

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INFORMATION OPEN HOUSE
August 12, 2013 from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Winona Bridge Project

Introduction

A Public Information Open House for the Winona Bridge project was held on Monday, August 12, 2013 from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. at the Winona Armory, Winona, Minnesota.

Notice of Public Information Meeting

Press releases announcing the Public Information Meeting were distributed to press contacts by MnDOT staff. Additionally, an email notice was sent to Project Advisory Committee members.

Attendees

The following agencies had representatives at the meeting to explain the project and answer questions:

MnDOT:	Terry Ward	SRF Consulting:	Dave Nelson
	Mark Trogstad-Isaacson		Kelcie Young
	Greg Paulson		Sean Jergens
	Kristin Kammuller		
	Tory Thompson		
	Kristen Zschomler		

An attendance record sheet was prominently displayed on a table at the front door and all persons entering were asked to sign in for the record. A total of 72 people signed in.

Summary of Open House

The meeting was held from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., with a presentation given at 5:00 p.m. Attendees viewed informational exhibits and engaged in one-on-one discussions with the project staff. Meeting attendees were given the opportunity to ask questions after the presentation, which were addressed by MnDOT staff during the meeting.

Comment forms were made available to meeting attendees. Meeting attendees were encouraged to submit comments either directly at the meeting in a comment box, or by mail. Contact information for project staff was provided on the comment form. Terry Ward's contact information was distributed on a contact card.

Written Comments

Four (4) comments were received at the night of the Public Meeting and two comments were received after the meeting.

Summary of Comments

- Concern about truck turning movements and vehicles hitting the YMCA in bad weather.
 - Response: The grade coming off the new bridge and the turning radius for trucks both meet engineering standards and are an improvement over the existing condition. The horizontal curvature off the new bridge into Winona moves Trunk Highway 43 traffic away from the YMCA.
- Support for the concrete box girder bridge type as the lower cost option. Ensure the bridge can handle two-way traffic if the existing bridge becomes unusable in the future. Entrance and exit routes must be user friendly to semi-trucks.
 - The bridge and both approaches have been designed to handle two-way traffic if needed (for example, as staging during the rehabilitation of the existing bridge). Routes to and from the bridge will be clearly signed.
- Why is a 60 foot clearance beneath the bridge? Beyond the federal regulation, what is the purpose? Can it be changed?
 - The United States Coast Guard has jurisdiction over the horizontal and vertical clearance requirements. The vertical clearance at this location is 62.5 feet above the normal level of the river and 60 feet within 30 feet of each pier.
- Can we change the location of the bridge landing to reroute truck traffic away from town?
 - The project examined a number of other alternative locations for a new bridge, but the Recommended Alternative was selected as the option which best meets the project purpose and need while minimizing impacts.
- Safety concerns regarding trail users when Latsch Island is flooded. Concerns regarding pier protection. Request for new bridge railings to be as open as possible to provide better views of the river and the existing bridge.
 - Alternative trail routes during flooding on Latsch Island are being studied and may include an at-grade crossing of Highway 43. A grade-separated crossing will be studied for feasibility.
 - Pier design is dictated by loading requirements, hydraulic considerations, and the need to withstand barge collisions. The new river piers will meet current requirements related to each of these parameters.

- Railing design will be considered by the Visual Quality Committee.
- A new two-lane bridge would be adequate for lower cost. Commenter indicated surprise that the rehabilitation of the existing bridge would cost more than construction of a new bridge.
 - Section 106 requirements, at the Federal Level, related to historic buildings and structures governed the decision to preserve the existing bridge. While cost was considered, the historic review process required the existing bridge be rehabilitated and reconstructed as currently defined in the recommended alternate.
- Note that commenter does not understand concerns regarding the view, and that bridge users take only 10 to 15 seconds to cross.
 - The environmental review process and the Visual Quality Review Committee will consider impacts to visual quality and mitigation for negative impacts.

H:\Projects\6802_Correspondence\Meetings\130812_PIM4\Open House Summary 130923.doc