

May 24, 2016  
James H. Gray, P.E.  
Concord, CA 94521

Board of Supervisors  
Contra Costa County  
651 Pine St., Room 107  
Martinez, CA 94553

**RE: Marsh Creek Road Bridge 28C141 Replacement, Agenda Item 7.c-BOS Meeting 5/10/16**

**Professional and Technical Concerns with Proposed Project**

Honorable Supervisors Anderson, Gioia, Mitchoff, Piepho, and Glover:


As the technical/engineering representative for the Dortzbachs', I have spent a substantial amount of time working with, and reviewing documents prepared by County Public Works Department(PW). Based on my interactions and participation in the CEQA document review process, I feel it necessary to send this letter expressing my concerns on their performance and attitude towards the residents for your consideration and action if you choose to do so.

The most significant concern is relative to the way the CEQA element was handled, starting with the performance of County consultants both in dealing with the affected residents as well as the actual performance of their studies. The management of this effort and apparent reliance on consultants to identify significant issues without sufficient in-house is troublesome to me. The fact that the document had over 100 comments, required an additional consultant to assess a significant oversight, and has delayed the process by at least two months speaks for itself. I also note that the attitude shown to the Dortzbachs' during the field work showed basic disrespect to them as well as missing an opportunity to gather information and avoid the recent delays. There also seems to me a disrespectful attitude towards the CEQA process, as reflected in the type of CEQA document prepared and that it was prepared by the project proponent(PW). It appeared to me to be prepared to justify the desired conclusion. The response to my comments requesting justification/substantiation of conclusions in the document were not answered. PW responses merely reiterated the PW position that the conclusions presented were valid. I highly doubt an outside agency reviewing permit application would accept such responses if they were asking the questions.

I also have concerns with the way Public Works Staff developed the justification for Federal funds and the opacity of the decision process/lack of documentation that defined the design scope currently being considered. I can only hope executive management (Supervisors'/Public Works director) would get more detail than I was able to get. I was also unable to get a clear and concise picture of the long term plan the County has for the Marsh Creek Rd. corridor despite a number of requests. It seems to me that it's harder to define objectives and scope of individual projects when overall priorities are not clearly defined.

I have asked to meet with Public Works top management to discuss my concerns. To date I have not had an answer. I think the Supervisors should consider whether Public Work's performance reflects the County's best effort, and make adjustments as needed. You are, after all, ultimately responsible for their actions.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
James H. Gray, P.E.

[Pick the Date]