steel but it's concrete. He asked are either of those more acceptable than steel. He stated the consideration that they as a team did not want to have something that looked so similar to Rocky Creek that there was a loss of keeping uniqueness of that structure separated from a viaduct. He stated cited in (CHMP) as part of the uniqueness of Big Sur is that each of the bridges is unique from everything around it. He noted there was a concern by the team that they didn't want to have a rail or wall that might blend the new viaduct with old bridge. He added this viaduct to the south looks completely different so it keeps Rocky Creek Bridge unique from everything else but physically they are limited to a certain number of railings that are crash tested that we could adopt and put out there in a very short period of time.

- Mr. Price noted that Mark Grandcolas had left the meeting at 11:28am.
- Mr. Hill asked the question if they did a 36-inch-high barrier but solid with like a rock treatment or something like the one that was when it went down. He added that the bridge rail that they worked on for Garrapata which has openings but is the same height but smaller. He stated he asked the question for the sake of discussion.
- Ms. Diehl stated she wanted to start by stating one thing in general. She said we don't want to look at the corridor as protecting unique landmarks but as the whole corridor. She stated when we start talking about abrupt transitions into a new historical realm of things that affect the experience of driving the corridor in terms of cultural and historical. She added that even if you can see through them like in the 2012 railing. She stated keeping in mind that not protecting the trees at the expense of the forest.
- Patte Kronlund asked when Caltrans will use the BSBO committee if it's an emergency or planned project or input on what the overall visuals will be. She added in some ways that's sort of the crux. She added we are finding out now what has been determined under an emergency project, which we understand, but she believes this committee could meet at an emergency session if it was presented for input on what that visual was going to be for the railings.
- Ms. Diehl responded to Patte Kronlund that if somebody would fund it, yes.
- Mr. Glazer stated back to Mr. Hill's point, when we were looking at the treatment, the 36-inch concrete with the rock face printed, and asked if that is a viable change. Mr. Glazer stated if we were to make that recommendation, would that be more aesthetically close to what was there than the ST75 and if that's within Caltrans necessary treatment and standards, it could be adopted as part of the plan. He added he realizes that you are down the road but given that we are just now getting that [information.] He asked are we were talking about a realistic effect that we could have as the organization right now.
- Mr. Hill responded to Mr. Glazer that there would be a delay and that it could be one or two weeks. He added that in terms of reopening we would be going backwards in design.
- Mr. Glazer stated understood but clarified if they could do it at this point.
- Mr. Hill stated if a decision was made today, we could talk about it and take it back to the team. He stated as we said we need a couple of weeks.

- Mr. Glazer stated in his experience being intimately a part of the Castro Canyon Bridge Project and talking about we want to finish this historic bridge. He added there is no doubt the stamped concrete would be more culturally consistent with what was there and that transition from Rocky Creek to the 2012 viaduct. He added there is no doubt the stamp concrete would be better than ST75, which would yield way more like what Pfeiffer Canyon Bridge is, which is ST75. He added he does not want to speak unanimously but would encourage this organization to make that recommendation now. He added if we want to have an impact and to say that we are willing to represent the community in slowing the project down by whatever amount, that would not be part of my recommendation, but to say that we would definitely rather see stamped, finished concrete and then to get to the nitty gritty on how that design applies versus ST75.
- Mr. Beck stated south of the project where there's a viaduct it looks like a viaduct. He added it does not look like it is trying to look like something from 1935. He added he is prejudiced as he does not like things that are trying to look like other things. Mr. Beck asked if the rock wall that existed in the project area would all come out.
- Mr. Stoehr answered Mr. Beck that it would.
- Mr. Beck stated the problem is where you have the historic bridge and you are now going to put in a viaduct that is constructed in the 21st century. He added, I do not like fake rock, but you have a 1930-whatever bridge, and now you are going to have a 2025 viaduct jammed up against each other, it is a problem. He added he does not have a solution. He noted it is one thing to have the viaduct around the corner across the Rocky Creek Bridge but for now you have got these slammed up against each other.
- Mr. Glazer stated the beauty is we do not have all the options in the world. He added we have a Caltrans standard options that are possible, and they are few and approved. Mr. Glazer added that we have a very limited menu to choose from and to play the ball where it lies because the viaducts going where it is going, and the bridge is where it is.
- Mr. Beck asked if actual rock is an option.
- Mr. Hill responded to Mr. Beck that it is not approved and that they have not had it tested. He noted functionally it can catch a rock, bumper, or car and it acts differently than a smooth surface. He stated the stamped has been tested.
- Ms. Diehl stated this reinforces her point which is they need to come up with a test and culturally appropriate alternative railing for Big Sur so we do not have to go through this discussion every time we need to have it.
- Mr. Hill stated I hear you. He stated that Rocky Creek Bridge rail is the next one and that they are moving forward with and trying to come up with a new design. He added that may be four years in the future.
- Ms. Diehl stated she understands about the emergency and about the now and she wants to use that as an opportunity to say we want a universal set of designs that we can use here and in other places.
- Mr. Price stated Harmony had added items in the chat and asked if she wanted to speak for public comment.

- Harmony stated that she did a brief search and found examples of what they proposed looks like.
- Mr. Glazer stated we have an opportunity now to speak in an active role and to possibly have an impact on this project in this moment, hearing that if we make a proposal if we have an agreement, let's move forward one way or another.
- Mr. Price stated he believed Mr. Foster posted something in the chat and asked if he had a comment.
- Mr. Foster said no, nothing to add in the chat. He added it sounds like this is turning into another bridge rail design battle. He added that he does not know of anybody that has caught their bumper or gone over the side of the rock wall that has been there for almost a hundred years. He added that he knows this must be up to State and Federal safety standards, but it will destroy the visual impact of what makes this place so special. Mr. Foster said that sometimes he feels like Caltrans throws the Big Sur Land Use Plan aside to accommodate the false narrative of public safety and I wish we could get past that.
- Mr. Aldinger said that whatever happens with this viaduct rail, we will not make everybody happy. He stated the proposed alternative to the Garrapata Bridge with smaller openings would be his preference but again stated that it is just his opinion. He stated either that bridge rail or stamped concrete that tries to look like rock, either of those is preferable to ST75.
- Ms. Diehl said she heard a great deal from the community on bridge railing over the past while she would say universally steel is not preferred. She added any options that is not steel would be better. She added she does not have a preference among those [options discussed] but that she does know that the community has spoken loud and clear about not wanting to move to steel like that 2012 rail.
- Mr. Stoehr stated where the railing is going to be on the new viaduct between where the endpoint is on the existing Rocky Creek Bridge is an approximate 40-to-50-foot transition that we need to make up. Mr. Stoehr stated he spoke about a concrete end block that is going to be employed, integral color, employed in that concrete block and based on surrounding conditions that landscape, architecture, archaeological, historical architecture. He added that, in this case, normally those are 10-feet in length, in this situation because they have that 40-to-50-foot gap that's going to be a 40 to 50-foot long at least what it looks like at this point. He stated the reason I am bringing that up is we are not looking at ST75 right up against the existing bridge rail. He added we are looking at ST75 and then the gap is going to be filled with a concrete end block. He noted that all of that must be looked at from a traffic safety standpoint, as mentioned, based on their current standards. He noted the potential of another option to ST75 and as Mr. Hill had mentioned a potential one-to-two-week delay. He added that in taking the recommendation and filtering it through the appropriate individuals that we need to filter it through, he is not sure how that is going to be looked at from a traffic safety perspective and what physically could be done. He added it is hard to put a finger on what the time impact is because of that at this point in the project and noted he just wanted to remind.
- Mr. Ortega asked if there is somewhere in the corridor that has stamped concrete.
- Mr. Hill responded there is a wide variety of stamped concrete.

- Mr. Stoehr responded that stamp concrete is subjective.
- Mr. Glazer stated stamped concrete can take on many forms, shapes, and color schemes. He stated ST75 can be colored.
- Mr. Stoehr agreed with Mr. Glazer's comment and added that the metal railing element can be stained. He noted Natina stain as they call it related to the manufacturer that does that type of work. He stated but you are right stamped concrete is kind of a subjective term and that there is texture, color, depth of form. He noted you use a longer form to establish that stamp look. He added stamped meaning it can take on many different facets.
- Ms. Diehl noted that Ms. Harvey had her hand raised via Zoom.
- Ms. Harvey stated she was thinking maybe two motions could be made here. She stated one of them could be replacing the ST75 or just stating for the community that is what we would prefer with the stamped concrete. She noted to possibly make another motion if appropriate that moving forward we request that Caltrans collaborate with the Big Sur Byways Organization in the beginning, so that it does not become the time constraint. She said we can put that as a formal motion to request collaboration.
- Ms. Diehl asked for other comments. She stated she is torn but knows she is absolutely 100% not steel but that she is not set in her ways and could go either way. She noted remembering that this is an emergency repair and to be always mindful and grateful that the repairs are occurring and that it did not have enough time to go through an elaborate design process and all of that. She stated she could not let the opportunity go by to state that switching from the 1930s to the 2012 look is not something she can support.
- Mr. Aldinger asked do you have a sense of between Garrapata bridge rail alternative and stamped concrete, would either of those present a shorter or longer delay in the project.
- Mr. Hill responded probably not.
- Ms. Diehl asked if someone wanted to make a motion.
- Patte Kronlund clarified for example, whatever railing, stamped concrete or the Garrapata Bridge Rail that this committee wants to put forth would it be from the Rocky Creek Bridge all the way through the viaduct south, meaning the same type of rail and asked do you still have to do that.
- Mr. Stoehr responded yes to Patte Kronlund.
- Mr. Stoehr stated, "I think what you were talking about was that gap between the Rocky Creek Bridge and this new viaduct.
- Patte Kronlund responded yes and that is what she wanted to clarify what it is going to look like.
- Mr. Stoehr stated the answer to your question is no there will still be that gap there and that it is not going to that ST75 running the whole line.
- Ms. Diehl stated she appreciated the clarification. She said her concern in general is she does not want to see them moving to metal railings anywhere along the coast. She stated so she is comfortable saying options that are not metal would be preferable to her.

- Mr. Aldinger stated the answer for me is that there seems to be more support for stamped concrete.
- Mr. Ortega stated he agreed with Mr. Aldinger's comment. He added out of respect for Caltrans design that has attempted to come close and that he realizes the permanent solution is down the road for some of these other projects. He stated as far as consistency if this would be the design that wins out that it remains consistent throughout.
- Mr. Stoehr stated you have the existing Rocky Creek Bridge and then you have this new section of viaduct and added we cannot control where the incident occurred. He stated it happened for reasons we just talked about. He noted right up against the existing approach slab to the Rocky Creek Bridge. He stated you can confirm the pavement which approximates the approach slab and then you have another repair incident, where again we could not control where its location was. He stated in effect you know the intent of the ST75 from an architectural and archaeological input we received as part of the project development team is that we are not attempting to emulate or copy what was there previously. He said we know what this must go because of our project's limitations. He stated the ST75 is a rather neutral approach to keeping that. He stated this repair is independent of what ends up happening with regards to railing for the Rocky Creek Bridge when that project comes through, date yet to be determined. He stated there was not intent to say that this is necessarily the best for this specific area as a whole. He stated there were emergency repairs similar to what was done down there. He stated they are carrying that neutral aspect to this point and then the gap that you were asking about is closed by a concrete end block.
- Ms. Diehl responded that the thought process is the issue. She stated that she does not support mock or copying either, but she thinks that it is essential that we compliment the historical character in whatever we do. She added she agrees with the community that what happened in 2012 does not complement the cultural, historical, and visual character of Big Sur. She added so anything that extends that is something that I would think was inappropriate. She stated we have to complement it and we want to bring it forward. She stated the history we have we want to feature and we do not want to gradually and incrementally make it go away because it's inconvenient and added that is what it feels like. She stated it's happening in this location as a model for things that might happen throughout the coast. She added we must deal with these slides so she is not so concerned about the incidents as about the thought process that equates making something that would visually carry that experience through on the same kind of history. She stated because the metal that happened in 2012 is neutral because that's not neutral in her mind at all and that is something that is very jarring in the experience. She added that is the kind of thinking I am hoping that we can work through the motion to mean that, more than to do this kind of design.
- Jason Field asked does the Heritage staff explore other options for the railing or do they ever talk about stamped concrete.
- Mr. Stoehr stated short answer yes. He stated there are multiple factors that come into it one of those being from a traffic safety perspective. He said the railing we use must be match compliant. He stated we looked at it extensively multiple individuals not just himself. He added from a design standpoint they have landscape architects, we have historical

architectural folks that work through our division and structural design to take a look at it and what can be implemented into the structure that we're building from a structural perspective.

- Mr. Glazer said we are pressed for time and have a chance to act now if this body wants to.
- *A motion was made that Big Sur Byways Organization recommends stamped concrete for the guardrail at Rocky Creek emergency viaduct 2024 project in place of the proposed Caltrans ST75 by Matt Glazer, second by Rick Aldinger. Katie Moon was absent. Mark Grandcolas has left the meeting. Forest service has abstained. The motion carried.*
- Ms. Diehl asked for any further discussion. Ms. Diehl stated it is less about the treatment than the approach.
- Ms. Harvey stated on the south coast she wanted to reiterate what Mr. Glazer mentioned about the littering. She stated she wanted to reiterate that several complaints that we have had down here from contracted crews speeding, driving 70 miles per hour past the school every day while they are getting off work. She stated she wanted to respectfully bring that up with Caltrans again and noted that it has been happening for about a year and a half so she just wanted to take the opportunity to bring it up again and to note that it happens everyday around 4:30pm and that it is very dangerous.
- Ms. Diehl stated that we are not going to get to the rest of our agenda. She had asked Patte Kronlund and Rachel Goldberger to prepare a presentation about what the traffic counter is saying and what we have learned. She noted they have graphs and such and she stated maybe they can make the PowerPoint available for people before the next meeting so anyone interested could begin to look at traffic patterns and trends that might help them in their own decision making. She stated we will not be able to get to general comments today. She added she wanted to give Mr. Price an opportunity to say anything about the administration of this.
- Mr. Price stated future discussion on the funding piece and grant funding may be useful.
- Ms. Diehl stated she may be calling on people asking if they wish to help us on the Administration Committee and things like that offline. She stated so we can re-energize our efforts to fund meetings.
- Ms. Diehl stated when Mr. Price puts out a notice that we are coming up with an agenda, please weigh in. She stated if you have anything you want from anybody you want to put forward, at least let's get it on the list because as you see we have so little time. She noted if it's not on the list we do not get to it at all. She stated she is so glad that we got our Highlands resident. She stated she so appreciated everybody coming here today. She stated it is wonderful to have Caltrans' participation and that she hates to be adversarial about this and that she really wants us to get earlier enough that people can use them.
- Patte Kronlund asked what the annual funding is needed for Big Sur Byways Organization.
- Ms. Diehl responded that we do not know and that we do not have anything to figure out what we need to know. She stated the county is contributing administrative support for all of these meetings and See Monterey is providing administrative support taking minutes that is all we have so far.

BIG SUR BYWAY ORGANIZATION (BSBO) – SPECIAL MEETING

FINAL MINUTES for Wednesday, August 21, 2024
10 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Adjournment

10. Adjournment – Ms. Diehl adjourned the meeting at 12:02pm

Next Regular Scheduled Meeting: November 20, 2024