



## MEETING SUMMARY

Red Wing Bridge --TAC #10/PAC #7

January 16, 2014

1:00 p.m.

Red Wing Public Library -- Foot Room

Meeting Chair: Chris Hiniker

Minutes by: Mark Benson

Present: Chad Hanson, Greg Paulson, Todd Stevens, Nancy Klema, Jim Rosenow, Anthony Wagner, Amy Adrihan, Mohamed Hayek, Jay Owens, Jess Greenwood, Patty Brown, Chris Hiniker, Todd Lang, Dan Dorgan, Mark Benson, Debra Moynihan, Abbi Ginsberg (via phone), Chris Moates, Jacob Bronder, Wendy Maves, Ben Jilk, Peter Leete, Teresa Martin, Rick Moskwa, Ted Seifert, Chad Johnson, Amber Blanchard, Nick Shaff, Sue Granger, Melissa Schultz, Anthony Nemcek-Zahorsky, Michael Bergervoet

**Copies to:** PAC/TAC Members

### I. Introductions

### II. Alternatives Analysis

#### A. Overview of Past Progress

1. Process began 7 years in advance of 2018 letting due to project complexities
2. Determined River Crossing will remain at its existing location
3. Identified and refined the approach roadway alternatives
4. Decided to proceed with a new 2-lane river bridge
5. Completed rehabilitation study of bridge 9103
6. Identified a recommended river crossing bridge type

#### B. Latest Approach Roadway Developments

1. Identified a recommended alternative on the Wisconsin approach
2. Completed comprehensive evaluation of three Minnesota approach alternatives

#### C. Latest River Bridge Developments

1. Three types were studied
  - a. Tied Arch
    - (1) Minimal profile raise
    - (2) Complex construction
    - (3) Higher inspection and maintenance
    - (4) Will require repainting
    - (5) Higher cost
    - (6) More difficult to expand in the future
  - b. Steel Box Girder
    - (1) Profile will raise approximately 4 feet
    - (2) Straight forward construction
    - (3) Straight forward inspection and maintenance
    - (4) Will require repainting
    - (5) Lower cost
  - c. Concrete Segmental
    - (1) Profile will raise approximately 13 feet

- (2) Moderately complex construction
    - (3) Straight forward inspection and least maintenance
    - (4) Lower cost
  2. Aesthetic Considerations – Sue Granger, Architectural Historian, Gemini Research
    - a. Conducted review of the structure types from an historic and cultural perspective.
    - b. Want to make sure the final structure is context sensitive.
    - c. Presented several images of the various bridge types from different perspectives.
    - d. From a historic/cultural perspective, the steel box design probably has the greatest potential to be the most compatible.
  3. Bridge 9103 Questions
    - a. What is the status of the bridge 9103 process? Study is still underway. Bridge 9103 is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.
    - b. What if the outcome is not acceptable to the community? Opportunity for public comment will continue throughout the environmental assessment.
    - c. Will all three 9103 bridge approach alternatives be carried forward through the NEPA process? This is being considered right now, it is preferred by MnDOT and WisDOT to have a single alternative.
    - d. It was noted that TH 61 will not be lowered to meet current standards for vertical clearance in the Rehabilitate Bridge 9103 Alternative.
    - e. If the button hook is constructed does TH 61 need to be reconstructed all the way to Potter Street? Yes, this is needed to develop the taper for the left turn lane. The TH 61 reconstruction project in 2015 will also begin at Potter Street.
- III. River Crossing Recommendation
  - A. Steel box girder design best balances the various evaluation criteria and will be carried into the Environmental Assessment process
  - B. Feedback from city and county representatives supported this decision
- IV. Environmental Assessment Process
  - A. This is a detailed impact assessment process to address state and federal laws
  - B. Many of the studies are currently underway
- V. Visual Quality Process
  - A. Process to determine aesthetic elements of the project (colors, lighting, railings, piers, trails, walls, etc.). Process will address the bridge as well as features on the approach roadways. Final product of the process will be a Visual Quality Manual for the project.
  - B. Next PAC/TAC meeting will outline the upcoming process and details
  - C. It is proposed that a Visual Quality Advisory Committee of up to 15 members be formed to guide and provide input for the process. Representation will be sought from the City, Heritage Preservation, businesses and residents, along with MnDOT and WisDOT staff.
- VI. Public Outreach Update
  - A. Listening Session #4 – November 2013
    1. Meeting was very well attended
  - B. Public Open House #3 – March 2014 (tentative)
  - C. Newsletter #3 will be distributed in March before the Open House
  - D. Project presentation opportunities
    1. Call Chad Hanson at MnDOT: 507-286-7637
  - E. Project Website - <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/d6/projects/redwing-bridge/index.html>
- VII. Next Meetings - Tentative

Red Wing Bridge --TAC #10/PAC #7

January 16, 2014

Page 3

- A. TAC #11 – February 20<sup>th</sup> 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- B. PAC #8 – March 20<sup>th</sup> 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

s:\ko\m\mnt06\119112\public involvement\pac meetings\4-18-13 red wing bridge tac #7-pac #4 summary.docx