



## MEETING SUMMARY

Red Wing Bridge --TAC #8/PAC #5

July 18, 2013

1:00 p.m.

Red Wing Public Library -- Foot Room

Meeting Chair: Chris Hiniker

Minutes by: Mark Benson

Present: Chad Hanson, Greg Paulson, Todd Stevens, Craig Lenz, Nancy Klema, Jim Rosenow, Anthony Wagner, Adam Wollnen,, Amy Adrihan, Mohamed Hayek, Jay Owens, Brian Peterson, Ken Bjornstad, Patty Brown, Anthony Nemcek-Zahorsky, Ashlyn Christianson, Chris Hiniker, Todd Lang, Dan Dorgan, Mark Benson, Debra Moynihan, Abbi Ginsberg, David Larson, Chris Moates, Nick Schaff, Jacob Bronder, Sue Granger, Wendy Maves, Ben Jilk, Diane Richter Biwer

**Copies to:** PAC/TAC Members

### I. Introductions

### II. Alternatives Analysis

#### A. Overview of Past Progress

1. Early in the study process it was determined the river crossing will be kept at current location
2. Reviewed the range of concepts for the Minnesota and Wisconsin approach roadways
  - a. MN Approach options include:
    - (1) Rehab 9103
    - (2) Replace 9103 in place
    - (3) Buttonhook
    - (4) Buttonhook with slip ramp
  - b. Wisconsin Approach
    - (1) Jug Handle access at 825<sup>th</sup> street
3. Reviewed the four river crossing options and seven bridge types considered.
  - a. Type 1 – Tied Arch
  - b. Type 2 – Single Span Truss
  - c. Type 3 – Three Span Continuous Truss
  - d. Type 4 – Extradosed
  - e. Type 5 – Cable Stayed
  - f. Type 6 – Concrete Segmental Box
  - g. Type 7 – Steel Box Girder
4. Decided to proceed with a two-lane project given:
  - a. The need for additional capacity is not anticipated for approximately 20 years
  - b. WisDOT does not anticipate widening Highway 63 in the next 10-15 years
  - c. Provisions can be made to ensure the ability to expand to four lanes

#### B. Progress Since April PAC Meeting

1. Bridge 9103 Rehabilitation Study

- a. Bridge 9103 is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The study followed the new MnDOT-FHWA historic bridge process.
  - b. Two feasible alternatives were identified
    - (1) Alternative 1
      - (a) Remove & replace a center strip. Patch deck. Replace joints
      - (b) Patch substructures and repair slope paving
      - (c) Requires a Design Exception for Railing
      - (d) Also options to lower TH 61 & add Cathodic Protection system for the slab
    - (2) Alternative 2
      - (a) Includes all of the work included in Alternative 1
      - (b) Adds a railing on the inside of the sidewalk
  - c. Question was asked about sidewalk on Bridge 9103 and what is proposed. Currently there is a 5 foot sidewalk on the east side and a 2.5 foot sidewalk on the west side. The rehabilitation option would repair or replace the 5 foot sidewalk and widen the 2.5 foot sidewalk to 5 feet.
2. Bridge 9040 Rehab vs. Replacement
- a. The rehabilitation alternative includes:
    - (1) Option to add 6-foot cantilevered sidewalks on each side
    - (2) Retains a non-redundant, fracture critical structure
    - (3) Retains existing condition and visual setting
    - (4) Significant maintenance of traffic (MOT) issues assuming bridge remains open to traffic during construction
  - b. Replacement
    - (1) Assume new two-lane bridge immediately upstream from existing river bridge
    - (2) Involve minimal MOT issues
    - (3) Some options are structurally redundant
    - (4) Greater structure depth (approach considerations)
  - c. Decision is to proceed with the replacement option for the following key reasons:
    - (1) They involve substantially less construction period impacts, especially related to maintenance of traffic and emergency services;
    - (2) All bridge types can tie into either the rehabilitation or replacement of Bridge 9103;
    - (3) Provides options that are structurally redundant and/or non-fracture critical;
    - (4) Provides a separate pedestrian trail and will be designed to be fully ADA compliant;
    - (5) Allows pretreatment of water runoff prior to being discharged into the Mississippi River;
    - (6) Lower life-cycle costs than rehab alternative.
3. River Bridge Types Recommended for Further Consideration include:
- a. Tied Arch
    - (1) Shallow deck
    - (2) Can be designed to be not fracture critical
    - (3) Does not preclude ability for future capacity expansion
  - b. Concrete Segmental Box
    - (1) Lower cost
    - (2) Redundant
    - (3) Lowest maintenance cost

- (4) Does not preclude future expansion
  - c. Steel Box Girder
    - (1) Lower cost
    - (2) Redundant
    - (3) Does not preclude ability for future capacity expansion
  - d. Question: What were the reasons for dismissing other bridge types:
    - (1) Simple truss
      - (a) Maintenance
      - (b) Fracture critical
      - (c) Requires extensive painting to maintain
    - (2) 3-span truss
      - (a) Maintenance
      - (b) Fracture critical
      - (c) Requires extensive painting to maintain
    - (3) Extradosed
      - (a) Deeper structure
      - (b) Construction complexity
      - (c) Higher cost
    - (4) Cable stayed
      - (a) Not appropriate for the relatively short river span at Red Wing
      - (b) Visual impacts of high towers
      - (c) Higher cost
  - e. Question: Where will the bridge piers be and will there be more or less?
    - (1) Similar to existing locations
    - (2) Potential exists to lengthen the main span moving the north river pier closer to the Wisconsin shoreline.
    - (3) Clearance over the shipping channel height will be maintained
- C. Next Steps in the Analysis Process
- 1. Identify the recommended approach roadway option(s)
  - 2. Conduct detailed analysis on the remaining alternatives
  - 3. Select the alternative(s) to analyze in the Environmental Assessment (EA)
    - a. Evaluation of Alternatives Will Center on the Following:
      - (1) Cost
      - (2) Primary Needs
      - (3) Secondary Needs
      - (4) Other Considerations
      - (5) Social , Economic and Environmental impacts

### III. Public Outreach Update

- A. Three Listening Sessions Held to Date:
  - 1. May 17, 2012
  - 2. September 20, 2012
  - 3. February 21, 2013
- B. Open House #2 – July 25<sup>th</sup> – 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. at the Red Wing Library
  - 1. **ACTION: Need PAC/TAC members to help spread the word and encourage attendance**
- C. Newsletter #2 – Issued Early July
- D. Project Presentation Opportunities – Request through Chad Hanson
- E. Website: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/d6/projects/redwing-bridge/index.html>

IV. Next Meetings

- A. TAC #9 – August 18<sup>th</sup> 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- B. PAC #6 – September 19<sup>th</sup> 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

V. Comments from PAC/TAC members

- A. What are you looking for from the business community at the open house – specific alternative recommendation?
  - 1. We are looking for broad participation and engagement from the community in this process
- B. What is the timeline for a decision on Bridge 9103.
  - 1. The goal is to identify a preference in the next two months.
- C. What is the long term outlook for Bridge 9103? If project only rehabs it now, then are we back to doing another project to fix the bridge?
  - 1. FHWA uses a 20 year design life. That will serve as the baseline. The life of the rehabilitation options for Bridge 9103 is 10-15 years, and can be extended with the addition of cathodic protection. Additional rehabilitation or replacement would be necessary at that time.
- D. Is there funding for the project that has a pending sunset date?
  - 1. Yes, in 2018 the Chapter 152 bond funds must be under contract
- E. Impacts to downtown are not being reflected with the Bridge 9103 rehab and in-place replacement. There are other impacts on traffic and historic resources not shown on the schematics. Need to better reflect the actual impacts and costs.
  - 1. The downtown impacts will be addressed in the evaluation process.
- F. Are we raising the river clearance
  - 1. Proposed plan is to maintain existing clearance which is approximately 65 feet.
- G. When will the decision be known on whether just one or two alternatives will be carried into the EA?
  - 1. Early Fall 2013

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