

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) proposes to make capacity improvements to the interregional corridor (IRC) connection between Interstate 94 (I-94) and Trunk Highway 10 (TH 10) within an area west of the City of Becker and east of the City of St. Cloud within Sherburne, Stearns and Wright Counties. A connection is currently provided via TH 24, a two-lane uncontrolled access roadway that passes through the Cities of Clearwater and Clear Lake with an at-grade crossing at the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad just south of TH 10. All Build Alternatives proposed in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to improve capacity and safety on the connection between I-94 and TH 10 include construction of a four-lane freeway with grade-separation at the BNSF rail crossing and a bridge crossing over the Mississippi River.

The extent of the proposed improvements requires preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 Statute (42 USC 4321 et seq.), as well as the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) (Minnesota Rules Chapter 4410). The DEIS was prepared to: discuss the purpose of and need for the proposed project; consider alternatives; evaluate environmental effects of alternatives; explore methods for avoiding and minimizing adverse impacts; and obtain public and agency input, to aid in the identification of a preferred alternative for further study in the Final EIS (FEIS). The FEIS will summarize public involvement during the DEIS process; respond to substantive comments received on the DEIS; identify the preferred alternative; and, if necessary, provide more detail on the environmental impacts of the preferred alternative and describe mitigation measures.

FHWA and Mn/DOT are the joint lead agencies for this project. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the MnDNR and the St. Cloud Area Planning Organization (APO) participated as cooperating agencies in review of draft environmental documents and as participants in the project Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) throughout the scoping and EIS processes. The COE is a cooperating agency for the EIS pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA (40 CFR, Part 1501.6) and Corps of Engineers permit authority under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 CFR 320-330). The St. Cloud APO and MnDNR are cooperating agencies providing input and expertise, consistent with NEPA regulations, related to their roles as metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for transportation-related issues in the St. Cloud planning area [St. Cloud APO] and management/regulatory authority over various natural resources (Mississippi Scenic Riverway, fisheries, wildlife, etc.) in this study area [MnDNR].

A River Corridor Advisory Committee (RCAC) was also established as part of the DEIS process. The TAC and RCAC included representatives from federal, state, regional and local agencies/governments. The DEIS process also included coordination with several additional natural and cultural resource agencies and numerous opportunities for public and agency comments.

## 1.1 PURPOSE OF THE I-94/TH 10 INTERREGIONAL CONNECTION PROJECT

The need for an improved interregional connection between I-94 and TH 10 was initially established in a comprehensive transportation study completed by Mn/DOT in 1996. Since that time, additional transportation policies, studies and forecasting have reconfirmed and strengthened the need for improvements to the transportation system connection between I-94 and TH 10. Problems and needs to be addressed by the proposed project include:

- Highways I-94, TH 10 and TH 24 in the study area are important linkages that connect regional centers throughout the state. They are designated as part of the National Highway System (NHS) as well as Minnesota's High-Priority Interregional Corridor (IRC) System. The TH 24/TH 10 corridor (as the connection currently in highest use by interregional travelers) was designated as a High-Priority IRC, with performance standards that include the need to maintain a minimum travel speed of 60 mph, with a preferable travel speed of 65 mph.
- Increasing transportation demand on existing corridors connecting I-94 and TH 10 coupled with limited opportunities in existing corridors to increase capacity. This results in increased congestion and the inability to meet the IRC performance standards described above.
- The existing TH 24 corridor currently experiences crash rates similar to statewide averages for similar roadways; however, the severity of crashes is higher than the state average. Safety problems in the TH 24 corridor will likely increase as traffic levels rise since the ability to find gaps in traffic to cross or access TH 24 will become more difficult and motorists will take greater risks. Also, pedestrian, bicyclist and snowmobile safety issues will continue to worsen as volumes rise and more modal conflicts result.
- Impacts of congestion on the communities through which interregional traffic is traveling (Clearwater and Clear Lake) will lead to increasing delays for local traffic trying to cross the corridor. This will also decrease the 'quality' of downtown areas bisected by the highways.
- The existing at-grade crossing of TH 24 with the BNSF rail line results in increased congestion at the TH 10/TH 24 intersection and in downtown Clear Lake when a train passes through, stopping vehicular cross-traffic on TH 24.
- Increasing growth in the area will limit available options for adding corridor capacity, if a Build Alternative is not selected as the preferred alternative during the EIS process. There is an immediate need to identify a preferred alternative and preserve the best corridor (i.e., serves the transportation need, while minimizing environmental impacts) as soon as possible. This would also allow communities to plan any future development with the preferred alternative corridor in mind.

## 1.2 ALTERNATIVES

The process of developing alternatives for the I-94/TH 10 Interregional Connection has included a number of studies and an increasing level of refinement of alternative concepts over the past eight years. A broad range of potential connections was evaluated in the *Mississippi River Crossing Study* conducted in 1995-1996, with four potential corridors ultimately recommended

for further study. These corridors were refined to four specific alignments during the scoping process documented in the 1997 *I-94/TH 10 Regional Connection Scoping Document* and the 2001 scoping decision document. During the DEIS process, the scoping alignments were further refined with respect to interchange configurations and system connection issues and a number of sub-alternatives were developed and evaluated, ultimately resulting in identification of four Build Alternatives (one in each of the alignments carried forward from scoping) that were analyzed and documented in detail in the DEIS. The four proposed Build Alternatives range from expansion of the existing TH 24 corridor with a realignment at the north end (Alternative B) to three new corridor alignments (Alternatives A, C and D). Figure 1.1 shows the location of the four Build Alternatives. The average length of the Build Alternative corridors is six miles with each alternative planned as a four-lane freeway. Following is a brief description of the alternatives analyzed in the DEIS.

- No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative consists of reconstruction of the existing TH 24 corridor (as required by routine maintenance) between I-94 and TH 10 within the study area. It is assumed that by 2040, the existing TH 24 bridge over the Mississippi River would need to be replaced as part of the No-Build Alternative.

- Alternative A

Alternative A is located east of the City of St. Cloud. This alternative intersects with I-94 at a point approximately 4.5 miles northwest of the existing TH 24 interchange. It continues in a northeasterly direction on a new alignment across the river, then heads north to connect to TH 10 in the vicinity of the intersection of Sherburne County State Aid Highway (CSAH 3) with TH 10. This alternative would be a freeway design with interchanges at I-94 and TH 10 and a grade-separated rail crossing near TH 10. This alternative also includes the replacement of the existing TH 24 bridge over the Mississippi River by 2040.

- Alternative B

Alternative B is located along the existing TH 24 alignment from its interchange with I-94, through the City of Clearwater, across the Mississippi River and northeast to the intersection of TH 24 with a local road (70th Avenue) approximately 0.8 mile north east of Sherburne CSAH 8. The alignment then continues north on 70th Avenue to intersect with TH 10 at a point approximately 1.2 miles northwest of the existing TH 24/TH 10 intersection. This alternative would be a freeway design with interchanges at I-94 and TH 10, and a grade-separated rail crossing near TH 10. This alternative also includes an interchange at Sherburne County Road (CR) 57 to provide local access to/from the City of Clear Lake.

[Insert Figure 1.1 – Project Location]

- Alternative C

Alternative C intersects with I-94 at a point approximately 1.6 miles southeast of the existing TH 24/I-94 (Clearwater) interchange. It continues in a north-northeast direction on a new alignment across the river until it intersects with Sherburne CSAH 8, it then continues north on an existing local road alignment (70th Street – the same road alignment as identified for Alternative B) to intersect with TH 10 at a point approximately 1.2 miles northwest of the existing TH 24/TH 10 intersection. This alternative includes a freeway design with interchanges at I-94 and TH 10 and a grade-separated rail crossing near TH 10. This alternative also includes an interchange at existing TH 24 to provide local access to/from the City of Clear Lake. Alternative C also includes the replacement of the existing TH 24 bridge over the Mississippi River by 2040.

- Alternative D

Alternative D is located west of the City of Becker. This alignment intersects with I-94 at a point approximately 0.6 mile west of the freeway rest area east of the Hasty interchange. It continues in a northerly direction on a new alignment parallel to existing Barton Avenue across the river 0.2 mile east of the existing intersection of TH 10 and Sherburne CSAH 53. With this alternative, TH 25 north of TH 10 would be realigned to connect to the new interregional connection alignment at the TH 10 interchange. This alternative includes a freeway design with interchanges at I-94 and TH 10 and a grade-separated rail crossing near TH 10. Alternative D also includes the replacement of the existing TH 24 bridge over the Mississippi River by 2040.

### 1.3 COSTS/FUNDING

Preliminary cost estimates for the DEIS alternatives have been prepared and are shown in Table 1.1. The table includes cost estimates for construction of the proposed improvements and right of way acquisition costs. These estimates are based on 2003 dollars.

**TABLE 1.1  
COST ESTIMATES FOR DEIS ALTERNATIVES**

COST	ALTERNATIVE				
	No-Build	A	B	C	D
Construction Cost of Interregional Connection (excludes right of way acquisition) <sup>(1)</sup>	\$8,000,000	\$94,449,000	\$94,616,000	\$97,876,000	\$109,136,000 <sup>(2)</sup>
Right of Way and Relocation Costs	N/A	\$12,010,000	\$13,361,000	\$7,305,000	\$3,552,000
<b>TOTAL COST</b> (Construction and right of way only)	\$8,000,000	\$106,459,000	\$107,977,000	\$105,181,000	\$112,688,000

<sup>(1)</sup> Cost estimates for the No-Build Alternative and Build Alternatives A, C and D include \$8 million for replacing the existing TH 24 bridge.

<sup>(2)</sup> Construction cost for Alternative D includes approximately \$9,400,000 for the TH 25 connection.

Funding sources have yet to be identified; however, it is anticipated that funding will be a combination of state and federal funds.

## 1.4 SCHEDULE

The proposed project is currently included in Mn/DOT District 3's long-range plan and is identified for construction beginning in 2015. However, since this interregional connection has been identified as an important link in the state's IRC system it is possible, if funding becomes available, that the project could be advanced. Table 1.2 shows the planned schedule for completion of the environmental review process and project construction.

**TABLE 1.2  
PROJECT SCHEDULE**

<b>Task/Activity</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
Release of Scoping Document/Draft Scoping Decision Document	September 1997
Final Scoping Decision Document	December 2001
Distribute DEIS for agency/public comment	Winter 2003 - 2004
DEIS Public Hearing	Winter 2003 - 2004
Identification of Preferred Alternative by Mn/DOT Commissioner	Spring 2004
Distribute FEIS	Fall 2004
Mn/DOT Adequacy Determination and FHWA Record of Decision	Winter 2004 - 2005
Construction	Begin 2015, complete 2019

## 1.5 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Table 1.3 summarizes the transportation, environmental, social and economic impacts of the DEIS alternatives. Assessment of these impacts is based upon an assumed 300-foot wide corridor, with wider impact areas assumed at interchanges based on preliminary interchange design concepts, plus impacts as required to re-connect local roadway access affected by the proposed alternatives. The impacts included in the summary table may be able to be further minimized through avoidance and minimization efforts during final project design, but represent a reasonable basis for comparison among alternatives for the purpose of identifying a preferred alternative. The impacts of each alternative are described in greater detail in Chapters 4 through 12 of the DEIS document.

## 1.6 OTHER MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL ACTIONS IN THE DEIS STUDY AREA

Independent corridor studies have been prepared for the I-94 and TH 10 corridors within and beyond the EIS study area to address capacity and safety issues in the corridors over the next 20 years. The recommendations of these corridor studies are summarized in Section 2.2 of the DEIS. The recommendations generally include construction of additional lanes on I-94 to increase capacity and conversion of TH 10 to a freeway from the I-94/TH 10 Interregional Connection through the City of St. Cloud to the City of Rice.

The need for capacity improvements to the I-94 and TH 10 corridors are independent from the need for the I-94/TH 10 Interregional Connection project – that is, the projects are not needed to support each other and each has an independent utility. However, the proposed I-94/TH 10 connection project would influence the extent of improvements needed on the I-94 and TH 10 corridors. For instance, Alternative A would result in more improvements to I-94, while Alternative D would result in more improvements to TH 10. While independent

environmental review of the I-94 and TH 10 corridor improvements will occur prior to their implementation, Chapter 10 of the DEIS includes a discussion of the secondary environmental impacts of the I-94 and TH 10 system improvements for each DEIS alternative.

## 1.7 PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The following federal, state and local permits/approvals/concurrences will likely be required for construction of the proposed action:

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>TYPE OF PERMIT/APPROVAL/ CONCURRENCE</b>
<b>Federal</b>	
Federal Highway Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIS (Draft and Final)</li> <li>• Record of Decision</li> <li>• Section 4(f) Evaluation (Draft and Final)</li> </ul>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 404 Permit</li> </ul>
National Park Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4(f) Evaluation (Draft and Final) Review</li> </ul>
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 106 review (if needed)</li> </ul>
<b>State</b>	
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES)</li> <li>• Section 401 Water Quality Certification</li> </ul>
Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 106 concurrence</li> </ul>
Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 106 review</li> <li>• EIS (Draft and Final)</li> <li>• Wetland Conservation Act</li> <li>• EIS Adequacy Determination</li> </ul>
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Waters Permit</li> <li>• Water Appropriation Permit, if needed</li> </ul>
<b>Local</b>	
City of Clearwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Consent, if applicable</li> </ul>
City of Clear Lake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Consent, if applicable</li> </ul>
<b>Watershed Districts</b>	
Clearwater River Watershed District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface Water Plan review, if applicable</li> </ul>

## 1.8 POTENTIAL AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

Throughout the EIS scoping and DEIS process, the proposing agencies have made extensive efforts at agency, local government and public involvement, in order to identify potentially controversial issues and resolve them during development of the DEIS alternatives. This effort has generally been successful in addressing concerns of stakeholders in the project area, however different agencies and different municipalities affected by the proposed DEIS alternatives have varying priorities and interests they would like to see protected. The DEIS document attempts to document the positions presented by these various interested parties, to inform the process of assessing benefits and impacts and, ultimately the preferred alternative decision-making process.

[THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]

**TABLE 1.3  
COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE IMPACTS**

Subject	Alternatives				
	No-Build	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND FISCAL IMPACTS</b>					
<b>IRC Performance Criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not meet criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets criteria.</li> </ul>
<b>Safety</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflicts/crashes on existing TH 24 due to local access points, including TH 10/TH 24 signal.</li> <li>Ped/bike conflicts with vehicles on TH 24 within Clearwater and Clear Lake.</li> <li>At-grade rail crossing safety issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Controlled-access freeway eliminates conflict points, improves safety.</li> <li>Reduced volumes on TH 24 decreases ped/bike conflicts with vehicles.</li> <li>Grade-separated rail crossing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Controlled-access freeway eliminates conflict points, improves safety.</li> <li>Need for and method of accommodating ped/bike users on TH 24 will be assessed.</li> <li>Grade-separated rail crossing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Controlled-access freeway eliminates conflict points, improves safety.</li> <li>Reduced volumes on TH 24 decreases ped/bike conflicts with vehicles.</li> <li>Grade-separated rail crossing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Controlled-access freeway eliminates conflict points, improves safety.</li> <li>Reduced volumes on TH 24 decreases ped/bike conflicts with vehicles.</li> <li>Grade-separated rail crossing.</li> </ul>
<b>Relative Year 2040 Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)<sup>1</sup></b>	Not Applicable – No-Build is basis for comparison.	141,740	201,160	-156,440	55,380
<b>Relative Year 2040 Daily Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)<sup>1</sup></b>	Not Applicable – No-Build is basis for comparison.	-240	-250	-20,660	-13,360
<b>Construction cost of interregional connection (excludes ROW acquisition)<sup>2</sup></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$8,000,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$94,449,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$94,616,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$97,876,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$109,136,000 (Includes approx. \$9,400,000 for TH 25 connection)</li> </ul>
<b>Total cost of interregional connection (includes ROW acquisition and relocation estimates)<sup>3</sup></b>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$106,459,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$107,977,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$105,181,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$112,688,000</li> </ul>
<b>Total cost of regional system improvements<sup>4</sup> (upgrade of TH 10 and I-94) See DEIS Chapter 10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$96,126,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$88,799,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$96,526,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$93,399,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$110,472,000</li> </ul>
<b>TOTAL COST (cost of interregional connection and cost of regional system improvements)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$104,126,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$195,258,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$204,503,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$198,580,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$223,160,000</li> </ul>
<b>Benefit/Cost</b>	N/A	7.8	6.3	26.5	13.4
<b>SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</b>					
<b>Section 4(f) and Cultural Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct impact to one National Register eligible property (also Section 4(f)).</li> <li>Potential archaeological resources impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential archaeological resource impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> </ul>
<b>Parks, Trails, Recreational Areas and Natural Areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change from existing conditions; however, access to the DNR boat landing on the north side of the river could be impacted with the replacement of the existing bridge and/or by increasing roadway congestion on TH 24.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If necessary, provisions for existing DNR snowmobile trail within an abandoned RR corridor adjacent to CSAH 75 will need to be provided.</li> <li>Proposed CSAH 75 bridge will need to provide accommodations for future Beaver Island Regional Trail Extension.</li> <li>Possible noise and visual impacts to the quality of user experience on Mississippi Scenic Riverway and Canoe/Boating Route.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If necessary, provisions for existing DNR snowmobile trail within an abandoned RR corridor adjacent to CSAH 75 will need to be provided.</li> <li>Proposed CSAH 75 bridge will need to provide accommodations for future River County Regional Trail.</li> <li>Possible noise and visual impacts to the quality of user experience on Mississippi Scenic Riverway and Canoe/Boating Route.</li> <li>More circuitous access to DNR boat landing, Clearwater Wayside/Riverside Park, Warner Lake County Park, Spring Street Park and Clear Lake SNA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If necessary, provisions for existing DNR snowmobile trail within an abandoned RR corridor adjacent to CSAH 75 will need to be provided.</li> <li>Provide accommodations for River County Regional Trail near CSAH 75.</li> <li>Possible noise and visual impacts to the quality of user experience on Mississippi Scenic Riverway and Canoe/Boating Route.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If necessary, provisions for existing DNR snowmobile trail within an abandoned RR corridor adjacent to CSAH 75 will need to be provided.</li> <li>Approximately five acres of R/W acquisition from Snuffy's Landing (privately owned). This recreation area would also experience noise, visual and access impacts.</li> <li>Noise and visual impacts for island campers just north of the proposed river bridge.</li> <li>Possible noise and visual impacts to the quality of user experience on Mississippi Scenic Riverway and Canoe/Boating Route.</li> </ul>

[THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]

**TABLE 1.3 continued**  
**COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE IMPACTS**

Subject	Alternatives				
	No-Build	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS continued</b>					
<b>Threatened/endangered species</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential impact to species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act with removal of TH 24 bridge.</li> <li>(Impact also occurs with Alternatives A, C and D.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Known concentration" of Blandings turtles (State-listed threatened) north of TH 10 and "potential important" area of Blandings turtles between I-94 and river.</li> <li>"Potentially important" area of Blandings turtle habitat located near southern portion of Alternative A (between I-94 and the Mississippi River).</li> <li>Loggerhead Shrike (State-listed threatened) nesting area north of Mississippi River along Alternative A.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blandings turtle sighting in Clearwater.</li> <li>Potential impact to species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act with removal of TH 24 bridge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No record of threatened/endangered species in this corridor area.</li> <li>Blandings turtle sighting in Clearwater.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bald eagle (federal listed threatened) nest near river; peregrine falcon (State-listed threatened) nesting at Xcel plant.</li> <li>Known concentration of Blandings turtles north of alignment (at 120th and 97th).</li> <li>Loggerhead Shrike nesting area.</li> </ul>
<b>Other natural resource impacts (fish, wildlife, vegetation)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely impact to oak woodland at top of east bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Likely impact to sedge meadow at base of east bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Potential impacts to two wetlands at the base of the east river bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>(Impact also occurs with Alternatives A, C and D.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential impacts to a good fish habitat (riffle) at river crossing and downstream (islands).</li> <li>Likely impact to oak woodland at top of east bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Likely impact to sedge, meadow at base of east bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Potential impacts to two wetlands at the base of the east river bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Alternative will need to provide mitigation in bridge design to facilitate wildlife movements along the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to oak woodland at top of east bluff - 3.6 acres.</li> <li>Impacts to sedge meadow at base of east bluff - 0.2 acre.</li> <li>Alternative will need to provide mitigation in bridge design to facilitate wildlife movements along the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to 0.4-acre strip floodplain forest along the east river shore.</li> <li>Likely impact to oak woodland at top of east bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Likely impact to sedge, meadow at base of east bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Potential impacts to two wetlands at the base of the east river bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Impacts to large oak woodland at top of east bluff - approximately 4.5 acres.</li> <li>Alternative will need to provide mitigation in bridge design to facilitate wildlife movements along the river.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential indirect impacts to heron rookery near river crossing.</li> <li>Likely impact to oak woodland at top of east bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Likely impact to sedge, meadow at base of east bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Potential impacts to two wetlands at the base of the east river bluff with replacement of existing TH 24 bridge.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Potential impacts to good fish habitat (riffle) at crossing.</li> <li>Alternative will need to provide mitigation in bridge design to facilitate wildlife movements along the river.</li> </ul>
<b>Wetlands (number of acres of encroachment)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.3 acres of impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.5 acres of impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.3 acres of impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 acres of impact.</li> </ul>
<b>Floodplain/Floodway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encroachment in 100-year floodplain: transverse, 430 linear feet, 3.6 acres fill area.</li> <li>Bridge pier impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach roadways would not require any fill within floodplain/floodway.</li> <li>Bridge pier impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encroachment in 100-year floodplain: transverse, 370 linear feet, 2.4 acres fill area.</li> <li>Bridge pier impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encroachment in 100-year floodplain: transverse, 520 linear feet, 3.2 acres fill area.</li> <li>Bridge pier impacts.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited opportunity for detention/treatment of bridge runoff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential treatment ponding sites on the southwest bluff, above the 100-year flood level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential treatment ponding site on the northeast bluff above 100-year flood level. Minimal ponding opportunities on south side of river, in Clearwater.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential treatment on northeast side of river, within or partially within 100-year floodplain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential treatment ponding site on the southwest side of the river, within the 100-year floodplain.</li> </ul>

[THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]

TABLE 1.3 continued  
COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE IMPACTS

Subject	Alternatives				
	No-Build	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS continued</b>					
<b>Noise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No-Build 2040 noise levels along TH 24 will increase 3 to 4 decibels above existing noise levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greatest change in noise levels along Alt. A will occur at existing 'isolated' residential receptors located along the Riverway (16-decibel increase from 2040 No-Build to 2040 Build). The new crossing location also creates an additional noise source that could be annoying to riverway users looking for quiet river experience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2040 Build noise levels for residents along TH 24 within the City of Clearwater will increase by 3 to 6 decibels over No-Build 2040 noise levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greatest change in noise levels along Alt. C will occur at 'isolated' residential receptors located along the Riverway (15-decibel increase from 2040 No-Build to 2040 Build). The new crossing location also creates an additional noise source that could be annoying to riverway users looking for quiet river experience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greatest increases in noise levels along Alt. D will occur at existing residences along Barton Avenue and CR 53, immediately adjacent to the Alt. D alignment (15- to 19-decibel increase from 2040 No-Build to 2040 Build). The new crossing location also creates an additional noise source that could be annoying to riverway users looking for quiet river experience.</li> </ul>
<b>Wild and Scenic River</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change from existing conditions, except for increased level of traffic noise at existing TH 24 crossing due to increased traffic levels over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New crossing corridor approximately 4.5 miles downstream from proposed 33rd Street crossing and six miles upstream from existing TH 24 crossing. Introduces additional source of traffic noise and visual impacts to Riverway users.</li> <li>Bridge is visible for approximately one mile (downstream view from river bend).</li> <li>Bridge is within the section designated as 'scenic' and within the proposed 'rural open space' land use district.</li> <li>Bottom of bridge structure is approximately 25 feet above top of bank. Cut 20 feet into east bluff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expands existing TH 24 river crossing corridor. Increased traffic noise and more massive bridge structure, compared to No-Build.</li> <li>Bridge is visible for approximately 3/4 mile (downstream view from river islands).</li> <li>Bridge is at the location dividing the 'scenic' and 'recreational' sections of the Riverway, and within the proposed land use districts that include: 'rural open space,' upstream on the east side of the river, 'rural residential' downstream on the east side and 'river town' on the west side of the river in Clearwater.</li> <li>Bottom of bridge structure is approximately 35 feet above top of bank. No bluff cut (existing embankment).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New crossing corridor approximately 1.5 miles downstream from existing TH 24 crossing. Introduces additional source of traffic noise and visual impacts to Riverway users.</li> <li>Bridge is visible for approximately 1/2 mile (downstream view from river bend).</li> <li>Bridge is within the designated 'recreational' section of the Riverway and the proposed 'rural residential' land use district.</li> <li>Bottom of bridge structure is approximately 17 feet above top of bank. Cut 8 feet into east bluff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New crossing corridor approximately 8 miles downstream from existing TH 24 corridor and 9 miles upstream from City of Monticello (TH 25). Introduces additional source of traffic noise and visual impacts to Riverway users.</li> <li>Bridge is visible for approximately 1/4 mile (downstream view from Oak Island).</li> <li>Bridge is within the designated 'recreational' section of the Riverway and the proposed 'rural open space' land use district.</li> <li>Bottom of bridge structure is approximately 20 feet above top of bank. Cut 20 feet into east bluff.</li> <li>Noise and light impacts to Oak Island campsite upstream from bridge.</li> </ul>
<b>Visual/Context'</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal visual impacts from future roadway maintenance and bridge reconstruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New bridge across Mississippi Scenic Riverway (see also Wild and Scenic River impacts).</li> <li>A new four-lane highway through existing rural area.</li> <li>Bridges/ramps for interchanges and overpasses are between 32 and 35 feet above adjacent land surface.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Larger bridge at existing Mississippi Scenic Riverway crossing (see also Wild and Scenic River impacts).</li> <li>A new four-lane highway through existing rural area.</li> <li>Bridges/ramps for interchanges and overpasses are approximately 32 feet above adjacent land surface.</li> <li>Adverse visual impacts to/from residents and businesses within City of Clearwater.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New bridge across Mississippi Scenic Riverway (see also Wild and Scenic River impacts).</li> <li>A new four-lane highway through existing rural area.</li> <li>Bridges/ramps for interchanges and overpasses are between 25 and 32 feet above adjacent land surface.</li> <li>Adverse visual impacts to/from residents within City of Clearwater.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New bridge across Mississippi Scenic Riverway (see also Wild and Scenic River impacts).</li> <li>A new four-lane highway through existing rural area.</li> <li>Bridges/ramps for interchanges and overpasses are between 27 and 41 feet above adjacent land surface.</li> </ul>
<b>Soils: Erosion, sedimentation, bluff slumping.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 20-foot cut into east river bluff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilizes existing crossing embankment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 8-foot cut into east river bluff face.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 20-foot cut into east river bluff face.</li> </ul>
<b>Right of way Acquisition and Relocation</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential residential/agricultural total acquisitions</li> <li>Potential commercial/industrial total acquisitions</li> <li>Total right of way acquisition<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> <li>None</li> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>19</li> <li>13</li> <li>470 acres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16</li> <li>14</li> <li>380 acres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18</li> <li>5</li> <li>480 acres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7</li> <li>0</li> <li>540 acres</li> </ul>

[THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]

**TABLE 1.3 continued**  
**COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE IMPACTS**

Subject	Alternatives				
	No-Build	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<b>SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS continued</b>					
<b>Farmland<sup>6</sup></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 acres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>46 acres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>149 acres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>162 acres</li> </ul>
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No effect on tax base anticipated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimated tax loss on total acquisitions is \$91,000.</li> <li>Would displace businesses at six commercial, seven industrial and nine agricultural properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimated tax loss on total acquisitions is \$198,000.</li> <li>Would displace businesses at 13 commercial, one industrial and two agricultural properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimated tax loss on total acquisitions is \$31,000.</li> <li>Would displace businesses at five commercial, and three agricultural properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimated tax loss on total acquisitions is \$9,000.</li> <li>Would displace no businesses and one agricultural property.</li> </ul>
<b>Social/Community</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keeps interregional traffic going through Clearwater, maintaining 'pass-through' business. However, congestion may affect accessibility of businesses, and discourage travelers from stopping.</li> <li>Increased congestion on TH 24 would have an adverse effect on east-west movement across the highway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keeps interregional traffic going past Clearwater - possible "pass-through" business ("easy off/on").</li> <li>Interregional traffic 'bypasses' downtown Clear Lake.</li> <li>This alternative would impact the cities of Clearwater and Clear Lake by eliminating interregional trips through the cities downtowns - this could be viewed as a negative and/or positive impact.</li> <li>Proposed alignment would bisect existing residential 'community' on north side of river along the bluff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Right-of-way acquisition affects a number of downtown Clearwater businesses.</li> <li>Downtown Clear Lake is bypassed - possible 'pass through' business impact.</li> <li>Adverse impacts to the City of Clearwater - this alternative would further degrade community cohesion; would result in the acquisition of several existing businesses; create circuitous routes for local trips, including school buses and emergency vehicles.</li> <li>This alternative would also impact the City of Clear Lake by eliminating interregional trips through the city's downtown - this could be viewed as a negative and/or positive impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interregional traffic 'bypasses' downtown Clearwater. Signs could advertise easy off-on via TH 24 interchanges.</li> <li>Interregional traffic 'bypasses' downtown Clear Lake. Signs could advertise easy off-on via TH 24 interchanges.</li> <li>This alternative would impact the cities of Clearwater and Clear Lake by eliminating interregional trips through the cities downtowns - this could be viewed as a negative and/or positive impact.</li> <li>Proposed alignment would bisect existing residential 'community' along CSAH 75.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interregional traffic 'bypasses' Clearwater.</li> <li>Downtown Clear Lake is bypassed by interregional connection and less easily accessed from TH 10 - possible 'pass through' business impact.</li> <li>This alternative would impact the cities of Clearwater and Clear Lake by eliminating interregional trips through the cities downtowns - this could be viewed as a negative and/or positive impact.</li> <li>Adverse impacts to the City of Clear Lake's emergency and school bus services.</li> <li>Adverse impact to farmers needing to access and/or cross over TH 10.</li> </ul>
<b>OTHER CONSIDERATIONS</b>					
<b>Local government preference</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No local government support expressed for this alternative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>St. Cloud APO on record as supporting this alternative.</li> <li>Clear Lake Township Board supports Alternative A.</li> <li>City of Clearwater on record as supporting this alternative.</li> <li>St. Cloud Area Joint Planning District Board supports Alternative A.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City of Clearwater on record as opposing this alternative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City of Clearwater on record as opposing this alternative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City of Becker on record as supporting this alternative.</li> <li>Sherburne County on record as supporting this alternative.</li> </ul>

Notes:  
<sup>1</sup> VMT and VHT values in this table are the difference between No-Build VMT and each Build alternative VMT and the difference between No Build VHT and each Build alternative VHT (see Section 4.4 of DEIS)  
<sup>2</sup> Cost estimates for the No-Build Alternative and Build Alternatives A, C, and D include \$8 million for replacing the existing TH 24 bridge.  
<sup>3</sup> Total right of way includes the area within the right of way boundaries on the layouts. It does not include the land area of 'total acquisition' for residential and commercial properties.  
<sup>4</sup> See Section 4.2 of DEIS for additional details.  
<sup>5</sup> Impacts for the replacement of the existing TH 24 bridge have not been quantified, as preliminary design for this structure has yet to be completed.  
<sup>6</sup> This acreage is approximate and includes only prime, unique and statewide important farmland as identified by the NRCS.

[THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]