



**STOCKTON
EAST WATER
DISTRICT**

PROVIDING SERVICE SINCE 1948

www.sewd.net

DIRECTORS

Richard Atkins
Division 1

Andrew Watkins
Division 2

Ryan Hansen
Division 3

Melvin Panizza
Division 4

Paul Sanguinetti
Division 5

Paul Nakaue
Vice President
Division 6

Thomas McGurk
President
Division 7

STAFF

Justin M. Hopkins
General Manager

Juan M. Vega
Assistant General Manager

LEGAL COUNSEL

Jeanne M. Zolezzi
General Counsel

Phone 209-948-0333
Fax 209-948-0423

E-mail sewd@sewd.net

6767 East Main Street
Stockton, CA 95215

Post Office Box 5157
Stockton, CA 95205

MEETING NOTICE

The Agriculture Operations Committee
Of the Stockton East Water District
Board of Directors will meet at

10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 17, 2026

At the District Office, 6767 East Main Street, Stockton, CA

Assistance for the Disabled: If you are disabled in any way and need accommodation to participate in the meeting, please contact Administrative Staff at (209) 948-0333 for assistance so the necessary arrangements can be made.

Agendas and minutes are located on our website at www.sewd.net.

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|---|------------------------|
| 1. | Roll Call - Chairperson Atkins, Director Nakaue, Director Hansen, Director Sanguinetti (Alternate) | <u>Page No.</u> |
| 2. | Public Comment | |
| 3. | Stockton East Water District – Staff Report – Consider Approval of Replacement, Removal, and/or Quitclaim Deed of Bridges | 01 |
| 4. | Adjournment | |

Certification of Posting

I hereby certify that on June 12, 2026, I posted a copy of the foregoing agenda in the outside display case at the District Office, 6767 East Main Street, Stockton, California, and said time being at least 24 hours in advance of the Agriculture Operations Committee Meeting (Government Code Section 54954.2). Executed at Stockton, California on June 12, 2026.

Priya Ram, Director of Finance & Administration
Stockton East Water District

Any materials related to items on this agenda distributed to the Agriculture Operations Committee of the Stockton East Water District less than 72 hours before the public meeting are available for public inspection at the District's office located at the following address: 6767 East Main Street, Stockton, CA 95215. Upon request, these materials may be available in an alternative format to persons with disabilities.

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

DATE: June 17, 2026

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3

TITLE: Calaveras River Bridges

SUBJECT: Consider Approval of Replacement, Removal, and/or Quitclaim Deed of Bridges

Executive Summary

The Stockton East Water District (District) presently maintains many crossings within the New Hogan distribution system. The District recently engaged Weatherby Reynolds Frison Engineering to structurally evaluate each crossing while staff concurrently evaluated our obligations to continue maintenance of the crossings. Based on the evaluations, staff recommend the Board authorize the General Manager to:

1. Proceed with including bridge demolition in the next budget cycle of bridges that have a condition score of 5 or less and are not being used (2 bridges per **Table 1**).
2. Incorporate into the District's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for budgeting and planning purposes any bridge that has a condition score of 5 or less – to be built by staff.
3. Pursue Quitclaim Deed transfers to landowners who own both sides of a bridge as part of the bridge replacement process prioritization.
4. Pursue Quitclaim Deed transfers to landowners who do not own both sides of a bridge.
5. Pursue Quitclaim Deed transfers for those bridges that have undergone unauthorized modifications by landowners.

Background

The District is required to maintain bridges at various locations on the Calaveras River. Many of these bridges were built before the District was formed, and some have become liability concerns. District staff engaged Weatherby Reynolds Frison Engineering and Design to survey all the bridges and rate them on a scale from 1 to 10. In addition to ratings, the survey included summaries, photographs, and recommendations.

Based on this review, staff have made recommendations for each bridge based on condition, landowner and grower use, and unapproved modifications made by landowners — or, in some cases, no current use at all. Options include full removal or replacement. Staff also recommend exploring the use of Quitclaim Deeds between the District and landowners for bridges that:

1. Connect properties under different ownership, or
2. Have undergone unauthorized modifications by landowners.

Over the years, repairs have been made by District staff as needed. However, due to the exceeded useful life of most bridges, the District has initiated planning for replacements. The bridge analysis report is available as **Attachment 1**.

One bridge was replaced by District staff in 2021 using a railcar-style structure to replace a wooden bridge, at a cost of \$117,794.93. The District successfully obtained a Quitclaim

Deed for the old bridge and that is why it is not listed here. The District still owns and is responsible for the replacement bridge’s maintenance.

Summary

District staff reviewed the condition and status of multiple bridges on the Calaveras River and recommended actions including removal, replacement, and/or the attempt of Quitclaim Deed transfers, depending on bridge usage and ownership. The Agricultural Committee previously reviewed this staff report on August 20, 2025, and made some recommendations which included determining if the bridge was being used, whether it presented a severance issue (both sides are owned by the landowner) and in that case whether the landowner would entertain a Quitclaim Deed transfer. Replacements completed by staff are significantly more cost-effective than contracted work and will be prioritized and budgeted accordingly. Based on the subsequent review by Staff, there are 5 bridges that rate less than 5 per the condition assessment but 2 of those are not used as can be seen in **Table 1**. Of the 3 remaining bridges, 2 are owned by the same landowner.

Bridge	Name	Rating	Same Owner?	Used?
8	Remington	2	No	No
6	Vaccarezza	3	Yes	No
13	Sunbury Farms	4	No	Yes
2	Rugani	5	Yes	Yes
12	Demartini #1	5	Yes	Yes
11	Demartini #2	6	No	Yes
9	Botsford	6	Yes	Yes
16	Gotelli	6	Yes	Yes
10	Houston	7	No	Yes
7	Celum	8	Yes	Yes
14	Adeline Podesta	8	Yes	Yes
1	Guthery	9	No	Yes
3	Williams	9	No	Yes
4	Becker	9	Yes	Yes
15	Podesta	9	Yes	Yes
5	Nixon	10	Yes	Yes

Table 1. Summary of Wooden Bridge Condition, Usage and Ownership

Financial Impact

If replaced by District staff, the estimated cost per bridge is approximately \$175,000. If contracted out, staff estimate the cost could significantly increase — potentially ranging from \$250,000 to \$350,000 per bridge. Bridge replacements will be prioritized based on criticality. All replacements will be budgeted and added to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). If replaced by District staff, bridges will have a lesser financial impact. At \$175,000 three bridges would cost \$525,000 while at \$350,000 that cost would rise to \$1,050,000.

Recommendation

Staff recommend the Board authorize the General Manager to:

1. Proceed with including bridge demolition in the next budget cycle of bridges that have a condition score of 5 or less and are not being used (2 bridges per **Table 1**).
2. Incorporate into the District's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for budgeting and planning purposes any bridge that has a condition score of 5 or less – to be built by staff.
3. Pursue Quitclaim Deed transfers to landowners who own both sides of a bridge as part of the bridge replacement process prioritization.
4. Pursue Quitclaim Deed transfers to landowners who do not own both sides of a bridge.
5. Pursue Quitclaim Deed transfers for those bridges that have undergone unauthorized modifications by landowners.

Staff Responsible for Report

Chris Donis

Chris Donis, Water Supply Manager

Date: 06/17/26

Juan Vega

Juan M. Vega, Assistant General Manager

Date: 06/17/26

Justin M. Hopkins

Justin M. Hopkins, General Manager

Date: 06/17/26

Attachments

1. Bridge report by Weatherby-Reynold-Fritson WRF Engineering and Design

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK



July 10, 2023

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
P.O. Box 5157
Stockton, CA 95205

RE: FIELD OBSERVATION OF SIXTEEN (16) BRIDGES ON THE OLD CALAVERAS RIVER TO DETERMINE STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY AND PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY AND ANALYSES.

Dear Mr. Evensen;

On March 16th, 2023, this engineer met you and your representatives to review the first twelve (12) bridges listed below. On April 13th, 2023, this engineer met you and your representatives to review the last four (4) bridges listed below. Each bridge below is listed by name, a paragraph about construction, a paragraph about recommendations, and a general rating from 1-10 (10 is best) of their current condition.

1. Guthery

This bridge is constructed using a flatbed train car to span and is supported by concrete abutments at each end. The wood decking on top is in good condition. Abandoned existing (E) concrete piers were observed below. This bridge is very new.

This bridge appears in excellent condition. The installation of a guardrail should be considered for safety purposes. The current Code requires a guardrail where the step to adjacent grade is greater than thirty (30) inches.

Bridge Rating - 9.

2. Rugani

This bridge is constructed with wood decking over wood beams. The wood beams span between concrete abutments at each end with two wood-framed cross supports in the span. Each cross support consists of a wood beam supported by wood posts bearing on a concrete grade beam footing. Three (3) newer 8x8 wood posts appear to have been added recently to the north cross-beam support. Some of the main 4x12 wood decking members have been replaced. No guardrail was observed.

Two (2) or Three (3) additional 8x8 supports should be added to the south cross-beam support similar to the north. Some of the 4x12 wood decking members need replacement soon. Additional 4x12 and/or 4x14 wood decking members will need to be replaced as they deteriorate. The installation of a guardrail should be considered for safety purposes. The current Code requires a guardrail where the step is greater than thirty (30) inches.

Bridge Rating - 5.

3. Williams

This bridge is constructed with wood decking over wood beams. The wood beams span between concrete abutments at each end and two full-height concrete cross-support piers break up the span. This bridge appears very new. No guardrail was observed.

This bridge is in excellent condition. The installation of a guardrail should be considered for safety purposes. The current Code requires a guardrail where the step to adjacent grade is greater than thirty (30) inches.

Bridge Rating - 9.

4. Becker

This bridge is constructed using a flatbed train car to span, concrete slab decking, and is supported by 8x8 wood plates bearing on concrete abutments at each end. The concrete decking on top is in good condition. A steel guardrail using steel pipes was observed on each side. The concrete abutments at each end are minimal but sufficient.

This bridge is in very good condition. The concrete abutments and 8x8 bearing plates should be monitored for potential future challenges.

Bridge Rating - 9

5. Nixon

This covered bridge is constructed using a flatbed train car to span and is supported by concrete abutments at each end. The concrete decking on top is in good condition. The bridge is covered with wood-framed walls and roof. Openings along each side allow viewing of the slough and provide an appropriate guardrail.

This bridge is in excellent condition.

Bridge Rating - 10.

6. Vaccarezza

This bridge is constructed with wood decking over wood beams. The wood beams span between concrete abutments at each end and three (3) concrete cross-support piers break up the span. One of the concrete cross supports does not appear to provide any support to the bridge decking as there is no attachment. This bridge appears very old. The east end bay had been strengthened at some point using steel railroad track for beams. The concrete apron on the western end appears pretty dilapidated. The concrete abutments at each end exhibit cracks and appear to have been repaired multiple times. The concrete piers appear in relatively good condition. No guardrail was observed.

This bridge is in very poor condition. The bridge decking should be removed and appropriate wood beams be provided to span between the supports. Consideration should be given to replacing the concrete abutments at each end soon. The installation of a guardrail should be considered for safety purposes. The current Code requires a guardrail where the step to adjacent grade is greater than thirty (30) inches.

For the short term, minimal use of the bridge can continue but repairs should commence within the next couple of years.

Bridge Rating - 3

7. Celum

This bridge is constructed using a flatbed train car to span and is supported by concrete abutments at each end and a concrete cross-beam support in the

center. The steel plate decking on top is in adequate condition. The steel tubing guardrail has some deformation.

This bridge is in very good condition. The bottom of one of the concrete abutments exhibits some deterioration and should be patched (see the end of this report for patching recommendations) to minimize future potential problems. Also, consider repairing the unsightly guardrail at some point.

Bridge Rating - 8

8. Remington

This bridge has wood decking supported by wood beams, wood cross-beam supports bearing on concrete grade-beams, and concrete abutments at each end. This bridge appears to be more of a footbridge and does not appear to go anywhere. A portion of the decking was broken towards one end. That end of the bridge was inaccessible. The wood decking and a couple of the beams are deteriorating and borderline unsafe. The wood cross beams, concrete footings, and concrete abutments appear adequate. A wood guardrail was observed.

This bridge is in very poor condition but could be rehabilitated. If continued use is desired, replace the damaged wood decking and beams where decay is observed.

Bridge Rating - 2.

9. Botsford

This bridge has wood decking supported by steel assemblies that span between concrete abutments. The two steel assemblies are made up of steel channels with connecting steel plates to the top and bottom flanges in a crisscross pattern. The two assemblies span below the bridge to provide support for the vehicle tire path above. The steel assemblies span in the plane of the support beams. At the mid-span of the bridge, a wood cross beam hangs below the steel assemblies and is hung from them with rods and a steel plate above each steel assembly and below the cross beam. The concrete wing walls extending from the abutment have separated from the

main abutment. On one end, the wing wall was constructed of wood. A wood guardrail was observed.

This bridge appears in decent condition. The center wood cross beam appears to be deteriorating and will probably need to be replaced soon. The separation between the concrete abutment and the wing walls should be filled in with appropriate cementitious material and, possibly, doweled rebar. The wood wing wall should be replaced with concrete when feasible. Wood retaining walls perform very poorly in the long term.

Bridge Rating - 6.

10. Houston

This bridge has wood decking supported by wood cross beams that span between two army surplus steel trusses. The wood cross beams are supported at each end by the steel trusses at a panel point. The wood decking looks relatively new and was probably replaced 6-9 years ago. The trusses bear at each end on concrete abutments. An anomaly on the bridge along one edge resulted in a broken 4x6 wood decking member along an edge. The normal edge beam over most of the bridge does not exist at one of the truss bays resulting in insufficient vertical support. A steel guardrail could be observed on each side attached to the steel truss.

This bridge is in pretty good condition. Replace the missing deck beam to span between the truss panel points to match the existing beams throughout the rest of the deck. Replace the broken 4x6 decking member as well. The steel trusses are very old so should be checked often to make sure no dilapidating steel members and/or bolts could cause future structural challenges.

Bridge Rating - 7.

11. Demartini #2

This bridge is constructed using a flatbed train car to span and is supported by concrete abutments at each end and two (2) cross-beam supports breaking up the span. The concrete bridge topping is in very good condition. The light gage metal edges of the train car on each side appear very

unsightly but do not appear structurally significant at this time. At one of the two cross-beams, one of the columns is missing. The guardrail has some deformation and is missing over a good portion of one side.

This bridge is in fairly good condition. The missing column should be replaced in the very near future to match the existing columns that remain. This will minimize the potential for future unbalanced structural bridge difficulties. The missing guardrail and damaged portion should be replaced. One corner of one of the approach aprons has some erosion that should be strengthened to minimize potential future problems.

Bridge Rating - 6.

12. Demartini #1

This bridge has wood decking supported by wood beams, wood cross-beam supports, and concrete abutments at each end. Two (2) wood cross beams were supported with wood posts below bearing on a concrete footing on grade. Portions of the decking appeared severely dilapidated and covered with steel mesh. A minimal cable guardrail could be observed with posts lagged to the edge of the wood decking.

This bridge appears in fairly good condition but requires work. The support structure is in good shape but the wood decking needs repair and replacement. One beam appears more dilapidated than the others and replacement in the new future needs to be considered. The replacement of the guardrail should be considered for safety purposes. The existing cables are minimal.

Bridge Rating - 5.

13. Sunbury Farms

This bridge has wood decking supported by steel assembly beams and concrete abutments at each end. Steel diamond plates define the drive path on the surface. Two (2) concrete cross piers support three (3) steel assembly beams that support the wood decking directly. The steel assemblies are made up of steel channels with connecting steel plates to the top and bottom flanges in a crisscross pattern. The steel assemblies span below the

bridge to provide support for the vehicle tire path above. One of the concrete abutments has no concrete wing walls and exhibits severe undermining on the side. A minimal cable guardrail could be observed on each side of the bridge with post base plates lagged at the edge of the wood decking.

This bridge appears in adequate condition but requires work. A new concrete abutment needs to be provided at the undermined area to minimize potential future abutment difficulties. The new wing walls need to be doweled to the existing abutment and extend far enough outward that erosion of the hillside does not affect the abutment. The steel in the steel assembly beams needs to be monitored as it is deteriorating and will require replacement at some point in the not-too-distant future. The replacement of the guardrail should be considered for safety purposes. The existing cables are minimal.

Bridge Rating - 4.

14. Adeline Podesta

This bridge has a concrete decking slab supported by steel beams. The two steel beams span between the abutments and are each supported by two (2) circular concrete columns jacketed by steel breaking up the span. Steel cross channels extend outward from each steel beam to provide edge decking support. Cracks at the ends of the steel beams in the concrete abutments were observed. A steel channel guardrail could be observed on each side of the bridge.

This bridge appears in very good condition. The concrete cracks in the abutment should be patched using an epoxy system to minimize future difficulties. The steel beam surfaces appear to be dilapidating and should be properly protected.

Bridge Rating - 8.

15. Podesta

This bridge has a flat slab concrete deck with a 16" to 18" high concrete curb on each edge. The concrete flat slab is supported at each end with

concrete abutments and two (2) concrete crossbeams breaking up the span. Each concrete crossbeam is supported by three (3) circular concrete columns bearing on a concrete foundation grade beam. No guardrail was observed at the top of the concrete curb.

This bridge is in excellent condition. The addition of a guardrail as previously described should be considered for safety purposes.

Bridge Rating - 9.

16. Gotelli

This bridge has wood decking supported by three (3) steel assembly beams. The steel assemblies are made up of steel channels with connecting steel plates to the top and bottom flanges in a crisscross pattern. The steel assemblies span below the bridge to provide support for the vehicle tire path above. The steel assembly beams span between concrete abutments at each end and are supported by four (4) wood crossbeams breaking up the span. Each wood crossbeam is supported by four (4) "wood/steel" posts. Each of these posts is wood for the top half and steel pipe for the bottom half. The row of steel pipes is supported by a concrete grade-beam. No guardrail was observed although vertical wood posts from a presumably previously existing one could be seen.

This bridge support structure is in fairly good condition. The wood decking will need to be repaired or replaced soon. The strangest item is the support columns being constructed of partial wood and partial steel pipe. The connection between the two elements is generally discouraged because this condition creates a hinge where buckling of the column could occur. These columns should be replaced with either full-height wood posts or full-height steel pipes. The addition of a guardrail as previously described should be considered for safety purposes.

Bridge Rating - 6.

END

Water in the slough can tend to break down exposed wood posts, concrete piers or columns, or exposed steel columns so general observational maintenance needs to

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
July 10, 2023
Page 9 of 28

be ongoing. Treatment and patching are both good solutions but replacement may need to be done if a structural element has deteriorated beyond repair.

For damaged or deteriorated wood, treatment with Copper Naphthenate (The Green Stuff) is recommended. All wood used for replacement or repair needs to be Preservative Treated or Redwood (or another naturally resistant type of wood) intended for outdoor use. The connectors used should be stainless steel or hot-dipped galvanized (HDG).

For patching concrete, high-strength epoxy is recommended. Sika, Damtite, or Quikcrete are three manufacturers that can provide appropriate epoxy repair compounds. For patching of concrete cracks, we recommend that cracks smaller than 1/4" be filled in with Simpson Crack-Pac Injection Epoxy installed per the manufacturer's instructions. Simpson advises that this product is not recommended for cracks over 1/4" in width.

Steel exposed to weather should be galvanized per ASTM A123 and, if damaged, should be touched up as recommended by the American Galvanizers Association using zinc-based solders, zinc-rich paint, or zinc spray (metalizing). Another option for protecting existing steel members would be to use two-part epoxy systems such as Rust-oleum, Loctite, J-B Weld, or equal.

Our scope of services has been limited to a review of this portion of work pertaining to the referenced structure only with regard to conformance to the minimum requirements outlined in the prevailing California Building Code (CBC) and amended by the local building authority for this project. Please observe that no structure or portion thereof can ever be completely safe from potential damage due to loads in excess of the minimums required in the CBC or the local building authority. The referenced structure has been cursorily reviewed by our office, pursuant to the acceptable risk standards established by the CBC, and amended by local ordinance. Normal care has been taken to provide the professional's opinion contained herein. No warranties are either expressed or implied.

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
July 10, 2023
Page 10 of 28

If you have any questions or additional comments, please call me.

Sincerely,

WEATHERBY-REYNOLDS-FRITSON Engineering and Design



Terrence E. Weatherby
Structural Engineer S3321

TEW

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
July 10, 2023
Page 11 of 28

APPENDIX A



BRIDGE 1 GUTHERY



Bridge Rating - 9.

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
July 10, 2023
Page 13 of 28



BRIDGE 2 RUGANI



Bridge Rating - 5.



BRIDGE 3 WILLIAMS



Bridge Rating - 9.



BRIDGE 4 BECKER



Bridge Rating - 9.

BRIDGE 5 NIXON



Bridge Rating - 10.

BRIDGE 6 VACCAREZZA



Bridge Rating - 3.

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
July 10, 2023
Page 18 of 28

BRIDGE 7 CELUM



Bridge Rating - 8.

BRIDGE 8 REMINGTON



Bridge Rating - 2.





BRIDGE 9 BOTSFORD



Bridge Rating - 6.



BRIDGE 10 HOUSTON



Bridge Rating - 7.

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
July 10, 2023
Page 22 of 28



BRIDGE 11 DEMARTINI #2



Bridge Rating - 6.

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
July 10, 2023
Page 23 of 28



BRIDGE 12 DEMARTINI #1



Bridge Rating - 5.



BRIDGE 13 SUNBURY FARMS



Bridge Rating - 4.



BRIDGE 14 ADELINE PODESTA



Bridge Rating - 8.



BRIDGE 15 PODESTA



Bridge Rating - 9.



BRIDGE 16 GOTELLI



Bridge Rating - 6.

Mr. Darrel Evensen, P.E. District Engineer
Stockton East Water District
July 10, 2023
Page 28 of 28

END