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Letter 1:
Mn/DOT Cultural Resource Unit,
12/19/08
December 19, 2008

Mr. Dennis Gimmestad
State Historic Preservation Office
Minnesota Historical Society
345 Kellogg Blvd. W.
St. Paul, MN 55101-1906

Regarding: S.P. 1913-64 (TH 61, Washington and Dakota counties)
Bridge No. 5895 over the Mississippi River
T. 26 & 115 N., R. 20 & 17 W., Denmark Township & City of Hastings

Dear Mr. Gimmestad:

We are providing your office with this information pursuant to our FHWA-delegated responsibilities for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (36 CFR 800). The proposed project consists of either the replacement of the existing two lane bridge with a single or pair of bridges with a four lane capacity, or the rehabilitation of the existing bridge with the addition of a second new two lane bridge next to it.

Three cultural resource investigations were undertaken to identify and evaluate archaeological and architectural properties within the area of potential effect (APE). Please find enclosed these three final reports: TH 61 Hastings Bridge Replacement Project Phase I and II Architectural History Investigation, Dakota and Washington Counties, Minnesota by Stark Preservation Planning LLC and Landscape Research, LLC (2008), Phase I and II Archaeological Investigations for the Trunk Highway 61 Hastings Bridge Project, Dakota and Washington Counties, Minnesota by Two Pines Resource Group, LLC (2008), and Stratigraphic and Geoarchaeological Investigations at the Proposed Trunk Highway 61 Hastings Bridge Replacement Project, Dakota and Washington Counties, Minnesota by Strata Morph GeoeXploration, Inc (2008).

The archaeological and geomorphological survey and evaluation identified one site, St. John’s Hotel and Saloon (21DK0081) as being eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A and D. Since this site will be adversely affected by construction activities, mitigation of this effect will be addressed in a Memorandum of Agreement. Two sites (21WA0107, one unnumbered) on the north side of the Mississippi River are recommended as potentially eligible but could not be fully evaluated due to landowner concerns over expanded trenching. This area is currently not being considered for any storm water pond or construction staging activities. Four parcels in the City of Hastings (Block 4, Lots 2-4; Block 6, Lots 6-8; Block 12, Lots 3-4; Block 12, Lot 5) could not be fully tested or evaluated due to the presence of asphalt parking lots and logistical problems with their complete removal. These parcels were initially being considered for storm water ponds but are not at this time. However, if any of these...
sites or areas north or south of the river are designated for construction or staging activities, additional Phase I and II investigations will be conducted.

The architectural history survey identified 97 properties built in or before 1960. Two historic districts within the APE are listed in the NRHP, containing 38 and 13 properties. Three properties are individually listed in the NRHP, and four have been previously determined eligible. Of the properties surveyed during the Phase I survey, nine are recommended as eligible for listing and one as potentially eligible, in addition to the nine already listed or previously determined eligible (see Table 4, pp. 336-337). An assessment of effects study was conducted on all architectural properties within the APE listed in, determined eligible for listing in, or recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP. The assessment of effects took into account the four alternatives for bridge designs and various other elements related to the project being considered at the time of this investigation. The assessment concluded that various aspects and alternatives of the proposed project would have an adverse effect or potentially adverse effect to nine of the historic properties within the APE (see Table 3, pp. 332-333).

Our office continues to consult with you about the possible rehabilitation of National Register eligible bridge no. 5895. Although you are aware no preferred alternative has been selected, we request that you concur with the evaluation results in the interest of moving the project forward.

If you have additional questions regarding this project, please contact me at (651) 366-3614.

Sincerely,

Craig Johnson
Archaeologist
Cultural Resource Unit

cc: Joseph Hudak, Mn/DOT CRU
    Steve Kordosky, Mn/DOT Metro (1 report)
    Lynn Clarkowski, Mn/DOT Metro
    Brigid Gombold, Mn/DOT Metro (1 report)
    Steve Johnson, NPS-MNRRRA (1 report)
    Brad Johnson, USACE (1 report)
    Phil Forst, FHWA
    Justin Fortney, Hastings HPC (1 report)
    John Grossman, City of Hastings (3 reports)
    Chad Roberts, Dakota Co. Historical Society (1 report)
    Heidi Langenfeld, Le Duc Estate (1 report)
    Legislative Library (1 report)
    Mn/DOT Library (1 report)
    Scott Anfinson, OSA (1 report)
    Mn/DOT CRU/CO Files
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Property</th>
<th>Bridge Alt 1</th>
<th>Bridge Alt 2</th>
<th>Bridge Alt 3</th>
<th>Bridge Alt 4</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Storm Pond</th>
<th>Bicycle/ Pedestrian Ramp</th>
<th>Construction Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schaller Building, DK- HTC-008</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes House; DK-HTC-009</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diedrich Becker Wagon Shop; DK-HTC-010</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota County Courthouse; DK-HTC-015</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Second Street Commercial Historic District; DK-HTC-016</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyke-Libby House; DK-HTC-023</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West 2nd Street Residential District; DK-HTC-024</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Presbyterian Church; DK-HTC-029</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke’s Episcopal Church; DK-HTC-042</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Post Office; DK-HTC-119</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Depot; DK-HTC-125</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Property</td>
<td>Bridge Alt 1</td>
<td>Bridge Alt 2</td>
<td>Bridge Alt 3</td>
<td>Bridge Alt 4</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Storm Pond</td>
<td>Bicycle/ Pedestrian Ramp</td>
<td>Construction Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Manufacturing Company; DK-HTC-131</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker House; DK-HTC-164</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House; DK-HTC-166</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith House; DK-HTC-261</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge No. 5895; DK-HTC-318</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings National Bank; DK-HTC-323</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Potential Adverse Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM&amp;S&amp;W Railroad; DK-HTC-326 and WA-DMK-016</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine-Foot Mississippi River Navigation Channel Project Segment; DK-HTC-373 and WA-DMK-017</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO No.</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>NRHP Recommendation</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Area(s)</td>
<td>Potential for Adverse Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-008</td>
<td>Schaller Building</td>
<td>313 Ramsey St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-009</td>
<td>Archibald M. and Louisa Hayes House</td>
<td>307 Sibley St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-010</td>
<td>Diedrich Becker Wagon Shop</td>
<td>401-403 Vermillion St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>Ethnic History and Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-015</td>
<td>Dakota County Courthouse</td>
<td>101 E. 4th St.</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>Government and Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-016</td>
<td>East Second Street Commercial District</td>
<td>E. 2nd St.</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>Commerce and Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-023</td>
<td>Van Dyke-Libby House</td>
<td>612 Vermillion St.</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-024</td>
<td>West Second Street Residential District</td>
<td>Roughly W. 2nd St.</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-029</td>
<td>First Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>602 Vermillion St.</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>Social History and Architecture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-042</td>
<td>St. Luke's Episcopal Church</td>
<td>615 Vermillion St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>Social History and Architecture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-119</td>
<td>Hastings Post Office</td>
<td>300 E. 2nd St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>A, C and D</td>
<td>Social History, Architecture and Art</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-125</td>
<td>Hastings Depot</td>
<td>201 Tyler St.</td>
<td>Eligible; Contributing</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-131</td>
<td>H. D. Hudson Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>200 W. 2nd St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-164</td>
<td>Diedrich Becker House</td>
<td>110 E. 4th St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-166</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>312 E. 4th St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-261</td>
<td>Peter and Barbara Smith House</td>
<td>323 S. Ramsey St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ethnic History</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-318</td>
<td>Bridge No. 005895/Hastings Bridge</td>
<td>TH 61 over Mississippi River</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-323</td>
<td>Hastings National Bank</td>
<td>111 E. 3rd St.</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO No.</td>
<td>Property Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>NRHP Recommendation</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Area(s)</td>
<td>Potential for Adverse Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-326;</td>
<td>Chicago, Milwaukee &amp; St. Paul River Division Railroad</td>
<td>T114N, R15W, Sec. 27, Dakota Co.; T26, R20, SW 1/2 Sec. 7 Washington</td>
<td>Eligible; Contributing</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-DMK-016</td>
<td>Railroad Corridor Historic District Segment</td>
<td>Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-HTC-373;</td>
<td>9-Foot Mississippi River Navigation Channel Segment</td>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>Potentially Eligible</td>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>Commerce, Economics,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA-DMK-017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation, Government,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation, and Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Letter 2:
State Historic Preservation Office:
2/5/09
February 5, 2009

Mr. Craig Johnson
Cultural Resource Unit
MN Dept. of Transportation
Transportation Building, MS 620
395 John Ireland Boulevard
St. Paul, MN  55155-1899

Re:  S.P. 1913-64, T.H.  61
      Replace Bridge No. 5895 on T.H. 61 over the Mississippi River
      Denmark Twp. and the City of Hastings, Washington and Dakota Counties
      SHPO Number: 2008-2228

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above project. It has been reviewed pursuant to the responsibilities given the State Historic Preservation Officer by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the Procedures of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (36CFR800), and to the responsibilities given the Minnesota Historical Society by the Minnesota Historic Sites Act and the Minnesota Field Archaeology Act.

We have reviewed the results of the surveys of the project area, and have the following comments:

1. We concur with the determination that site 21DK0081 meets National Register criteria.

2. There are six areas which merit further archaeological investigation if they lie within the area of potential effect for the selected project design. These areas are: site 21WA0107, the identified mussel shell and charcoal scatter, and four lots recommended for Phase II/II investigations on page ii of the December 2008 archaeological survey report prepared by Two Pines Resource Group.

3. The following National Register-listed properties are in the project area: Dakota County Courthouse, East Second Street Commercial District, Van Dyke-Libby House, West Second Street Residential District, and First Presbyterian Church.

4. We concur with the determinations that the following properties meet National Register criteria: Schaller Building, Diedrich Becker Wagon Shop, Hastings Post Office, Hastings Depot, H.D. Hudson Manufacturing Company, House at 312 East 4th Street, Bridge No. 5895, Hastings National Bank, and the Chicago Milwaukee & St. Paul River Division Railroad Corridor Historic District Segment.
5. We do not concur with the determinations that the following properties meet National Register criteria: Archibald and Louisa Hayes House, St. Luke’s Episcopal Church, Diedrich Becker House, and Peter and Barbara Smith House.

You have indicated that the project is currently defined as the replacement of the National Register-eligible Hastings Bridge (Bridge No. 5895) with one of three structure types. We concur with your determination that any of these project alternatives would result in an adverse effect.

The preliminary analysis of project effects in the survey report will be helpful in completing the effects assessment as the planning process proceeds. We look forward to entering into the consultation process with your office and other interested parties. We would recommend that an effort be made to identify Section 106 consulting parties at an early stage in this process.

Contact us at 651-259-3455 with questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Britta L. Bloomberg
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Justin Fortney, Hastings Heritage Preservation Commission
    John Anfinson, National Park Service
    Will Stark, Stark Preservation Planning
    Carole Zellie, Landscape Research
    Michelle Terrell, Two Pines Research
Letter 3:
Mn/DOT Cultural Resource Unit,
1/14/09
January 14, 2009

Mr. Dennis G immestead  
State Historic Preservation Office  
Minnesota Historical Society  
345 Kellogg Blvd. W.  
St. Paul, MN 55101-1906

Regarding: S.P. 1913-64 (TH 61, Washington and Dakota counties)  
Bridge No. 5895 over the Mississippi River  
T. 26 & 115 N., R. 20 & 17 W., Denmark Township & City of Hastings

Dear Mr. Gimmestead:

We are providing your office with this information pursuant to our FHWA-delegated responsibilities for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (36 CFR 800), and as per the terms of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) between the FHWA and the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) (June 2005). We previously wrote to your office on 12/19/2008 with the determinations of eligibility and assessment of effects to one archaeological property and 19 architectural properties. The purpose of the present letter is to demonstrate the Department’s effort to identify and evaluate avoidance alternatives in relation to the Hastings Bridge, which is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

We have held numerous meetings with you and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee throughout 2008 to discuss cultural resources issues for the project, including the Hastings Bridge. In addition, there were three meetings held with you to specifically discuss the rehabilitation option for the structure. These meetings were held on 9/9/2008, 12/30/2008, and 1/9/2009.

The Mn/DOT Bridge Office completed a report detailing the rehabilitation options that would preserve the bridge but address the fracture critical and redundancy issues. Enclosed please find two copies of that report entitled *Bridge Rehabilitation Alternative Report for SP 1913-64 T.H. 61 Mississippi River Crossing in Hastings* by Keith Farquar, Senior Bridge Engineer from Mn/DOT. The rehabilitated bridge would be immediately adjacent to and downstream from a new arch bridge carrying two south-bound lanes of traffic. This report presents three rehabilitation alternatives – two external load path redundant and one internal load path redundant options. The two external path load redundant options basically involve a second bridge supporting the existing one either with a cable supported structure or duplicate truss members. The internal load path redundancy alternative involves replacing the entire deck and steel supporting members and substantial numbers and portions of the remaining members,
depending on height above the driving surface. In addition, vertical I-beams would have to be reinforced by converting them to box-beams, lateral bracing would be converted from lattice to solid I-beams, sway frames would be changed from open to solid configuration, sway frames at or near the bridge portals would be narrowed, and the railings would be replaced. Additional steel truss members would have to be added to the upper side trusses, changing them from a zig-zag pattern to a crossing or X pattern. Finally, crossing steel cables would run between the existing vertical members joining the deck to the upper trusses.

The Hastings Bridge is eligible under criterion C because it exhibits exceptional engineering to meet the unusual site conditions of fitting in with existing businesses and because it was the first steel tied-arch highway bridge built in Minnesota. The character-defining element of the bridge is the steel tied-arch truss, both in its visual appearance and the way the truss functions. The external path load redundant option that includes construction of a cable-stay structure dramatically affects the visual appearance of the bridge, as well as changes the way the structure works. The other external path load redundant option consists of building a bridge around the bridge. While the truss still works in the same way, the substantial addition of material dramatically affects the original appearance of the truss, including its design and workmanship. Finally, the internal load path redundancy alternative requires the addition of many additional members, creating a dramatically different appearance from the original truss design. Also, please note that all of the alternatives require substantial replacement of historic materials. Because of the dramatic changes to the appearance of the original truss design, the change in the way the truss works on one of the options, and the substantial amount of new materials, it is the determination of our office that the three rehabilitation alternatives would have an adverse effect on the Hastings Bridge, and would make the structure not eligible after rehabilitation.

At our meeting on 1/9/2009, you stated that you felt there is potential that the internal redundancy approach could result in the bridge still being eligible, depending on the design details. Due to lack of community support for preservation of the structure, the problems with maintenance under the three alternatives, and constructability issues, however, you stated that it is understandable why the rehabilitation option should not be carried forward. We all agreed that the Department demonstrated a good faith effort in trying to identify rehabilitation options that would result in preservation of the structure and compliance with redundancy issues in relation to Chapter 152. You stated your appreciation of the level of study, and encouraged the Department to keep the approaches developed for this project for application on other non-redundant historic bridges. Our office agrees that these approaches could be of great use on future rehabilitation projects.

Mn/DOT Metro District has defined the project as the replacement of the Hastings Bridge with either a twin box girder, a single arch, or single cable bridge. Since the Hastings Bridge will be replaced, it is the determination of this office that the project as currently proposed will result in an adverse effect to the Hastings Bridge and those properties discussed in our determination letter to you on 12/19/2008. These include St. John’s Hotel and Saloon (21DK0081) and
possibly nine architectural properties. We look forward to determining appropriate mitigation for the loss of the Hastings Bridge, and developing a Programmatic Agreement since not all project effects are known. We would appreciate your response in 30 days, but that due to the project schedule if it could be submitted to us prior to that, it would be greatly appreciated.

If you have additional questions regarding this project, please contact me at (651) 366-3614.

Sincerely,

Craig Johnson
Archaeologist
Cultural Resource Unit

encl

cc: Steve Kordosky, Mn/DOT Metro
Joseph Hudak, Mn/DOT CRU
Lynn Clarkowski, Mn/DOT Metro
Brigid Gombold, Mn/DOT Metro
Steve Johnson, NPS-MNRRA
Brad Johnson, USACE
Phil Forst, FHWA
Justin Fortney, Hastings HPC
John Grossman, City of Hastings
Chad Roberts, Dakota Co. Historical Society
Heidi Langenfeld, Le Duc Estate
Mn/DOT CRU/CO Files
Letter 4:
Mn/DOT and City of Hastings,
1/14/09
Date: Jan. 14, 2009

Mr. Barry Bernstein  
Parks and Recreation Director  
City of Hastings  
920 10th St. W.  
Hastings, MN 55033

Re: S.P. 1913-64 T.H. 61 Hastings Bridge Project  
Temporary Occupancy Letter

Dear Mr. Bernstein:

As part of the construction of a new T.H. 61 Mississippi River crossing, there will be temporary construction impacts to the City Hall property, Levee Park, Jaycee Park, Lake Rebecca Park, City of Hastings Flint Hills Nature Preserve, and the Hastings Loop Trail. The following outlines the proposed temporary impacts.

**City Hall property**  
As shown in the attached figure, the south west corner of the City Hall property, or the north east corner of Hwy. 61 and Fourth Street, will have temporary construction impacts. The triangular area shown, which is on the City Hall property, is currently a concrete sidewalk. As part of the project Mn/DOT’s pedestrian ramp at the intersection will be reconstructed. As part of this work the triangular piece of sidewalk on the City Hall property will also need to be reconstructed because it functions as a piece of the entire sidewalk at this corner. This will ensure that the concrete joints are smooth. This area will be closed to pedestrians during the reconstruction. The proposed work will simply replace the existing concrete sidewalk with new concrete and there will be no changes to the triangular piece of sidewalk, such as changes in size or elevation. There will be no impacts to adjacent fences, walls, or monuments. At the end of construction this area will be restored to an equal or better condition that existed at the time of the Project’s Contract Award.

**Levee Park**  
As shown in the attached figure, the Hastings Bridge Project will connect to an existing water main stub located in Levee Park, and extend the water main up to 2nd Street. The water main is owned by the City of Hastings and the work will be paid for by the City of Hastings. The Mn/DOT Contractor will perform the work. This area of the park will have a temporary easement and park.

An equal opportunity employer
users will not be allowed in this area. At the end of construction this area will be restored to an equal or better condition that existed at the time of the Project’s Contract Award.

**Jaycee Park**
As shown in the attached figure, a small portion of the Hastings Loop Trail that travels through Jaycee Park will be used as a delivery truck access to H. D. Hudson Manufacturing Company. This area of the park will have a temporary construction easement and park users will not be allowed in this area. The trail will be repaved in order to support the weight of large trucks. At the end of construction the use of this trail as a truck access will cease and the park users will have the full use of the park and trail. The effected park and trail will be restored to an equal or better condition that existed at the time of the Project’s Contract Award.

**Lake Rebecca Park**
As shown on the attached figure, the existing Lake Rebecca parking lot will be used during construction as a truck turn around for H. D. Hudson Manufacturing Company delivery trucks. In order to provide adequate turning radius for semi-trucks to turn into the park entrance the corner will be widened. This condition will become permanent, see exhibit. The park road leading to the parking lot, and the parking lot itself will be restored to equal or better condition that existed at the time of the Project’s Contract Award. At the end of construction the use of this parking lot as a truck turn around will cease.

**City of Hastings Flint Hills Nature Preserve**
The northwestern portion of Flint Hills Nature Preserve, see attached figure, will be needed for construction staging. This area will be graded and lined with a non-permeable liner with gravel over the liner. The Hastings Loop Trail that travels along the riverbank and through this area would be relocated adjacent to the northern edge of Lock and Dam Road. As requested by the city, the trail will stay in its present location up to the observation deck and provide a connection to this trail amenity. Temporary lighting will be provided along the realigned trail section. The power lines along the riverbank will be relocated. Trees along the river bank will also be removed. The staging area will be restored to the usage and an equal or better condition that existed at the time of the Project’s Contract Award. The portion of this staging area that has trees removed and had native prairie vegetation plantings by the city will be re-established when the staging area is no longer needed for the project. The trail along the river will be re-established to equal or better condition once the staging area is no longer in need for the project. The power lines may be left permanently in their relocated position, or may be relocated back to their original location once the staging area is no longer in need for the project, as directed by the City of Hastings.

**Hastings Loop Trail**
The portion of the Hastings Loop Trail shown on the attached figure will be closed and detoured during construction. Mn/DOT will work with city staff to determine an exact detour route when the project is further developed. When construction is complete the trail will be restored to the usage and an equal or better condition that existed at the time of the Project’s Contract Award.
As per Federal Register Rules and Regulations 23 CFR 774, these temporary easements are considered a temporary occupancy of Section 4(f) lands. To proceed with the design and construction of the Hasting Mississippi River Bridge project, there must be documented agreement that the officials having jurisdiction over these resources concur with the work to be completed and agree that the following conditions are met.

The duration of the occupancy will be temporary in nature and there will be no change in ownership of the land. There are no anticipated permanent adverse physical impacts. There will be temporary impacts that will interfere with the activities or purposes of the park on a temporary basis. These temporary impacts have been mitigated to the satisfaction of the officials having jurisdiction over these resources as described previously in this document. The land being used will be restored to the usage and an equal or better condition that existed at the time of the Project's Contract Award.

Please review the attached figure and indicate your concurrence with the work proposed, and that the above conditions are met, by signing below. Please forward the signed original back to me for our records. I will forward this information to the Mn/DOT Project Liaison Unit for concurrence by the FHWA.

If you have questions regarding this matter, feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience at (651) 234-7880. Thank you.

Sincerely

Steve Kordosky
Hwy. 61 Hastings Bridge Project Manager
Mn/DOT
1500 Co. Rd. B2
Roseville, MN 55113

I concur that the proposed work constitutes a Temporary Occupancy of the City Hall property, Levee Park, Jacyee Park, Lake Rebecca Park, the City of Hastings Flint Hills Nature Preserve, and the City of Hastings Loop Trail.

City of Hastings

Date

1/27/2009

Attachments: Figure illustrating temporary construction impacts on parks
Letter 5:
Department of Natural Resources,
8/6/08 Letter
August 6, 2008

Brigid Gombold
MnDOT Metro District
1500 West County Road B2
Roseville, MN 55113

RE: Response to MnDOT Early Notification Memo Requesting Information and Early Coordination Regarding TH 61 Mississippi River Crossing (Hastings Bridge), Washington and Dakota Counties

Dear Ms. Gombold:

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has completed review of the information submitted in the MnDOT Early Notification Memo regarding information for a scoping study for upgrading the TH 61 Mississippi River crossing at the City of Hastings, Washington and Dakota Counties. The following comments were submitted to me during DNR field review of the project:

1. The Mississippi River is a Public Watercourse and as such a Public Waters Work Permit will be required for work within the Ordinary High Water Elevation (OHW) of the river. As the project moves forward, design of the crossing should meet the conditions listed in GP 2004-0001. Guidance for conditions of the GP (including guidance on construction methods) may be found in the Manual “Best Practices for Meeting DNR General Public Waters Work Permit GP 2004-0001”. A pdf version of this manual may be found at: http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/watermgmt_section/pwpermits/DNR_GP_Guidance_Manual.pdf

   Additional design considerations and information on specific GP conditions are:

   a. The Ordinary High Water Elevation (OHW) of the Mississippi River at the crossing location is 681.7’ in 1929 datum or 682.2’ in 1912 datum. It is unknown how much of the proposed project will require work within the OHW of the river. However acceptable criteria for permanent and/or temporary impacts (including demolition/construction methods) should be identified in project documents.

   b. The Mississippi River is listed as ‘infested’ with Zebra Mussels and suitable precautions against their spread will be required.

   c. Commercial and recreational navigation occurs in the area. The demolition and/or construction phases should recognize the possibility of boaters in the area and plan accordingly so their safety is not compromised. The DNR may defer to the US Coast Guard regarding this issue.

   d. Hydraulic/Hydrologic reporting is required. All temporary or permanent fill/structures will be required to be modeled for 100yr flood elevation impacts. Detailed Flood Studies exist for this reach of the Mississippi River and new approaches and bridge design must meet those requirements.

   e. A primary issue we see with bridge replacement projects is that the demolition/construction often conflicts with fish spawning dates. For construction purposes, Work Exclusion dates for the Mississippi River at this location is April 15 through June 15. These dates are to allow for fish migration and spawning. A waiver may be possible should methods of demolition/construction be determined not to adversely effect fish migration or spawning. However, work during these dates shall not occur adjacent to, or in the water during this time without prior written approval of the DNR.

   f. Note that to meet DNR Erosion and Sediment control requirements, NPDES construction site requirements shall be followed regardless if the NPDES permit is required or not. Adherence to the NPDES program, including but not limited to MnDOT Standard Specifications for Construction, 2005 edition, (eg. Specification 1717), will generally suffice for DNR concerns.

   g. Due to habitat, flood elevation, and sediment concerns, the DNR prefers that barges be utilized to the maximum extent possible for demolition and construction. Any temporary structures proposed in the water must also be approved by the DNR (EG causeways, workpads, staging areas, etc.). In addition to habitat concerns, these structures would be required to be modeled for flood elevation impacts, and/or provide a Removal Contingency Plan. This plan would detail how the contractor would plan on removing the temporary structures before flooding, how the contractor will ensure all construction equipment and materials are removed from these structures to prevent being swept away by the river, and restoration plans upon complete removal.
h. Nesting Birds. MnDOT adherence to existing federal migratory bird protection programs will suffice for DNR concerns (also see #1.a below). Contact Jason Alcott, MnDOT Office of Environmental Services (jason.alcott@dot.state.mn.us, ph; 651-366-3605), as he is the MnDOT contact person for issues relating to Federal Threatened and Endangered Species and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service coordination.

2. The Minnesota Natural Heritage Information System has been queried to determine if any rare plant or animal species, native plant communities, or other significant natural features are known to occur within an approximate one-mile radius of the TH 61 Hastings Bridge (S.P. 1913-64) project area. Based on this query, several rare features have been documented within the search area (for details, please see the cover email for database reports). The following rare features may be impacted by the proposed project:

a. Peregrine falcons (Falco peregrinus), a state-listed threatened species, have been documented in the vicinity of the TH 61 bridge during the breeding season, and in the last few years have nested on the Milwaukee Railroad lift bridge. Construction activities at the TH 61 bridge site will not affect these birds as long as the birds do not choose the bridge as a nest site. If construction activities will take place during the breeding season (April through July), the bridge should be inspected prior to the onset of any construction work to determine whether the falcons are using the bridge as a nesting site. Please note that if the bridge is being actively used by peregrine falcons, seasonal work restrictions may be required. Also note #1.h above

b. Several state and federally listed mussel species have been documented in the Mississippi River in the vicinity of the TH 61 bridge. Bridge work can impact mussel resources if it involves disturbance of the river substrate or results in increased siltation due to bank work. As such, it is important that sound erosion and sediment control practices be implemented and maintained throughout the duration of the project. In addition, given the potential for harming a state-listed mussel species and the likelihood of success in moving them out of harm’s way, we are requesting that a mussel survey and relocation be conducted if the riverbed will be disturbed. The extent of the mussel survey should include all areas of the riverbed that will be directly impacted by excavation, pile driving, placing of fill or riprap, driving of equipment, or dewatering; as well as any areas downstream that will receive sediment from project activities. The mussel surveyor will need to contact the Minnesota Endangered Species Coordinator, Rich Baker at 651-259-5073, to obtain a permit before conducting the mussel surveys. Please send the results of all survey work to Lisa Joyal, Endangered Species Environmental Review Coordinator (lisa.joyal@dnr.state.mn.us or 651-259-5109) and Jason Alcott, MnDOT Office of Environmental Services (jason.alcott@dot.state.mn.us, ph; 651-366-3605), as he is the MnDOT contact person for issues relating to Federal Threatened and Endangered Species and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service coordination.

The Natural Heritage Information System (NHIS), a collection of databases that contains information about Minnesota’s rare natural features, is maintained by the Division of Ecological Resources, Department of Natural Resources. The NHIS is continually updated as new information becomes available, and is the most complete source of data on Minnesota’s rare or otherwise significant species, native plant communities, and other natural features. However, the NHIS is not an exhaustive inventory and thus does not represent all of the occurrences of rare features within the state. Therefore, ecologically significant features for which we have no records may exist on the project area.

3. Regional Trails and proposed state trails will need access across the river at this point. Non-motorized transportation must be included in the design and included as part of the construction. Washington County has a trail plan that includes non-motorized trails to the bridge from the St. Croix River area. On the south side there is a hiking/biking trail that comes across the Lock and Dam 2 Embankment and through JayCee Park.

4. There is Floodplain forest on the Washington County side of the crossing. The project should avoid adversely impacting these areas.

If you have questions regarding this letter, please e-mail me at peter.leete@dot.state.mn.us or call at (651) 366-3634.

On behalf of the DNR
Sincerely,

Peter Leete, Transportation Hydrologist
DNR-MnDOT OES Liaison, Office of Environmental Services, mail stop 620
Minnesota Department of Transportation,
395 John Ireland Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55155

C: ERDB file 20080686
Letter 6:
United States Coast Guard,
2/9/09
Mr. Keith Farquhar, P.E., Senior Engineer
MnDOT Bridge Office
Mail Stop 610
3485 Hadley Ave. North
Oakdale, MN 55128-3307

Subj: PROPOSED HASTINGS HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, MILE 813.91, UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Dear Mr. Farquhar:

The Coast Guard determined the pier locations of the proposed bridge should be as follows:

1. The left descending main span pier should be placed approximately 125 feet upstream of the existing main span pier and 25 feet toward the left descending bank.

2. The right descending main span pier should be placed approximately 125 feet upstream of the existing main span pier and aligned with it.

If you have any questions about this requirement, please contact Dave Studt at the above number.

Sincerely,

ROGER K. WIEBUSCH
Bridge Administrator
By direction of the District Commander
Letter 7:
United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service
2/10/09
United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Mississippi National River and Recreation Area
111 E. Kellogg Blvd., Ste. 105
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1256

L7427 (MISS)

February 10, 2009

Brigid Gombold
MnDOT Metro District
1500 West County Road B2
Roseville, MN 55113

RE: Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) Early Coordination; TH 61 Mississippi River Crossing (Hasting Bridge), Washington and Dakota Counties

Dear Ms. Gombold:

I thank you for your early coordination regarding the proposed bridge replacement project across the Mississippi River at the City of Hastings, Minnesota. According to the information you submitted as part of the scoping study, the proposed project will include the disassembly and removal of an existing high through truss bridge that is reaching the end of its service life. The replacement bridge will convey vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic in the general alignment of the existing bridge, but will have a substantially wider footprint in order to accommodate additional traffic lanes.

This particular segment of the Mississippi River lies within the Mississippi National River and Recreational Area, a unit of the National Park Service (NPS), and is listed on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) prepared by the NPS. The NRI is a register of rivers that may be eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. These rivers were included on the NRI based on the degree to which they are free-flowing, the degree to which the rivers and their corridors are undeveloped, and the outstanding natural and cultural characteristics of the rivers and their immediate environments. The Mississippi River is included in the NRI for its scenic, recreational, geological, wildlife, and historical outstanding remarkable values (ORV’s). Section 5(d) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires that, "In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all federal agencies involved to potential national wild, scenic and recreational river areas."

In partial fulfillment of the section 5(d) requirements, NPS has compiled and maintains the NRI.

The intent of the NRI is to provide information to assist in making balanced decisions regarding use of the nation's river resources. A Presidential directive and subsequent
instructions issued by the Council on Environmental Quality required that each Federal agency as part of its normal planning and environmental review processes, take care to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the values for which rivers have been placed on the NRI. Further, all agencies are required to consult with NPS prior to taking actions that could effectively foreclose wild, scenic, or recreational status for rivers on the inventory. We would expect the proposal to have little, if any impact on the free-flowing condition of the river, and on ORV’s listed previously provided proper site management systems and mitigative measures are in place. We recommend the following measures to protect and enhance the values for which the Mississippi was designated:

1. The new bridge should remain on the same alignment as the current structure to the greatest extent possible in order to minimize the scope of stream bank disturbance, construction within the floodplain, slope instability, and loss of riparian vegetation—especially mature forest stands in the northern vicinity of the project;

2. The new bridge should span the entire river channel to the greatest extent possible; bridge design should minimize the number of piers that are constructed within the river and floodplain function should be maintained (no net loss of floodplain);

3. Trees and other woody vegetation existing along the riverbank and on steep slopes should not be removed unless absolutely necessary. Any vegetation removed should be replaced with the same or similar native species;

4. The use of a bank stabilization system that integrates native plantings rather than hardened systems such as riprap or steel bulkheads to the extent practicable. At a minimum, native fieldstone should be used, covered with topsoil above the ordinary high watermark, and planted with native vegetation;

5. Erosion control plans should be kept on site and designed to incorporate measures to minimize short-term and long-term sedimentation impacts. All erosion control devices that are installed should be monitored throughout the duration of the project and the project should comply with NPDES standards;

6. Construction techniques which will cause a minimum amount of damage to the river bottom should be used when removing and constructing new piers. The use of barges instead of stone-filled work pads or causeways is recommended and free-flow should be maintained at all times throughout the construction period;

7. NPS concurs with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) work exclusion dates from April 15 to June 15 to allow for fish migration and spawning.

8. Several state and federally listed mussel species including the Higgins Eye Pearlmussel (Lampsilis higginsii) have been documented in the Mississippi River in the vicinity of the bridge project. Mussels (Unionidae) are especially sensitive to sediment and substrate disturbances associated with construction within the river channel. A mussel survey by a qualified malacologist should be conducted in the vicinity of the project and mussels that are likely to be adversely impacted by the project should be relocated to suitable habitats unlikely to be adversely impacted by the project;

9. All fill placed below the ordinary high water level should be stabilized as soon as possible;
10. Removal of all traces of construction materials and equipment from the project site upon project completion; bridge components should be removed from the river channel immediately;
11. The use of earhtone colors on any paintwork that may need to be completed; and
12. Consideration should be given to the general character of the area, lay of the land, and local historical context. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) should be consulted regarding historic structures that may be affected by the project.

These comments have been provided as early technical assistance and do not necessarily indicate the NPS' or DOI's responses to future environmental documents prepared in association with the project. Please contact Jim Von Haden of my staff at 651-290-3030 ext 235 if you have questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Paul Labovitz
Superintendent

cc:
Nick Rowe
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Ecological Services Field Office – MN
4101 East 80th Street
Bloomington, Minnesota 55425-1665

Peter Leete, Transportation Hydrologist
DNR-MnDOT Liaison
Office of Environmental Services, mail stop 620
395 John Ireland Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55155

Hector Santiago, Regional Rivers Coordinator, MWRO
Letter 8:
United States Coast Guard,
5/8/08
Mr. Philip Forst  
Federal Highways Administration  
Minnesota Division  
380 Jackson Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101-4802

Subj: PROPOSED HASTINGS HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, MILE 813.9,  
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Dear Mr. Forst:

This is in reply to your letter dated April 29, 2008 concerning the proposed bridge project at  
Mile 813.9 Upper Mississippi River.

The General Bridge Act of 1946 requires that the location and plans for bridges over navigable  
waters of the United States be approved by the Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard prior to  
commencing construction. The Upper Mississippi River is a navigable waterway of the United  
States for bridge administration purposes at the bridge site.

Applications for bridge permits should be addressed to Commander (dwb), Eighth Coast Guard  
District, 1222 Spruce Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63103-2832, Attention: Bridge Branch. The  
application must be supported by sufficient information to permit a thorough assessment of the  
impact of the bridge and its immediate approaches on the environment. We recommend that the  
impacts of procedures for constructing cofferdams, sand islands, and falsework bents, etc., that  
will be employed to build the bridge and demolish the old bridge be discussed. The  
Environmental Assessment (EA) should also contain data on the number, size and types of  
vessels currently using the waterway. This information should be compared with past and  
projected future trends on the use of the waterway.

We agree to serve as a Cooperating Agency for the project from a navigation standpoint. We  
should be given the opportunity to review the EA and be consulted before a decision is made to  
prepare a FONSI in lieu of an EIS. Our review and recommendations on the vertical and  
horizontal clearance requirements for river traffic will be coordinated with the Minnesota  
Department of Transportation Bridge and Structure Division office.

If the old bridge is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a Department of  
Transportation Guidance Memorandum signed by the Federal Highway Administration and the  
Coast Guard requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for demolition  
of a historic bridge unless the structure is not considered important for preservation. You will  
note that documentation and coordination beyond Section 106 requirements are necessary in  
order for a FONSI to be acceptable for such projects.
We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the project in this early stage. You may contact Mr. David Studt at the above number if you have questions about our requirements.

Sincerely,

ROGER K. WIEBUSCH
Bridge Administrator
By direction of the District Commander
Letter 9:
United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service
5/22/08
May 22, 2008

A42 (MISS-HHB)

Philip Forst
Area Engineer
FHA, 380 Jackson Street
Galtier Plaza, Suite 500
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

Dear Mr. Forst:

Your letter of April 28, 2008, addressed to Regional Director Quintana, has been referred to this office. The Hastings bridge project lies within the boundary of the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, a unit of the National Park System, and is also a river segment listed on the National Rivers Inventory. As a result, we are very interested in becoming a Cooperating Agency for this project.

Our primary point of contact for this project will be Steve Johnson, Chief of Resource Management. He can be reached at 651-290-3030 x223, or by email at steven_p_johnson@nps.gov

Thank you for contacting is about this important project.

Sincerely,

Paul Labovitz
Superintendent

cc:
Ernie Quintana
Nick Chevance
Steve Johnson

REC'D
MAY 23 2008
MN - FHWA