Application

04776-2016 Bridges
04868 - CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive) over Tanager Channel Bridge (No. 27592) Replacement
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Status: Submitted
Submitted Date:
07/14/2016 11:14 AM

## Primary Contact



## Organization Information

Name:

Jurisdictional Agency (if different):
Organization Type: County Government

Organization Website:

| Address: | DPT OF PUBLIC WORKS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1600 PRAIRIE |  |  |
| * | MEDINA | Minnesota | 55340 |
|  | City | State/Province | Postal Code/Zip |
| County: | Hennepin |  |  |
| Phone:* | 763-745-7600 |  |  |
|  |  | Ext. |  |
| Fax: |  |  |  |
| PeopleSoft Vendor Number | 0000028004A9 |  |  |

## Project Information

Project Name

Primary County where the Project is Located
Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive) over Tanager Channel Bridge (No.
27592) Replacement

Hennepin

Brief Project Description (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

The project includes the replacement of the CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive) bridge over Browns Bay and Tanager Channel. This bridge is located on an AMinor Arterial roadway that currently carries 16,500 vehicles per day in the City of Orono.

CSAH 15 is a significant regional corridor, providing travel through the Lake Minnetonka area. The regional detour length is 11 miles, so this is a critical connection for this area.

The current CSAH 15 bridge design has prestressed quad-T beams that are in poor condition. The pile bents have exposed piling (as designed) which are deteriorating at the water level and above. Pre-tensioning strands at the bottom of the beams are exposed at many locations. These are exhibiting section loss resulting in a reduced inventory rating. The CSAH 15 bridge is classified as structurally deficient with a sufficiency rating of 41.5.

The project includes a full replacement of this bridge. The current width of this bridge is 36 feet, providing two 12-foot driving lanes and two 6-foot shoulders. The new bridge design will increase the current width to provide a 40-foot typical section, with two 12-foot driving lanes and two 8 -foot shoulders.

With the construction of a new bridge, there are additional improvements that can be incorporated in the design. The current bridge alignment has limited sight lines for motorists. The new bridge would be realigned to the west of the existing bridge to improve these sight lines. This will also provide a better driveway transition for a residential property located just to the southeast of the bridge.

Construction of a new bridge will also allow the height of the bridge to be lifted, which will accommodate larger boats to pass under the facility. Lastly, by keeping the current bridge functional during construction of the new bridge, this will allow for staged construction, to allow the bridge to remain open to traffic. This is important due to the significant nature of this corridor, the connection for motorists and the high traffic volumes that use the facility on a daily basis. The detour for this bridge would be 11 miles, which is significant for motorists, especially emergency and truck traffic.

The reconstruction of this bridge will include an accelerated bridge construction, to keep the roadway open to traffic in both directions. The bridge would be designed for a 75 -year or greater service life.

Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.

TIP Description Guidance (will be used in TIP if the project is
selected for funding)
Project Length (Miles)

CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive) over Tanager Channel Bridge (No. 27592) Replacement
0.15

## Project Funding

Are you applying for funds from another source(s) to implement this project?

If yes, please identify the source(s)

Federal Amount
Match Amount
Minimum of $20 \%$ of project total
Project Total \$2,500,000.00
Match Percentage
20.0\%

Minimum of 20\%
Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total
Source of Match Funds

Preferred Program Year
Select one:
2020
For TDM projects, select 2018 or 2019. For Roadway, Transit, or Trail/Pedestrian projects, select 2020 or 2021.
Additional Program Years:
Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available.

## Project Information-Roadways

County, City, or Lead Agency

Functional Class of Road

Road System
TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET
Road/Route No.
i.e., 53 for CSAH 53

Name of Road

Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE

| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | 55391 |
| :--- | :--- |
| (Approximate) Begin Construction Date | $04 / 01 / 2020$ |
| (Approximate) End Construction Date | $10 / 30 / 2020$ |

TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)

From:
(Intersection or Address)
To:
(Intersection or Address)
DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Or At
Primary Types of Work
Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF,
SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER,
SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS,
BRIDGE, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.
BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)
Old Bridge/Culvert No.:

New Bridge/Culvert No.:
Structure is Over/Under
(Bridge or culvert name):

## Specific Roadway Elements

CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ..... Cost
ESTIMATES
$\$ 0.00$
Mobilization (approx. 5\% of total cost)
$\$ 0.00$
Removals (approx. 5\% of total cost)
$\$ 0.00$
Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.)
$\$ 0.00$
Roadway (aggregates and paving)
$\$ 0.00$
Subgrade Correction (muck)
$\$ 0.00$
Storm Sewer
$\$ 0.00$
Ponds
$\$ 0.00$
Concrete Items (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers)
$\$ 0.00$
Traffic Control
$\$ 0.00$
Striping
$\$ 0.00$
Signing
$\$ 0.00$
Lighting
$\$ 0.00$
Turf - Erosion \& Landscaping
\$2,500,000.00
Bridge
$\$ 0.00$
Retaining Walls
$\$ 0.00$
Noise Wall (do not include in cost effectiveness measure)
$\$ 0.00$
Traffic Signals
$\$ 0.00$
Wetland Mitigation
$\$ 0.00$
Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection
$\$ 0.00$
RR Crossing
$\$ 0.00$
Roadway Contingencies
$\$ 0.00$
Other Roadway Elements$\$ 2,500,000.00$
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST EStIMATES ..... Cost
Path/Trail Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Sidewalk Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Pedestrian-scale Lighting ..... $\$ 0.00$
Streetscaping ..... $\$ 0.00$
Wayfinding ..... $\$ 0.00$
Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Specific Transit and TDM Elements
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES ..... Cost
Fixed Guideway Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Stations, Stops, and Terminals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Support Facilities ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.) ..... $\$ 0.00$
Vehicles ..... $\$ 0.00$
Contingencies ..... $\$ 0.00$
Right-of-Way ..... $\$ 0.00$
Other Transit and TDM Elements ..... $\$ 0.00$
Totals ..... $\$ 0.00$
Transit Operating Costs

| Number of Platform hours | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cost Per Platform hour (full loaded Cost) | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Substotal | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Other Costs - Administration, Overhead,etc. | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Totals

| Total Cost | $\$ 2,500,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Cost Total | $\$ 2,500,000.00$ |
| Transit Operating Cost Total | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Requirements - All Projects

## All Projects

1.The project must be consistent with the goals and policies in these adopted regional plans: Thrive MSP 2040 (2014), the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2015), and the 2040 Water Resources Policy Plan (2015).

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
2.The project must be consistent with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Reference the 2040 Transportation Plan objectives and strategies that relate to the project.
A) Transportation System Stewardship: Hennepin County's annual bridge inspection program ensures planned preservation and maintenance of our facilities. The project will replace a structurally deficient bridge that carries 16,500 vehicles per day. The new bridge construction will be staged and/or accelerated immediately west of the current bridge to minimize impacts to roadway users.
B) Safety/Security: The bridge replacement will solve the structural safety issues for this deficient bridge. The new bridge will be realigned to improve current sight lines, and may provide a safety benefit for the pedestrian crossings at North Shore Marina to the north. The alignment will also provide an opportunity for a safer driveway transition for the property immediately south of the bridge. If the bridge is load-posted, a significant detour will result, which will affect freight and emergency vehicles. The new bridge will increase the shoulder widths, creating a safer environment for bikes and pedestrians.
C) Access to Destinations: CSAH 15 is a regionally significant corridor that provides a direct connection from western Hennepin/Wright County to Highway 12 through the Lake Minnetonka area. The new bridge could be designed with an increased height to accommodate larger boats. The Dakota Rail Trail, $1 / 2$-mile from the project, connects the regional trail system and nearby recreational destinations. Within $1 / 4$-mile of both sides of the bridge, Metro Transit bus routes 675 and 677 provide service between Mound, Ridgedale, and Minneapolis.

[^0]freight carrying time-sensitive goods.

> E) Healthy Environment: CSAH 15 currently serves two transit routes. If bridge conditions worsen, causing closure of the bridge, these routes would face significant delays, likely resulting in reduced ridership. In addition, this project will provide some benefit to people who choose to bike this route, including bikeable shoulders on the bridge and a smoother riding surface.
> F) Leveraging Transportation Investments to Guide Land Use: Due to land constraints, development will be largely limited to subdivision and redevelopment. There is an imminent need to preserve and enhance the existing infrastructure to support transportation and land use in the area.
3. The project or the transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document. Reference the name of the appropriate comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study document [studies on trunk highway must be approved by the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Council], or other official plan or program of the applicant agency [includes Safe Routes to School Plans] that the project is included in and/or a transportation problem/need that the project addresses.

Top 20 Hennepin County Bridge Priority Ranking

## MnDOT Bridge Inspection Report (pages attached)

List the applicable documents and pages:

> MnDOT Structure Inventory Report (pages attached)
4.The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of bicycle/pedestrian projects, transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project, which is otherwise eligible.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5.Applicants that are not cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
6. Applicants must not submit an application for the same project elements in more than one funding application category.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
7.The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Funding amounts by application category are listed below.
Roadway Expansion: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Roadway System Management \$250,000 to \$7,000,000
Bridges Rehabilitation/ Replacement: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
8. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
9. The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
10. The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project for the useful life of the improvement.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
11. The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term independent utility means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match. Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
12. The project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
13. The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected state and local units of government prior to submitting the application.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

## Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

1.All roadway and bridge projects must be identified as a Principal Arterial (Non-Freeway facilities only) or A-Minor Arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Roadway Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization projects only:
2. The project must be designed to meet 10-ton load limit standards.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:
3.Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a Principal Arterial freeway must be limited to the federal share of those project costs identified as local (non-MnDOT) cost responsibility using MnDOTs Cost Participation for Cooperative Construction Projects and Maintenance Responsibilities manual. In the case of a federally funded trunk highway project, the policy guidelines should be read as if the funded trunk highway route is under local jurisdiction.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

```
4.The bridge must carry vehicular traffic. Bridges can carry traffic from multiple modes. However, bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or
pedestrian traffic must apply under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities application categories. Rail-only bridges are ineligible for
funding.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5.The length of the bridge must equal or exceed 20 feet.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
6. The bridge must have a sufficiency rating less than }80\mathrm{ for rehabilitation projects and less than 50 for replacement projects. Additionally, the
bridge must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
```


## Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

## Measure A: Functional Classification

| Area | 0.159 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Length | 0.15 |
| Average Distance | 1.06 |
| Upload Map | $1466192021968 \_$CSAH 015 (Shoreline Drive) Bridge - |
|  | Roadway Area Def.pdf |

## Measure B: Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, and Education

Existing Employment within 1 Mile:
1016
Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile:

Existing Students:

Upload Map

1466192243859_CSAH 015 (Shoreline Drive) Bridge Regional Economy.pdf

## Measure C: Current Daily Heavy Commercial Traffic

Location
Current Daily Heavy Commercial Traffic Volume
Date Heavy Commercial Count Taken:

CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive) North of Tanager Bridge
2172.0

05/18/2016

## Measure D: Freight Elements

Response (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
The CSAH 15 bridge over the Tanager Channel is a regionally significant freight route for Lake Minnetonka communities, carrying 2,172 heavy commercial vehicles per day. Traffic trends show a continued increase in freight and delivery trucks along this corridor and others in the region.

This bridge is classified as structurally deficient with a 41.5 sufficiency rating. There are currently no weight restrictions, however, further deterioration may result in significant detours of heavy vehicles. The bridge replacement would preserve this route to serve heavy vehicles. Without this crossing, there would be an 11-mile detour to the nearest crossing. With limited access routes around Lake Minnetonka and the even more scarce crossings without weight restrictions, this is a vital arterial route.

As the needs for freight continue to increase, this project will improve the mobility, safety and operations for truck traffic. The bridge replacement will support the economic development in the area by providing efficient access to key destinations in the area. The bridge design will widen each shoulder from 6 to 8 feet. An accelerated bridge construction method will be used to keep the roadway open to traffic. The project also straightens the roadway to improve sight lines, further benefitting larger commercial vehicles. The bridge would be designed for a 75-year or greater service life.

## Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput

Location
Current AADT Volume
Existing Transit Routes on the Project:

CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive), north of Tanager Bridge 16500.0

675, 677

# Response: Current Daily Person Throughput 

| Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Current Daily Person Throughput | 21450.0 |

## Measure B: 2040 Forecast ADT

Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume

METC Staff - Forecast (2040) ADT volume
0
OR
Approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume

Forecast (2040) ADT volume
20900.0

## Measure A: Project Location and Impact to Disadvantaged Populations

Select one:
Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50\% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):

Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:
Projects census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:

Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color or Yes includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:

This project is located in the City of Orono, which is identified as a census track that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color. This project is in an area that includes children, people with disabilities and the elderly; although not in concentrations recognized by the Metropolitan Council.

The CSAH 15 bridge connects residents (inclusive of all races, ethnicity, incomes, and abilities) to jobs and educational opportunities. The replacement of this bridge will maintain a vital east-west link through the communities around Lake Minnetonka. CSAH 15 is a heavily used corridor that currently provides two 6 -foot shoulders. The project will provide a benefit to all residents, including children
Response (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words) and elderly that currently live in the area by increasing the space to walk or bike along this facility. The new bridge will provide two 8 -foot shoulders to better accommodate pedestrian, bicycle and wheelchair use. This will allow all transportation modes with the freedom to use this facility for commuting, recreational or social purposes.

The CSAH 15 bridge replacement project will provide a safer bridge design and additional space on the bridge for all residents, including children and elderly, to walk or bike along this facility. The project will not negatively impact low-income populations, populations of color, or the elderly. All facilities will be upgraded to current ADA standards to improve access for people with disabilities.

The response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations affected by the project.

Upload Map

## Measure B: Affordable Housing

|  | City/Township | Segment Length in Miles (Population) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Orono | 3003.0 |  |
| Wayzata | 463.0 |  |
|  | 3466 |  |

# Total Project Length 

Total Project Length (Total Population)
0.15

## Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

City/Township \begin{tabular}{ccccc}
Segment <br>
Length (Miles)

 

Total Length <br>
(Miles)

$\quad$ Score $\quad$

Segment <br>
Length/Total <br>
Length

 

Housing Score <br>
Multiplied by <br>
Segment <br>
percent
\end{tabular}

## Affordable Housing Scoring - To Be Completed By Metropolitan Council Staff

Total Project Length (Miles)
Total Housing Score
0

## Measure A: Bridge Condition

Bridge Sufficiency Rating

## Measure B: Project Improvements

Load Posted (Check box if the bridge is load-posted):

## Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

The CSAH 15 Bridge Reconstruction project will include the following multimodal elements:
-Bikeable shoulders
-Improved site distance for pedestrian crossings at North Shore Marina pedestrian crossings

The CSAH 15 Bridge currently serves Metro Transit routes 675 and 677 with express service between Mound, Ridgedale, and Downtown Minneapolis. CSAH 15 is not identified as a planned bikeway in the county bike plan or Orono's Trail System Plan. Orono's Comprehensive Plan states that CSAH 15 is purposefully not included as a proposed trail corridor due to severe limitations for development of parallel or adjacent trail facilities. The Dakota Rail Trail, located on the opposite side of Tanager Lake approximate one half mile from the project area, provides an alternative bike route and connects users to the greater regional trail system and to nearby commercial and recreational destinations. This project will nonetheless provide some benefits to people who choose to bike this route, including bikeable shoulders on the bridge and a smoother riding surface.

In addition, this project proposes a slight realignment of the bridge, which will yield improved site distances for pedestrians and drivers at the North Shore / Brown's Bay Marina pedestrian crosswalk. The crossing was recently studied by the county due to high pedestrian crossing volumes. Findings resulted in crossing upgrades, including installation of Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) to improve driver yielding behavior and enhance pedestrian comfort and safety. Realignment will provide further safety benefits to pedestrians crossing at that location,
which provides access to an express transit bus stop and popular recreation destinations.

## Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction

If the applicant is completing a transit or TDM application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment.
Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.
Check Here if Your Transit Project Does Not Require Construction

## Measure A: Risk Assessment

1)Project Scope (5 Percent of Points)

| Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred | Yes |
| :--- | :--- |
| $100 \%$ |  |
| Stakeholders have been identified |  |
| $40 \%$ |  |
| Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted |  |
| $0 \%$ | Yes |
| 2)Layout or Preliminary Plan (5 Percent of Points) |  |
| Layout or Preliminary Plan completed |  |
| 100\% |  |
| Layout or Preliminary Plan started |  |
| 50\% |  |
| Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started |  |
| 0\% |  |
| Anticipated date or date of completion |  |
| 3)Environmental Documentation (5 Percent of Points) |  |
| EIS |  |
| Document Status: |  |
| YA |  |

Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)

Document submitted to State Aid for review

Document in progress; environmental impacts identified; review request letters sent

No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and Yes project is not located on an identified historic bridge

100\%
Historic/archeological review under way; determination of no historic properties affected or no adverse effect anticipated

80\%
Historic/archaeological review under way; determination of adverse effect anticipated

40\%
Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological resources in the project area

0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review:

Project is located on an identified historic bridge
5)Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (10 Percent of Points)

4(f) Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild \& scenic rivers or public private historic properties?
6 (f) Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild \& scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?

No Section 4f/6f resources located in the project area Yes
100\%
No impact to $4 f$ property. The project is an independent bikeway/walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement; letter of support received

## 100\%

Section $4 f$ resources present within the project area, but no known adverse effects

80\%
Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely
coordination/documentation has begun
50\%
Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely
coordination/documentation has not begun
$30 \%$
Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area

## 0\%

6)Right-of-Way (15 Percent of Points)

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements not required
100\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired

100\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers
made
75\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made

50\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified

25\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not identified

0\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed
$0 \%$
Anticipated date or date of acquisition
7)Railroad Involvement (25 Percent of Points)

No railroad involvement on project
Yes
$100 \%$

Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature page)

Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated

60\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

40\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations not begun

0\%
Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement
8)Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)*
*Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mn.us or 651-234-7784) to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee.
Project does not involve construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps

Yes
100\%
Interchange project has been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee 100\%
Interchange project has not been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee

## 0\%

9)Construction Documents/Plan (10 Percent of Points)
Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)
100\%
Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review
75\%
Construction plans in progress; at least $30 \%$ completion
50\%
Construction plans have not been started Yes
0\%
Anticipated date or date of completion
12/31/2019
10)Letting
Anticipated Letting Date
04/15/2020

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | $\$ 2,500,000.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | $\$ 2,500,000.00$ |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria |  |
| Cost Effectiveness | $\$ 0.00$ |

## Other Attachments

File Name
Fig 01 - Project Map_CSAH 15
Bridge.pdf
Fig 02- MnDOT Bridge Inspection and Inventory Reports - CSAH 15 Bridge.pdf

Fig 03 - Photos of CSAH 15
Deficiencies.pdf
Fig 04 - Proposed Typical Section CSAH 015.pdf

Fig 05 - CSAH 15 Bridge 2016 Heavy
Commercial Volumes.pdf
Fig 06 - AADT Vols CSAH 15 Bridge MnDOT 50 Series Map - 5E.pdf

Fig 07 - Orono - Public Transit Routes.pdf

Fig 08 - CSAH 15 Bridge 2040 Forecasts from Mark Filipi.pdf

Fig 09 - Orono - Comprehensive Trail System Map.pdf

Fig 10 - Orono CSAH 15 Bridge Support Letter.pdf

## Description

File Size

Project Map_CSAH 15 Bridge
373 KB

MnDOT Bridge Inspection and Inventory
Reports - CSAH 15 Bridge

Photos of CSAH 15 Deficiencies

Proposed Typical Section-CSAH 15155 KB

CSAH 15 Bridge 2016 Heavy
Commercial Volumes
AADT Vols CSAH 15 Bridge - MnDOT 50
Series Map - 5E

Orono - Public Transit Routes

CSAH 15 Bridge 2040 Forecasts from Mark Filipi

Orono - Comprehensive Trail System Map


## Regional Economy Bridges Project: CSAH 15 Bridge | Map ID: 1465846575898

## Results

WITHIN ONE MI of project:
Totals by City:

## Orono

Population: 3003
Employment: 852
Mfg and Dist Employment: 16

## Wayzata

Population: 463
Employment: 164
Mfg and Dist Employment: 8

Postsecondary Students
0


Project Points $\square$ Project Area
Project



## CSAH 15 (Shoreline Dr) - Bridge Rehabilitation Project

Figure 01 - Project Location Map


## MINNESOTA STRUCTURE INVENTORY REPORT

Bridge ID: 27592
CSAH 15 over BROWNS BAY-TANAGER LK CH
Date: 06/10/2016

| + GENERAL + | + ROADWAY + | + I NSPECTION + |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency Br. No. | Bridge Match ID (TIS) 1 | Deficient Status S.D. |
| District METRO Maint. Area | Roadway O/U Key 1-ON | Sufficiency Rating 41.5 |
| County 27-HENNEPIN | Route Sys/Nbr CSAH 15 | Last Inspection Date 07-28-2015 |
| City ORONO | Roadway Name or Description | Inspection Frequency 12 |
| Township | CSAH 15 | Inspector Name HENNEPIN COUNTY |
| Desc. Loc. $\quad 0.9 \mathrm{MI}$ NE OF JCT CSAH 51 | Roadwav Function MAINLINE | Status A-OPEN |
| Sect., Twp., Range 11-117N-23W | Roadway Type 2 WAY TRAF | + NBICONDITION RATINGS |
| Latitude $\quad 44 \mathrm{~d} 57 \mathrm{~m} 31.93 \mathrm{~s}$ | Control Section (TH Only) | Deck 5 \% UNSOUND 4 |
| Longitude 93d 33m 32.42s | Ref. Point | Superstructure 4 |
| Custodian COUNTY | Date Opened to Traffic 09-01-1979 | Substructure 5 |
| Owner COUNTY | Detour Length 11 mi . | Channel 7 |
| Inspection By HENNEPIN COUNTY | Lanes 2 Lanes ON Bridge | Culvert N |
| Year Built 1979 | ADT (YEAR) 19,474 (2008) | + NBI APPRAISAL RATINGS |
| MN Year Remodeled | HCADT | Structure Evaluation 4 |
| FHWA Year Reconstructed | Functional Class. URB/MINOR ART | Deck Geometry 4 |
| Bridge Plan Location COUNTY | + RDWY DIMENSIONS + | Underclearances N |
| Potential ABC N.A. | If Divided NB-EB SB-WB | Waterway Adequacy 8 |
|  | Roadway Width 36.0 ft | Approach Alignment 8 |
| + STRUCTURE + | Vertical Clearance | + SAFETY FEATURES + |
| Service On HIGHWAY | Max. Vert. Clear. | Bridge Railing 1-MEETS STANDARDS |
| Service Under STREAM | Horizontal Clear. 36.0 ft | GR Transition 1-MEETS STANDARDS |
| Main Span Type PRESTR QUAD TEE | Lateral Clr. - Lt/Rt | Appr. Guardrail 1-MEETS STANDARDS |
| Main Span Detail | Appr. Surface Width 36.0 ft | GR Termini 0-SUBSTANDARD |
| Appr. Span Type | Bridge Roadway Width 36.0 ft | $+\quad$ IN DEPTH INSP. + |
| Appr. Span Detail | Median Width on Bridge | Frac. Critical N |
| Skew 5R | + MISC. BRIDGE DATA + | Underwater N |
| Culvert Type | Structure Flared NO | Pinned Asbly. N |
| Barrel Length | Parallel Structure NONE | Spec. Feat. |
| Number of Spans | Field Conn. ID | + WATERWAY + |
| MAIN: 3 APPR: $0 \quad$ TOTAL: 3 | Cantilever ID | Drainage Area |
| Main Span Length 40.0 ft | Foundations | Waterway Opening 300 sq ft |
| Structure Length 92.8 ft | Abut. CONC - PILE BENT | Navigation Control NO PRMT REQD |
| Deck Width 39.6 ft | Pier CONC - PILE BENT | Pier Protection |
| Deck Material C-I-P CONCRETE | Historic Status NOT ELIGIBLE | Nav. Vert./Horz. CIr. |
| Wear Surf Type LOW SLUMP CONC | On - Off System ON | Nav. Vert. Lift Bridge Clear. |
| Wear Surf Install Year 1979 | + PAINT + | MN Scour Code I-LOW RISK |
| Wear Course/Fill Depth 0.17 ft | Year Painted Pct. Unsound | Scour Evaluation Year 1991 |
| Deck Membrane NONE | Painted Area | + CAPACITY RATINGS + |
| Deck Rebars NONE | Primer Type | Design Load HS 20 |
| Deck Rebars Install Year | Finish Type | Operating Rating HS 28.80 |
| Structure Area $3,675 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ | + BRIDGE SIGNS + | Inventory Rating HS 13.20 |
| Roadway Area $3,337 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ | Posted Load NOT REQUIRED | Posting |
| Sidewalk Width - L/R $\quad 0.8 \mathrm{ft} \quad 0.8 \mathrm{ft}$ | Traffic NOT REQUIRED | Rating Date 10-29-2013 |
| Curb Height - L/R | Horizontal OBJECT MARKERS | Overweight Permit Codes |
| Rail Codes - L/R 22 22 | Vertical NOT APPLICABLE | A: $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{B}: \mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{N}$ |

## MINNESOTA BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

Inspected by: HENNEPIN COUNTY

## BRIDGE 27592 CSAH 15 OVER BROWNS BAY-TANAGER LK CH

County: HENNEPIN
City: ORONO
Township:
Section: 11 Township: 117N Range: 23W
Span Type: PRESTR QUAD TEE

Location: $\quad 0.9 \mathrm{MI}$ NE OF JCT CSAH 51
Route: CSAH 15 Ref. Pt.: 011+00.710
Control Section
Local Agency Bridge Nbr:

INSP. DATE: 07-28-2015
Length: 92.8 ft
Deck Width: 39.6 ft
Rdwy. Area / Pct. Unsnd: $\quad 3,337$ sq ft $5 \%$
Paint Area / Pct. Unsnd:
Culvert: N/A

Appraisal Ratings - Approach: 8 Waterway: 8
Required Bridge Signs - Load Posting: NOT REQUIRED Horizontal: OBJECT MARKERS

Open, Posted, Closed: OPEN
MN Scour Code: I-LOW RISK Def. Stat: S.D. Suff. Rate: 41.5
Traffic: NOT REQUIRED
Vertical: NOT APPLICABLE

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ELEM } \\ \text { NBR } \end{gathered}$ | ELEMENT NAME | INSP. DATE | QUANTITY | $\begin{gathered} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { QTY } \\ & \text { CS } 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 800 | CRITICAL DEFS OR SAFETY HAZARDS | 07-28-2015 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Notes: No critical structural deficiencies or serious safety hazards are present on this structure.

| 15 | PRESTRESSED CONCRETE TOP FLANGE | 07-28-2015 | 3,675 SF | 3,675 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Notes: [2016] Migrator assumed CS1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 510 | WEARING SURFACE | 07-28-2015 | 3,337 SF | 3,003 | 0 | 334 | 0 |
|  | Notes: Low Slump Overlay with Uncoated Rebar Notes: 22. Tra deteriorated. Long cracks w/ some large spalls @ top surfac in many areas. '13-large(2' x 1') spall in SBL @ S end. '1 many areas. '15-New sealer in place, some spalled/patch remaining conc pieces are settling |  | cracks in co quad-T jo L @ S end large in siz |  |  | s <br> ailing <br> in the |  |
| 810 | CONC WEAR SURF-CRACKING SEALING | 07-28-2015 | 0 LF | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Notes: 358. Long cracks @ T joints. Some transverse cracks. '11-cracks up to 1 " wide and less than 5 ' in density. '13-unsealed cracks of mod size, density <5'. '14-no change. '15-Cracks sealed

| 301 | POURED SEAL JOINT | $07-28-2015$ | 80 LF | 61 | 19 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Notes: 301. Spalls @ intersection of joint and quad-T joint. Joint material missing @ quad-T joints. '13-qty changed. Joints are over piers. Some material only partially adhered @ both. '14-few areas of minor deterioration @ both joints. 15'-S joint is severely spalled near centerline

| 331 | REINFORCED CONC BRIDGE RAILING | $07-28-2015$ | 187 LF | 0 | 187 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Notes: 331. Numerous vert cracks w/ efflor. Face of west railbase pitted. Form-tie popouts on outside of both railbases. Slight misalignment @ SW corner. Large spall in top of SW railing. Cork in joint is deteriorated. '13-W railing has areas of scale. '14-no change. '15-Misalignment @ SW corner is $3 / 4$ '.

| 822 | BITUMINOUS APPROACH ROADWAY | $07-28-2015$ | 2 EA | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Notes: $\quad 320$. Low spot in gutter @ SE driveway. Settled and spalled @ both ends. Badly spalled in NE. '13-8" spall in SW. Diag crack in SW. '14-spall in SW is patched. N is slightly settled \& patched @ deck joint. S has a 1 ' x 6 " spall in NBL near CL. '15-Majority of N joint is spalled in NBL

| 225 | STEEL OR CIP PILING | 07-28-2015 | 12 EA | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Notes: | or section los W @ S. '15-n | s. '13-se |  | -sec |  |  |
| 515 | STEEL PROTECTIVE COATING | 07-28-2015 | 999 SF | 999 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | [2016] Migrator assumed CS1 and a quantity of 999 SF. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 215 | REINFORCED CONCRETE ABUTMENT | 07-28-2015 | 119 LF | 84 | 35 | 0 | 0 |

Notes: [2016] Migrator added 40 LF to abutment quantity to account for wingwalls (CS1:20 CS2:20 CS3:0 CS4:0). 215. Vertical cracks w/ efflor, rust stains @ both abuts. Leakage @ both abuts. North-3 SF delam. South-spall on back in SW corner. '13-no change. '14-same. '15-same

Wingwall notes: 387 . Vert cracks in wingwalls. NW wall spalled @ wall/abut joint. Form-tie hole popouts on walls. Spall @ SW corner. '13-no change. '14-same. '15-no change

| 234 | REINFORCED CONCRETE PIER CAP | 07-28-2015 | 82 LF | 64 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 234. South-2 vert cracks. Water leakage and rust stain on the bent cap. '13-now 4 vert cracks. North-diagonal and vert cracks w/ efflor @ W end. Vert crack on S side over 3rd pile from W. '13-4 vert cracks on S side. '14-S has 5 minor - mod full height cracks w/ efflor. Minor cracks on $S$ side of $N$ are full height w/ efflor. '15-Heavy effl on $N$ face on $N$ cap $@ W$ end $@$ the diag crack |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 109 | PRESTRESSED CONC GIRDER OR BEAM | 07-28-2015 | 2,970 LF | 1,293 | 1,253 | 343 | 81 |

Notes: [2016] Migrator estimated the quantity of the quad tees. Verify the quantity by multiplying the number of vertical beams by the deck length.
374. Many quad-T legs cracked, some w/ efflor @ $N$ and S pier cap. 1 quad-T leg cracked @ $N$ abut. 5 legs cracked @ S abut. Some long cracks w/ rust in quad-T legs in center span. 2 west T's have adjoining webs long cracked on each quad for full length in center span. West fascia stringer is chipped in several areas @ bottom of stem in center span. Concrete is cracked w/ efflor over piers on both sides. Crumbled and punky concrete w/ spalled areas @ a few center span bearings-monitor. Stringer has been scraped above channel. Spall @ each end of SW fascia T @ bearing. Joints mostly stained and many spalled. Cracks, spalls and delams on legs of some T's, especially on W side. Full length, 6"-12" deep spall @ joint of E leg of 4th T from W in S span. Strands broke @ leg of west T. All exp reinforcing strands rusty w/ section loss. '13-no change. '14-4th \& 5th tees from W have exposed rebar for +10 ' w/ section loss. 5th tee from W has $1 / 5 \mathrm{LF}$ spall w/ rebar exp in leg @ S abut; 2nd tee from W leg has 1 LF spall w/ rebar exp @ P1. '15-heavy effl @ many jts. All jts in span 1 have spalls, 2nd jt from east in main span has a large spall, 1st tee from the west in the $S$ span is cracked in the leg for entire length, S span centerline jt is spalled for entire length

| 310 | ELASTOMERIC EXPANSION BEARING | $07-28-2015$ | 2 EA | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Notes: 310 . Continuous, full length bearing pads @ each abut. '13-no change. '14-same. '15-same.
313 FIXED BEARING $\quad 07-28-2015 \quad 4 \mathrm{EA} \quad 4 \quad 0$

Notes: $\quad 313.2$ continuous, full length bearing pads @ each pier. '14-no change. '15-no change.


Notes: 380. Concrete end diaphragms are spalled @ both abuts. '13-no change. '14-no change. '15-no change
883 CONCRETE SHEAR CRACKING $\quad 07-28-2015 \quad 1$ EA $\quad 1 \quad 0$

Notes: Use this element to monitor the presence of shear cracking on concrete elements. Pay particular attention to the concrete pier caps.

| 891 | OTHER BRIDGE SIGNING | $07-28-2015$ | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Notes: | 981. Horiz clearance marker X4-4 @ approach lanes only. No Parking sign @ NW, NE \& SW corners. 35 MPH sign @ NE <br>  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SE. '15-no change |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: $\quad 985$. Grouted riprap is cracked @ both abuts. Slope paving pulled away from $N$ and $S$ abuts, 3 "-4" horiz and up to 7" vert. Large crack w/ up to 10" shift (@ S slope) near toe of both slopes. Undermined and sand @ toe. Erosion behind NE wingwall. Grouted rip rap @ N slope has slumped 3 " horiz and 1 " vert away from abut. Erosion behind NE wingwall. '13-N slope has slumped 2"-3" away from abut. '14-SW corner broken off \& undermined. N has sunk 1 ' near top under CL. '15-large cracks @ undermining @ N abut slope


Notes: $\quad 982$. Rail @ SE corner turns for driveway. Rail turned down @ all other corners. Loose bolt in SW. '13-no change. '14-rail turned down @ N ends. SW is continuous from intersection w/ crashworthy end treatment. '15-Small tree has fallen on SW Rail, no damage visible

Notes: 984. CB in SW approach. '14-water standing in NW corner of deck. '15-no change

| 899 | MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS | $07-28-2015$ | 1 EA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Notes: Use this element to track the presence of protected species living on this structure.

General Bridge 27592 CSAH 15/Browns Bay-Tanager Lake 7/28/15. PTH and JDE. Inspected using Tony B's boat.
Notes: '13-start to plan to replace deck, piers and piling.

Recommended Repairs:
22. Seal large deck cracks w/ bit. Seal other deck cracks w/ epoxy.
301. Repair poured deck joints.
320. Repair spalled approaches.
374. Monitor cracked and deteriorated concrete quad-T beams. Clean, lightly blast and coat exposed prestressing strands on 2 West T's.
382. Clean and paint piling.
985. Repair slumped slope paving.
988. Notify utility company of missing hanger assemblies in N span.

05/04/2016 Update report created and approved by LH, MnDOT Bridge Office. Report created to correct sync issue..
Substructure: [5] Cracking of pier caps. Corrosion, section loss of piles.

# MINNESOTA BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT OLD ELEMENT SYSTEM 

Inspected by: HENNEPIN COUNTY
BRIDGE 27592
CSAH 15 OVER BROWNS BAY-TANAGER LK CH
INSP. DATE: 07-28-2015

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELEM } \\ & \text { NBR } \end{aligned}$ | ELEMENT NAME | ENV | INSP. DATE | QUANTITY | QTY CS 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { QTY } \\ & \text { CS } 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | QTY CS 4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | LS O/L (CONC DECK) | 4 | 07-28-2015 | 3,670 SF | 0 | 0 | 3,670 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | 07-28-2014 | 3,670 SF | 0 | 0 | 3,670 | 0 | 0 |

Notes: |22. Trans and long cracks in concrete surface, some sealed, most seals deteriorated. Long cracks w/ some large spalls @ top surface @ each quad-T joint-most filled w/ bit sealer, but sealer failing in many areas. '13-large(2' x 1 ') spall in SBL @ S end. '14-spall in SBL @ S end has been patched w/ bit. Sealer failing in many areas. '15-New sealer in place, some spalled/patched areas are large in size, patch in SBL at S end is failing and the remaining conc pieces are settling|

| 301 | POURED DECK JOINT | 4 | 07-28-2015 | 80 LF | 61 | 19 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 07-28-2014 | 80 LF | 75 | 5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
|  | Notes: \|301. Spalls @ in over piers. Some severely spalled |  | joint. Joint m d @ both. '14 | ng @ qu <br> of minor | ts. <br> ation | chan | ins |  |  |
| 320 | CONC APPR SLAB-BITOL | 4 | 07-28-2015 | 2 EA | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | N/A |
|  |  |  | 07-28-2014 | 2 EA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | N/A |

Notes: $\quad 320$. Low spot in gutter @ SE driveway. Settled and spalled @ both ends. Badly spalled in NE. '13-8" spall in SW. Diag crack in SW. '14-spall in SW is patched. N is slightly settled \& patched @ deck joint. S has a 1 ' x 6 " spall in NBL near CL. '15-Majority of N joint is spalled in NBL|

## 331 CONCRETE RAILING

$4 \quad 07-28-2015$
187 LF
0

Notes: |331. Numerous vert cracks w/ efflor. Face of west railbase pitted. Form-tie popouts on outside of both railbases. Slight misalignment @ SW corner. Large spall in top of SW railing. Cork in joint is deteriorated. '13-W railing has areas of scale. '14-no change. '15-Misalignment @ SW corner is 3/4".|

| 374 | P/S CONCRETE TEE | 2 | $07-28-2015$ | $735 ~ L F$ | 320 | 310 | 85 | 20 | N/A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $207-28-2014$ | 735 LF | 350 | 280 | 85 | 20 | N/A |  |

Notes: |374. Many quad-T legs cracked, some w/ efflor @ N and S pier cap. 1 quad-T leg cracked @ N abut. 5 legs cracked @ S abut. Some long cracks w/ rust in quad-T legs in center span. 2 west T's have adjoining webs long cracked on each quad for full length in center span. West fascia stringer is chipped in several areas @ bottom of stem in center span. Concrete is cracked w/ efflor over piers on both sides. Crumbled and punky concrete w/ spalled areas @ a few center span bearings-monitor. Stringer has been scraped above channel. Spall @ each end of SW fascia T @ bearing. Joints mostly stained and many spalled. Cracks, spalls and delams on legs of some T's, especially on W side. Full length, 6"-12" deep spall @ joint of E leg of 4th T from W in S span. Strands broke @ leg of west T. All exp reinforcing strands rusty w/ section loss. '13-no change. '14-4th \& 5th tees from W have exposed rebar for +10' w/ section loss. 5th tee from W has 1/5 LF spall w/ rebar exp in leg @ S abut; 2nd tee from W leg has 1 LF spall w/ rebar exp @ P1. '15-heavy effl @ many jts. All jts in span 1 have spalls, 2nd jt from east in main span has a large spall, 1st tee from the west in the S span is cracked in the leg for entire length, $S$ span centerline jt is spalled for entire length|


Notes: |215. Vertical cracks w/ efflor, rust stains @ both abuts. Leakage @ both abuts. North-3 SF delam. South-spall on back in SW corner. '13-no change. '14-same. '15-same|

| BRIDGE 27592 | CSAH 15 OVER BROWNS BAY-TANAGER LK CH |  |  |  | INSP. DATE: 07-28-2015 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELEM } \\ & \text { NBR } \end{aligned}$ | ELEMENT NAME | ENV | INSP. DATE | QUANTITY | $\begin{array}{r} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { QTY } \\ & \text { CS } 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { QTY } \\ \text { CS } 5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 234 CONCRE | E CAP | 4 | 07-28-2015 | 82 LF | 64 | 18 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  |  |  | 07-28-2014 | 82 LF | 64 | 18 | 0 | 0 | N/A |

Notes: |234. South-2 vert cracks. Water leakage and rust stain on the bent cap. '13-now 4 vert cracks. North-diagonal and vert cracks w/ efflor @ W end. Vert crack on S side over 3rd pile from W. '13-4 vert cracks on S side. '14-S has 5 minor - mod full height cracks w/ efflor. Minor cracks on $S$ side of N are full height w/ efflor. '15-Heavy effl on N face on N cap @ W end @ the diag crack|


Notes: 1981. Horiz clearance marker X4-4 @ approach lanes only. No Parking sign @ NW, NE \& SW corners. 35 MPH sign @ NE corner. Lake information signs on both fascias. X4-5 @ end of guardrail in NE. No Fishing Or Standing On Bridge in NW \& SE. '15-no change|

| 982 | GUARDRAIL | 2 | 07-28-2015 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 07-28-2014 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |

Notes: |982. Rail @ SE corner turns for driveway. Rail turned down @ all other corners. Loose bolt in SW. '13-no change. '14-rail turned down @ N ends. SW is continuous from intersection w/ crashworthy end treatment. '15-Small tree has fallen on SW Rail, no damage visible|


# MINNESOTA BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT OLD ELEMENT SYSTEM 

06/10/2016

Inspected by: HENNEPIN COUNTY
BRIDGE 27592 CSAH 15 OVER BROWNS BAY-TANAGER LK CH
INSP. DATE: 07-28-2015

| ELEM |  |  |  | QTY | QTY | QTY | QTY | QTY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NBR | ELEMENT NAME | ENV INSP. DATE | QUANTITY | CS 1 | CS 2 | CS 3 | CS 4 | CS 5 |

General Notes: Bridge 27592 CSAH 15/Browns Bay-Tanager Lake 7/28/15. PTH and JDE. Inspected using Tony B's boat. '13-start to plan to replace deck, piers and piling.

Recommended Repairs:
22. Seal large deck cracks w/ bit. Seal other deck cracks w/ epoxy.
301. Repair poured deck joints.
320. Repair spalled approaches.
374. Monitor cracked and deteriorated concrete quad-T beams. Clean, lightly blast and coat exposed prestressing strands on 2 West T's.
382. Clean and paint piling.
985. Repair slumped slope paving.
988. Notify utility company of missing hanger assemblies in N span.


## CSAH 015 - CP 1634 Bridge Replacement



Classification Grand Totals

| Interval Start | Total | Motor Bikes | Cars \& Trailers | 2 Axle Long | Buses | Hourly Averages Combined |  |  | <5 Axle Double | 5 Axle Double | >6 Axle Double | <6 Axle Multi | 6 Axle Multi | $\begin{gathered} >6 \text { Axle } \\ \text { Multi } \end{gathered}$ | Tailgating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { Axle } 6 \\ \text { Tire } \end{array}$ | 3 Axle Single | 4 Axle Single |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:00 AM | 65.0 | 0.5 | 50.5 | 12.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1:00 AM | 42.0 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2:00 AM | 27.5 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3:00 AM | 25.5 | 0.5 | 19.5 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 4:00 AM | 92.5 | 2.0 | 64.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5:00 AM | 357.0 | 3.0 | 227.5 | 94.0 | 3.5 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6:00 AM | 885.5 | 10.0 | 611.0 | 180.0 | 31.0 | 38.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 7:00 AM | 1278.5 | 12.5 | 864.0 | 230.5 | 78.5 | 53.5 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 26.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| 8:00 AM | 1137.0 | 15.0 | 739.5 | 220.0 | 73.0 | 42.5 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 29.0 | 3.5 | 0.5 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| 9:00 AM | 940.5 | 9.5 | 558.5 | 213.5 | 67.5 | 57.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| 10:00 AM | 823.0 | 5.0 | 504.5 | 188.0 | 37.5 | 53.0 | 6.0 | 1.5 | 22.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 11:00 AM | 830.5 | 6.0 | 506.5 | 193.5 | 46.5 | 45.0 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 22.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 12:00 PM | 871.5 | 5.5 | 540.5 | 189.5 | 52.0 | 49.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 23.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| 1:00 PM | 932.5 | 13.0 | 591.0 | 192.5 | 49.5 | 57.5 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| 2:00 PM | 912.5 | 12.5 | 570.0 | 200.0 | 60.0 | 45.0 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 14.0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| 3:00 PM | 1108.0 | 16.5 | 699.0 | 233.5 | 78.5 | 49.5 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 16.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| 4:00 PM | 1237.5 | 22.0 | 767.5 | 241.0 | 105.5 | 57.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| 5:00 PM | 1286.5 | 19.5 | 836.0 | 220.0 | 117.0 | 47.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 0.5 |
| 6:00 PM | 1029.0 | 13.0 | 691.0 | 178.0 | 75.5 | 37.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 24.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| 7:00 PM | 798.0 | 22.5 | 548.0 | 154.5 | 30.0 | 32.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 8:00 PM | 731.0 | 8.5 | 538.5 | 126.0 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| 9:00 PM | 596.5 | 12.5 | 438.5 | 108.5 | 16.5 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 10:00 PM | 296.0 | 2.0 | 240.0 | 45.5 | 2.5 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 11:00 PM | 146.0 | 0.5 | 121.5 | 21.5 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Daily Average | 16449.5 | 212.0 | 10784.0 | 3280.5 | 948.5 | 733.5 | 36.5 | 7.0 | 324.0 | 30.5 | 1.5 | 72.5 | 3.5 | 15.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Study Grand Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Motor Bikes | Cars \& Trailers | 2 Axle Long | Buses | $2 \text { Axle } 6$ Tire | 3 Axle Single | 4 Axle Single | <5 Axle Double | 5 Axle Double | >6 Axle Double | <6 Axle Multi | 6 Axle Multi | >6 Axle Multi | Tailgating |
| Combined | 32899 | 424 | 21568 | 6561 | 1897 | 1467 | 73 | 14 | 648 | 61 | 3 | 145 | 7 | 30 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.3 \% | 65.6 \% | 19.9 \% | 5.8 \% | 4.5 \% | 0.2 \% | 0.0 \% | 2.0 \% | 0.2 \% | 0.0 \% | 0.4 \% | 0.0 \% | 0.1 \% | 0.0 \% |
| E.B. | 16395 | 210 | 10866 | 3237 | 891 | 712 | 39 | 9 | 323 | 41 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
|  |  | 1.3 \% | 66.3 \% | 19.7 \% | 5.4 \% | 4.3 \% | 0.2 \% | 0.1 \% | 2.0 \% | 0.3 \% | 0.0 \% | 0.4 \% | 0.0 \% | 0.0 \% | 0.0 \% |
| W.B. | 16504 | 214 | 10702 | 3324 | 1006 | 755 | 34 | 5 | 325 | 20 | 3 | 83 | 7 | 25 | 1 |
|  |  | 1.3 \% | 64.8 \% | 20.1\% | 6.1 \% | 4.6 \% | 0.2 \% | 0.0 \% | 2.0 \% | 0.1 \% | 0.0 \% | 0.5 \% | 0.0 \% | 0.2 \% | 0.0 \% |

DAILY TOTAL OF HEAVY COMMERCIAL VEHICLES = 2,172


## Public Transportation Routes

City of Orono

Minnesota

Current Metro Transit Bus Route
Park \& Ride Facilities
年Bonestroo

| From: | Filipi, Mark |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Sierra Saunders |
| Cc: | Lason R Pieper; Jason D Gottfried; Carla Stueve; Robert H. Byers |
| Subject: | RE: 2016 Regional Solicitation - Forecast AADT"s |
| Date: | Thursday, June 16, 2016 10:23:49 AM |
| Attachments: | image006.png <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  image008.png |

Sierra,

Here is the data you requested. It is generated from the model runs from the most recent update of the Council's 2040 Transportation Policy Plan and is based in the four-step trip-based regional travel demand forecast model.

Project
CSAH 15 (Shoreline Dr) Bridge Replacement
CSAH 19 (Manitou Rd/Shadywood Rd) Bridge Rehabilitation
CSAH 23 (Marshall St NE)
CSAH 32 (Penn Ave) Reconstruction
you cite of 12,800 is actually outside

CSAH 66 (Golden Valley Rd) Reconstruction
CSAH 81 (Bottineau Blvd) Expansion
CSAH 81 (Broadway Ave) Bridge Replacement
CSAH 152 (Webber Pkwy) Reconstruction

Forecast Volume
20,900
16,200
10,500
16,200 (Note: The 2014 AADT
your project area. 10,800 is the only AADT reported in your
project area)
19,900 (West of Noble Ave.)
10,200 (East of Indiana Ave.)
51,100
24,700
This roadway is not in the regional model.
The model links in the area show an annualized
growth rate of 0.5\%. When applied to the 13,700

2013 volume, this grows to 16,100.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.


Mark Filipi, AICP PTP
Manager, Technical Planning Support
Metropolitan Transportation Services
mark.filipi@metc.state.mn.us
P.651.602.1725 | F.651.602.1739

390 North Robert Street | St. Paul, MN | 55101 | metrocouncil.org

From: Sierra Saunders [mailto:Sierra.Saunders@hennepin.us]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 8:02 AM
To: Filipi, Mark [Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us)
Cc: Jason R Pieper [Jason.Pieper@hennepin.us](mailto:Jason.Pieper@hennepin.us); Jason Gottfried [Jason.gottfried@hennepin.us](mailto:Jason.gottfried@hennepin.us);
Carla Stueve [Carla.Stueve@hennepin.us](mailto:Carla.Stueve@hennepin.us); Robert H. Byers [Robert.Byers@hennepin.us](mailto:Robert.Byers@hennepin.us)
Subject: 2016 Regional Solicitation - Forecast AADT's

Greetings Mark,

I'm writing to request 2040 Forecast AADT information for the Regional Solicitation. Below is the list of projects with our most recent adjusted traffic counts. Project location maps are attached, in the same order as the list below:

- CSAH 15 (Shoreline Dr) Bridge Replacement (Over Browns Bay/Tanager Channel): 16,500 (2014 AADT)
- CSAH 19 (Manitou Rd/Shadywood Rd) Bridge Rehabilitation (Over Narrows Channel): 11,900 (2016 AADT)
- CSAH 23 (Marshall St NE) Reconstruction: 8,800 (2016 AADT)
- CSAH 32 (Penn Ave) Reconstruction: 12,800 (2014 AADT)
- CSAH 66 (Golden Valley Rd) Reconstruction: 11,900 (2016 AADT)
- CSAH 81 (Bottineau Blvd) Expansion (4-lane divided to 6-lane divided): 21,400 (2013 AADT)
- CSAH 81 (Broadway Ave) Bridge Replacement (Over CSAH 153 [Lowry Ave]): 12,100 (2016 AADT)
- CSAH 152 (Webber Pkwy) Reconstruction: 13,700 (2013 AADT)

Please let me know if you need any additional information, and thank you!

Sierra Saunders
Multimodal Planner
Hennepin County Public Works
1600 Prairie Drive, Medina, MN 55340

Office: 612.596.0364
sierra.saunders@hennepin.us

Disclaimer: If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.


## CITY OF ORONO

June 06, 2016

James N. Grube, P.E.<br>Hennepin County Engineer<br>Transportation Department 1600 Prairie Drive<br>Medina, MN 55340

## Re: Support for Regional Solicitation Application

 CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive) Bridge over Tanager ChannelDear Mr. Grube:
The City of Orono supports Hennepin County's federal funding application through the Regional Solicitation for the proposed CSAH 15 (Shoreline Drive) bridge replacement project over the Tanager Channel.

The city supports this project to replace the existing bridge structure with a new bridge design. This bridge replacement project will enhance the livability and quality of life for Orono and Hennepin County residents.

Thank you for making us aware of this application effort and the opportunity to provide support. The city looks forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,


Director of Public Works/City Engineer


[^0]:    D) Competitive Economy: The CSAH 15 bridge provides a critical connection for residents to access employment, shopping and recreation in the region. If this bridge is load posted, the resulting 11-mile detour would have a major impact on

