



MEETING SUMMARY

Red Wing Bridge - Project Advisory Committee (PAC) #2

June 21, 2012

1:00 p.m.

Red Wing Public Library - Foot Room

Meeting Chair: Chris Hiniker

Minutes by: Mark Benson

Present: Dean Hove, Rick Moskwa, Ted Seifert, Ken Bjornstad, Patty Brown, Whitney White, Greg Paulson, Chad Hanson, Kristin Kammuehler, Jay Owens, Brian Peterson, Tara Carson, Jim Koenig, Chris Hiniker, Mark Benson, Todd Lang, Todd Stevens, Nancy Klema,

Copies to: PAC Members

I. Introductions

II. Purpose and Need Status

- A. Chad reviewed a summary of the projects Purpose and Need which will guide the development and evaluation of the alternatives (*see attachment*). The needs are divided into primary, secondary, and other considerations.
- B. Comment: Seems like other considerations should include residential and business impacts, specifically the neighborhood impacts to the "East End" residents. It was also recommended to include cultural impacts in the other considerations section.
- C. **ACTION: The purpose and need will be revised to reflect consideration of these additional items.**

III. Public Outreach Update

- A. April 12th Open House (see attached summary)
 1. Attended by approximately 30 people
 2. Some of the comments included the desire to have the Bluff Neighborhood area engaged in the process and the need to include the bicyclist community in the process.
 3. **ACTION: Michelle Lease and Ashlyn Christianson from Live Healthy Red Wing have been added to the PAC to represent the bicyclist community.**
 4. **ACTION: A separate public informational meeting will be held for the Bluff Neighborhood residents after the project alternatives have been drafted.**
- B. April 30th Environmental Agency Workshop
 1. Kick off meeting with agency representatives went well and provided opportunity for representatives to tour the study area.
- C. May 17th Listening Session (*see attached summary*)
 1. First informal listening session was well attended (about 20 people).
- D. Newsletter #1 – Distributed in advance of Open House #1
- E. E-mails Update Registration – Encourage all PAC members to sign up, see link from project website below.
- F. Project Website - <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/d6/projects/redwing-bridge/index.html>
- G. Bluff Neighborhood Outreach

1. Meeting referenced above will occur in Fall 2012
- H. Next Newsletter and Open House – Fall 2012

IV. Alternatives Analysis Update

- A. Outlined overall process to arrive at a preferred alternative in Summer 2013
- B. Currently working on narrowing to 3 to 5 project wide alternatives in the next two months
- C. New Bridge Location Assessment and Screening
 1. Looked at alternative alignments
 - a. Concluded that new alignments would have greater impacts so they would not be studied further (unless the impacts of the existing alignment are too great).
 - b. FHWA clarified that new location alternatives might need to be revisited to address specific regulations depending on the impacts associated with the existing alignment options.
 2. U.S. Coast Guard Comments
 - a. Oppose new corridor alignments
 - b. Maintain existing vertical and horizontal clearance with any new bridge alternatives at the existing crossing location.
- D. Traffic Tasks
 1. River Crossing Daily Traffic Volumes
 - a. Recent counts have been higher than the volumes indicated on MnDOT & WisDOT's statewide average daily traffic volume maps.
 - b. In the process of adjusting base volume to reflect this more refined information
 - c. Truck traffic
 - (1) Approximately 9% of traffic is trucks
 - (2) Changes in the region are increasing trucks including frac sand operations.
 2. Two vs. Four Lane Volume Threshold
 - a. Using 1.35% straight annual growth to develop 2042 forecast volume. This is the average of the historical straight-line growth and the Collar County Model.
 - b. Forecast traffic is in range where four lanes are considered
 - c. Question regarding cost differences between two and four lane. In general the four lanes will be close to double the cost (but there are some economies of scale). This would be costs for two new bridges, but there is also the potential for one new parallel bridge along with rehab of the existing bridge and other variations of these alternatives. These costs could vary greatly among the different alternatives.
 3. Traffic Operations Analysis will be used to design the intersections.
- E. Range of Alternatives
 1. River Crossing Options
 - a. Rehabilitate existing bridge
 - (1) Sub option considering a cantilevered sidewalk on each side
 - b. New 2-lane bridge
 - (1) Comment: If a new bridge is constructed adjacent to the existing bridge, the existing bridge corridor should be preserved for a possible new bridge.
 - c. Rehabilitate existing and construct a new parallel two lane bridge
 - d. New four lane bridge
 2. River bridge cross-sections
 - a. Modeling existing bridge to determine rehabilitation needs
 - b. Looking at sidewalk options/improved shoulders/cantilevered sidewalks
 3. Approach Roadway Options – six options under consideration

- a. Rehabilitate Bridge 9103 (Highway 63 overpass)
 - b. Buttonhook over TH 61 oriented away from downtown
 - c. Buttonhook over TH 61 oriented away from downtown with slip ramp connecting to 3rd Street.
 - d. At-grade roundabout
 - e. At-grade signal with three legged intersection
 - f. At-grade signal with four legged intersection
 - (1) Comment – consider connecting the fourth leg to 4th Street rather than 3rd Street?
4. Bridge 9103 Rehabilitation Study
 - a. The bridge over TH 61 is considered historic because it is the longest-tightest curved slab span bridge in the State.
 - b. Following a separate rehabilitation study process specific to historic bridges. This process will run concurrent to the ongoing alternatives development and evaluation process for the overall project area.
- V. Next Steps
- A. Screen to three to five project alternatives
 - B. Bridge inspections for the river crossing and Bridge 9103 will be underway week of June 25th
 - C. Contaminated properties study underway. The results will be used to inform the alternatives evaluation process.
 - D. Phase 2 architectural and archaeological studies are underway
- VI. Next Meeting
- A. PAC – September 20th 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. – Red Wing Library

If there are errors contained in this document, or if relevant information has been omitted, please contact Chris Hiniker at 651-490-2063.

Red Wing Bridge Purpose & Need Summary

June 21, 2012

Primary Needs

- A. NEED FOR STRUCTURALLY SOUND BRIDGE CROSSING OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER MAIN CHANNEL AT RED WING
- B. NEED FOR STRUCTURALLY SOUND CROSSING OF US TH 61

Secondary Needs

- D. NEED FOR CONTINUITY OF US TH 63
- E. NEED FOR CONNECTION TO US TH 61 AND MN TH 58
- F. NEED FOR ADEQUATE CAPACITY, ACCEPTABLE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS AND SAFE DESIGN
 - 1. Bridge Capacity
 - 2. Operational Deficiencies (Connecting Roadways & Intersections)
 - 3. Safety
 - 4. Bridge, Roadway, and Intersection Interrelationship
- G. NEED FOR MAXIMUM MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC
- H. NEED FOR ACCESS TO TRENTON ISLAND
- I. NEED TO MAINTAIN OR IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE FACILITIES

Other Considerations

- J. STRUCTURAL REDUNDANCY
- K. GEOMETRICS
- L. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
- M. PARKING
- N. REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS: PARKLAND, NAVIGATIONAL CHANNEL & STORMWATER



SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AT APRIL 2012 PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING

A public open house meeting to receive comments on the Red Wing Bridge Project was held as follows:

Thursday, April 12, 2012

5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

Red Wing Public Library, Foot Room

ATTENDANCE (MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET ENCLOSED)

- 27 individuals signed-in at the meeting

INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION (POSTED ON PROJECT WEBSITE)

A short project informational presentation was held at approximately 5:30 p.m. The presentation provided an update on the status of the project, outlined the process for identifying a preferred alternative, and provided information regarding the next steps in the environmental review and preliminary design process.

OPEN HOUSE EXHIBITS (POSTED ON PROJECT WEBSITE)

A series of project boards were located throughout the room covering items such as the study process, project purpose and need, and project schedule.

SUBMITTED COMMENT CARDS (ORIGINALS ENCLOSED, TYPED BELOW)

Attendees were invited to submit written comments on cards provided at the meeting. Three written comment cards were received at the meeting. The submitted comments are typed below.

Nancy Mikitta

Comment: Design of bridge – similar to what is there. Concerns – about impact on my neighborhood if access is looped to east or if cut closer to 4th & Plum.

Stanley Diercks (1828 Perlich Avenue, Red Wing; #651.385.0101)

Comment: New crossing 1100 Block Cedar and Pine Street closed at alley, to make room for half clover leave at end of bridge. Reroute old West Main under new bridge on the old railroad right of way. To get rid of the stop and go light at 61 and old West Main.

Bruce Blair

Comment: I discussed these issues with SEH staff but will also put in writing: 1) I have some concern that citizens, in and near Red Wing, are not at the “table” enough. 2) While Red Wing is most affected, there are stakeholders elsewhere – so what are the engagement opportunities for average citizens who do not live in Red Wing? 3) Bicycle and pedestrian interests need a special invitation to participate – they are critical stakeholders. 4) The presentation stressed the historical qualities of Red Wing – here is a challenge: design a solution that will be eligible for historic designation in 50 years!



SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AT MAY 2012 PUBLIC LISTENING SESSION

A public listening session to receive comments on the Red Wing Bridge Project was held as follows:

**Thursday, May 17, 2012
11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Red Wing Public Library, Foot Room**

ATTENDANCE (MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET ENCLOSED)

- 12 individuals signed-in at the listening session.

LISTENING SESSION EXHIBITS (FROM APRIL 2012 PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE #1)

A series of project boards were located throughout the room covering items such as the study process, project purpose and need, and project schedule.

SUBMITTED COMMENT CARDS (COPIES ENCLOSED, TYPED BELOW)

Attendees were invited to submit written comments on cards provided at the listening session. Two written comment cards were received. The submitted comments are typed below.

Andru Peters (Lake City)

Comment: 1.) Provide 10-foot bike lane on bridge and upgrade MN/WI TH 63 approaches for bikes to accommodate 10-foot lane i.e., local events Tour de Pepin; 100 mile garage sale; bikers river run. 2.) Construct bridge (learn from 35W bridge) to accommodate 2 million peds 24/7/365 with bridge swing of 15 feet. 3.) Change TH 63 onto MN 58 to truck highway and move off TH 63/61 R.W. to L.C. convert to historical/scenic road. 4.) Support MnDOT "MNGO" to "MRT Plans". 5.) Build short line RR from Maiden Rock to Red Wing through Hager City or Reeds Landing (copy ore cars) – truck loads onto rail cars short line.

Mike Schultz

Comment: Highway 58 connected via 4th to bridge diagonal through city parking lot (largely empty) – cuts through American Legion and other poor conditioned building.