

Application

19830 - 2024 Bridges 20039 - CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) Bridge Replacement Project Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements Status:

Submitted Date:

Submitted 12/11/2023 4:52 PM

Primary Contact

Feel free to edit your profile any time your information changes. Create your own personal alerts using My Alerts.

| Name:* | He/him/his Pronouns | Jason First Name | Richard Middle Name | Pieper Last Name |
|--|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Title: | Transportation Er | | | |
| Department: | | - Transportation Dep | partment | |
| Email: | jason.pieper@hei | | | |
| Address: | 1600 Prairie Drive | | | |
| | | | | |
| * | Medina _{City} | Minnesota State/Province | 53340 Postal Cod | le/Zip |
| Phone.* | 612-596-0241 Phone | | | Ext. |
| Fax: | | | | |
| What Grant Programs are you most interested in? | Regional Solicitat | tion - Roadways Inclu | uding Multimodal Ele | ements |
| Organization Information | | | | |
| | | | | |
| _ | HENNEPIN COU | NTY | | |
| Name: | HENNEPIN COU | NTY | | |
| Name: Jurisdictional Agency (if different): | HENNEPIN COU County Governme | | | |
| Name: Jurisdictional Agency (if different): Organization Type: | | | | |
| Name: Jurisdictional Agency (if different): Organization Type: Organization Website: | | ent WORKS | | |
| Name: Jurisdictional Agency (if different): Organization Type: Organization Website: | County Governme | ent WORKS | 55340 Postal Ci | |
| Name: Jurisdictional Agency (if different): Organization Type: Organization Website: Address: | County Governme DPT OF PUBLIC 1600 PRAIRIE DF MEDINA | ent WORKS २ Minnesota | | |
| Name: Jurisdictional Agency (if different): Organization Type: Organization Website: Address: | County Governme DPT OF PUBLIC 1600 PRAIRIE DF MEDINA City | ent WORKS २ Minnesota | | ode/Zip |
| Name: Jurisdictional Agency (if different): Organization Type: Organization Website: Address: * County: Phone:* Fax: | County Governme DPT OF PUBLIC 1600 PRAIRIE DF MEDINA City Hennepin | ent WORKS २ Minnesota | | |

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

CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) Bridge Replacement Project Hennepin Orono Brief Project Description (Include location, road name/functional class,
type of improvement, etc.)This project includes the replacement of the CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) Bridge
#90623 over the Luce Line State Trail in the City of Orono as shown in Attachment
02. CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) is classified as a Major Collector roadway.

The existing bridge (built in 1955) consists of a timber structure with a concrete deck that extends over the Long Lake Creek and Luce Line State Trail. The timber material throughout the structure has experienced advanced deterioration. In addition, the concrete deck is showing signs of extensive wear due to the frequency and size of visible cracking. A full replacement is being recommended as maintenance activities are no longer cost effective in preserving this bridge asset. Weight restrictions were introduced on this bridge in 2014, based on the results of a routine inspection, that prohibit certain types of commercial vehicles. The local planning index (LPI) for this bridge is 58 as shown in the Minnesota Structure Inventory Report (Attachment 03). Photos depicting the bridge's current condition are included in Attachment 04.

The proposed project will introduce a new bridge structure that is designed for a 75-year service life. The completion of this project will ensure that a grade separated crossing of the Luce Line State Trail is retained to eliminate conflicts for people walking and biking along the trail underneath the bridge. Additionally, the existing railing and guardrail will be upgraded to satisfy current design standards to ensure user safety. Furthermore, this project will eliminate weight restrictions along a collector route through the Lake Minnetonka Area. It is anticipated that this bridge will retain a shoulder space that can be upgraded should multimodal accommodations be constructed along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) in the future. Attachment 05 includes a potential typical section for this project, and Attachment 06 includes the potential concept.

(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) DESCRIPTION - will be used in TIP CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) over the Luce Line State Trail in Orono - Replace Bridge #90623

0.06

Include both the CSAH/MSAS/TH references and their corresponding street names in the TIP Description (see Resources link on Regional Solicitation webpage for examples).

Project Length (Miles)

to the nearest one-tenth of a mile

| Project Funding | |
|---|---|
| Are you applying for competitive funds from another source(s) to implement this project? | No |
| If yes, please identify the source(s) | |
| Federal Amount | \$2,672,000.00 |
| Match Amount | \$668,000.00 |
| Minimumof 20% of project total | |
| Project Total | \$3,340,000.00 |
| For transit projects, the total cost for the application is total cost minus fare revenues. | |
| Match Percentage | 20.0% |
| Minimum of 20% Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total | |
| Source of Match Funds | Hennepin County |
| A minimumof 20% of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the | he 20% rinimumcan corre fromother federal sources |
| Preferred Program Year | |
| Select one: | 2029 |
| Select 2026 or 2027 for TDM and Unique projects only. For all other applications, select 2028 or 2029. | |
| Additional Program Years: | |
| Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available. | |

Project Information-Roadways

NOTE: If your project has already been assigned a State Aid Project # (SAP or SP), please Indicate SAP# here SAP#:

| County, City, or Lead Agency | |
|--|-----------------|
| | Hennepin County |
| Functional Class of Road | Major Collector |
| Road System | CSAH |
| TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET | |
| Road/Route No. | 146 |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 | |
| Name of Road | Brown Rd |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE | |
| TERMINI:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work) From: | |
| Road System | |
| Road/Route No. | |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 | |
| Name of Road | |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE | |
| To: Road System | |
| DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION | |
| Road/Route No. | |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 | |
| Name of Road | |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE | |
| In the City/Cities of: | |
| (List all cities within project limits) | |
| OR: | |
| At: Road System | |
| (TH, CSAH, MSAS, OO. RD., TWP. RD., City Street) | |
| Road/Route No. | |
| i.e., 53 for CSAH 53 | |
| Name of Road | Bridge #90623 |
| Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE | 0 |
| In the City/Cities of: | Orono |
| (List all cities within project limits) | - |
| PROJECT LENGTH | |
| Miles | 0.1 |
| (nearest 0.1 miles) | |
| Primary Types of Work (check all the apply) | |
| New Construction | |
| Reconstruction | |
| Resurfacing | |
| Bituminous Pavement | |
| Concrete Pavement | |
| Roundabout | |
| New Bridge | |
| Bridge Replacement | Yes |
| Bridge Rehab | |
| New Signal | |
| Signal Replacement/Revision | |
| Bike Trail | |
| Other (do not include incidental items) | |
| BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE) | |
| Old Bridge/Culvert No.: | 90623 |
| - | 30023 |
| New Bridge/Culvert No.: | |
| Structure is Over/Under (Bridge or culvert name): | |
| OTHER INFORMATION: | |
| Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed | 55356 |
| Approximate Begin Construction Date | 05/01/2029 |
| Approximate End Construction Date | 10/31/2029 |
| | |

| Miles of Trail (nearest 0.1 miles) | 0 |
|--|----|
| Miles of Sidewalk (nearest 0.1 miles) | 0 |
| Miles of trail on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles): | 0 |
| Is this a new trail? | No |
| | |

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 (2018), the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2018), 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 goals, objectives, and strategies that relate to the project.

Briefly list the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages:

A) Transportation System Stewardship (p 2.2-2.4)

Objectives A & B; Strategies A1 & A2

The project will replace a functionally deteriorating bridge that provides key connections to TH 12. Reconstructing the bridge is a proactive cost-effective strategy to preserve the transportation system. Deferring replacement would likely result in closure of the bridge and roadway, which may have impacts on the Luce Line State Trail.

B) Safety and security (p 2.5-2.9)

Objectives A & B; Strategies B1, B3, B4 & B6

The project will address structural safety concerns related to the bridge. Deteriorating assets result in unsafe conditions for all users and will worsen over time. Safety issues may impact people using the Luce Line State Trail which passes under the bridge. Widened shoulders will accommodate multimodal users and provide space for people driving to pull over for emergencies.

C) Access to destinations (p 2.10-2.25)

Objectives A, B, C, D & E; Strategies C1, C2, C3, C4, C8, C9, C15, C16 & C17

CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) is a Major Collector and that provides key north-south access between Orono and Long Lake. The roadway provides access to residential and recreational destinations, including the Long Lake town center.

D) Competitive economy (p 2.26-2.29)

Objectives A, B & C; Strategies D1, D3 & D4

The project area serves needs for people to access residential, commercial and recreational locations in a residential rural area. Brown Road connects to a hub of shopping and restaurants in Long Lake; which is essential for the rural residential area that does not have many shopping or community centers nearby.

E) Healthy and equitable communities (p 2.30-2.34)

Objectives A, B, C & D; Strategies E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6 & E7

If the bridge needs to close due to deterioration, this would impact the Luce Line State Trail that passes underneath Brown Road.

F) Leveraging transportation investments to guide land use (p 2.35-2.41)

Objectives A & C; Strategies F1, F2, F3, F5, F6, F7

The project supports a design that suits the rural residential area. CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) provides direct access to Long Lake to the north, connecting to shops and destinations.

Replacing the bridge asset ensures that the area is attractive and suitable for development opportunities in the community. Replacing the bridge will preserve the prosperity that the Luce Line State Trail brings to 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.

2) Hennepin County 2040 Transportation Plan (pages 2-11 - 2-18)

URL: hennepin.us/-/media/hennepinus/your-government/projects-initiatives/2040-

List the applicable documents and pages: Unique projects are exempt 1) Hennepin County 2024-2028 Transportation CIP (Attachment 07) from this qualifying requirement because of their innovative nature.

| сс | omprehensive-plan/2040-comprehensive-plan-full.pdf |
|---|--|
| 3) | Hennepin County Climate Action Plan (pages 50-54) |
| | RL: hennepin.us/climate-action/-/media/climate-action/hennepin-county-climate- tion-plan-final.pdf |
| 4) | Hennepin County Complete and Green Streets Policy (pages 10-11) |
| | RL: hennepin.us/-/media/hennepinus/your-government/projects- tiatives/complete-streets/Complete-and-Green-Streets-Policy_Oct2023.pdf |
| 5) | Orono Comprehensive Plan (Pages 23-24) |
| Uł | RL: oronomn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1654/Chapter-4A-Transportation |
| Linit 2,800 characters, approximately 400 words 4. The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage j | construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of transit stations/stops, transit 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. Unique | e project costs are limited to those that are federally eligible. |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| | er, etc.) or non-profit organization (TDM and Unique Projects applicants only). Applicants that are not ,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a |
| 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 | e than one funding application category. |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal | rd and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization I funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the tegory are listed below in Table 1. For unique projects, the minimum award is \$500,000 and the 4,000,000 for the 2024 funding cycle). |
| Strategic Capacity (Roadway Expansion): \$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000 Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000 Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Management): \$500,0 Spot Mobility and Safety: \$1,000,000 to \$3,500,000 Bridges Rehabilitation/Replacement: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000 | 000 to \$3,500,000 |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| 8. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). | |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) self-evaluation or transition plan that covers | Program (TIP) and approved by USDOT, the public agency sponsor must either have a current s the public right of way/transportation, as required under Title II of the ADA. The plan must be completed re Regional Solicitation funding cycles, this requirement may include that the plan has undergone a recent |
| The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and has a completed ADA transition plan that covers the public right of way/transpo | |
| (TDM and Unique Project Applicants Only) The applicant is not a public age subject to the self-evaluation requirements in Title II of the ADA. | ncy |
| Date plan completed: | 08/31/2015 |
| | ennepin.us/-/media/hennepinus/residents/transportation/documents/ada- dewalk-transition-plan.pdf |

The applicant is a public agency that employs fewer than 50 people and has a completed ADA self-evaluation that covers the public right of way/transportation.

| Date self-evaluation completed: | |
|--|---|
| Link to plan: | |
| Upload plan or self-evaluation if there is no link | |
| Upload as PDF | |
| 10. The project must be accessible and open to the general public. | |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| 11. The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project year-round for the pedestrian, and transit facilities, per FHWA direction established 8/27/2008 and updated 4/ | he useful life of the improvement. This includes assurance of year-round use of bicycle, |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| 12. 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 ources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match. Projects that |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| | iect is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The |
| | ture stages. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| 14. The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed project to a | I 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 | |
| |) or A-minor arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map. In functionally classified roadway in the urban areas or a major collector and above in the rural |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| Roadway Strategic Capacity and Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobili | ty 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. | |
| Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement and Strategic Capacity projects only: | |
| 3. Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a principal arterial freeway must be lim responsibility using MnDOT?s ?Cost Participation for Cooperative Construction Projects a project, the policy guidelines should be read as if the funded trunk highway route is under lo | nd Maintenance Responsibilities? manual. In the case of a federally funded trunk highway |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | |
| 4. The bridge must carry vehicular traffic. Bridges can carry traffic from multiple modes. Ho Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities application categories. Rail-only bridges are ineligible for | wever, bridges that <u>are exclusively</u> for bicycle or pedestrian traffic must apply under one of the r funding. |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only: | |
| 5. The length of the in-place structure is 20 feet or longer. | |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| 6. The bridge must have a Local Planning Index (LPI) of less than 60 OR a National Bridge Adequacy as reported on the most recent Minnesota Structure Inventory Report. | Inventory (NBI) Rating of 3 or less for either Deck Geometry, Approach Roadway, or Waterway |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | Yes |
| Roadway Expansion, Reconstruction/Modernization, and Bridge Rehabilitation/R | Replacement projects only: |
| 7. All roadway projects that involve the construction of a new/expanded interchange or new/ Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal. Please contact David Elvin at Mr through this process as described in Appendix F of the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. | interchange ramps must have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange nDOT (David.Elvin@state.mn.us or 651-234-7795) to determine whether your project needs to go |
| Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. | |
| | |
| Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements | |
| Specific Roadway Elements | |
| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES | Cost |
| Mobilization (approx. 5% of total cost) | \$132,000.00 |
| Removals (approx 5% of total cost) | \$110,000.00 |
| Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) | \$49,400.00 |
| Roadway (aggregates and paving) | \$105,000.00 |
| Subgrade Correction (muck) | \$0.00 |

\$77,000.00

\$132,000.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

Storm Sewer

Ponds

Concrete Items (curb & gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) Traffic Control

| Striping | \$3,350.00 |
|---|----------------|
| Signing | \$4,500.00 |
| Lighting | \$0.00 |
| Turf - Erosion & Landscaping | \$77,000.00 |
| Bridge | \$1,804,000.00 |
| Retaining Walls | \$0.00 |
| Noise Wall (not calculated in cost effectiveness measure) | \$0.00 |
| Traffic Signals | \$0.00 |
| Wetland Mtigation | \$0.00 |
| Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection | \$0.00 |
| RR Crossing | \$0.00 |
| RoadwayContingencies | \$745,650.00 |
| Other Roadway Elements | \$0.00 |
| Totals | \$3,239,900.00 |
| | |

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 | \$77,000.00 |
| Wayfinding | \$0.00 |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies | \$23,100.00 |
| Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements | \$0.00 |
| Totals | \$100,100.00 |
| | |

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 |
| Subtotal | \$0.00 |
| Other Costs - Administration, Overhead, etc. | \$0.00 |

PROTECT Funds Eligibility

One of the new federal funding sources is Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT). Please describe which specific elements of your project and associated costs out of the Total TAB-Eligible Costs are eligible to receive PROTECT funds. Examples of potential eligible items may include: storm sewer, ponding, erosion control/landscaping, retaining walls, new bridges over floodplains, and road realignments out of floodplains.

INFORMATION: Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Formula Program Implementation Guidance (dot.gov).

Response:

Based on a planning level review of the proposed scope of work that's primarily focused on replacing a deteriorated bridge, county staff did not identify any project elements that were obviously eligible for the PROTECT Program.

| CSAH 19 (North Shore Dr) - Approximately 13.2 miles (Brown Rd) serves north/south trips between Long Lake and Orono es an important crossing over TH 12. The roadway generally includes |
|--|
| (Brown Rd) serves north/south trips between Long Lake and Orono |
| (Brown Rd) serves north/south trips between Long Lake and Orono |
| (Brown Rd) serves north/south trips between Long Lake and Orono |
| |
| each direction. |
| e noted that the CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) bridge does not currently ect access ramps to the Luce Line State Trail for people biking; an informal goat path suggests that people walking and biking access ail from this location. The closest formal on/off ramps to the Luce Line are located at Orono Orchard Rd, approximately 0.7 miles to the east. |
| ennepin County replaced Bridge #90622 over Long Lake Creek as part 74-005 - which is located approximately 0.5 miles south of this funding . A similar detour route has been produced for the proposed project, as attachment 08, which minimizes additional traffic volumes diverted to with a lower functional classification than CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) - Majo The three alternate routes shown in the map include CSAH 19 (North TH 12, and a Collector Route that are applicable to the CSAH 146 I) Bridge #90623. |
| people driving may choose to utilize Willow Dr, approximately 0.5 est; however, this Collector Route is not anticipated to be the signed ng construction activities. |
| nstruction, county staff will coordinate with staff at the City of Orono, g Lake, MnDOT, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources o better coordinate detours for all modes during construction activities. |
|) |
| |

| Along Tier 1: | |
|--|---|
| (65 Points) | |
| Miles (to the nearest 0.1 miles): | 0 |
| If box above is checked, fill in length. | |
| Along Tier 2: | |
| (60 Points) | |
| Miles (to the nearest 0.1 miles): | 0 |
| If box above is checked, fill in length. | |
| Along Tier 3: | |
| (55 Points) | |
| Miles (to the nearest 0.1 miles): | 0 |

| If box above is checked, fill in length. | |
|--|--|
| The project provides a direct and immediate connection (i.e., inte either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: | ersects) with |
| (10 Points) | |
| The project is not located on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: | Yes |
| (0 Points) | |
| Measure A: Current Daily Person Throughput | · |
| Location | CSAH 146 from Fox St to CSAH 112 (SEQ ID #42723) |
| Current AADT Volume | 3950.0 |
| Existing Transit Routes on the Project: | N/A |
| Select all transit routes that apply. | |
| Upload "Transit Connections" map | 1701983226607_RS 3_CSAH 146 Brown Rd Transit Connections.pdf |
| Please upload attachment in PDF form | |
| Response: Current Daily Person Throughput | |
| Average Annual Daily Transit Ridership | 0 |
| Current Daily Person Throughput | 5135.0 |
| Measure B: 2040 Forecast ADT | |
| Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) AD | T volume No |
| If checked, METC Staff will provide Forecast (2040) ADT volume | |
| OR | |
| Identify the approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume | Hennepin County conducted a comprehensive travel demand forecasting analysis based on the Metropolitan Council's regional activity based model. Forecast traffic volumes were based on a combination of socio-economic and land use assumptions. It should be noted that the future transportation network was |
| | assumed to include projects identified in the county's Capital Improvement Program. Attachment 09 illustrates the forecast traffic volumes. |

Measure A: Engagement

i. Describe any Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, Iow-income populations, disabled populations, youth, or older adults within a ½ mile of the proposed project. Describe how these populations relate to regional context. Location of affordable housing will be addressed in Measure C.

ii. Describe how Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, Iow-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing were engaged, whether through community planning efforts, project needs identification, or during the project development process.

iii. Describe the progression of engagement activities in this project. A full response should answer these questions:

- 1. What engagement methods and tools were used?
- 2. How did you engage specific communities and populations likely to be directly impacted by the project?
- 3. What techniques did you use to reach populations traditionally not involved in community engagement related to transportation projects?
- 4. How were the project?s purpose and need identified?
- 5. How was the community engaged as the project was developed and designed?
- 6. How did you provide multiple opportunities for of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, Iow-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing to engage at different points of project development?

7. How did engagement influence the project plans or recommendations? How did you share back findings with community and re-engage to assess responsiveness of these changes?

8. If applicable, how will NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities?

The CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) bridge project takes place within a rural residential context, with an estimated population of just under 900 within 0.5 miles of the project area. Of that population, 15% of the population are Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and 18% of households have an income under 200% of the federal poverty level. There are a number of families living in the project area, as 28% of the population within 0.5 miles of the project area are under the age of 18. These demographic profiles are from the 2017 - 2021 5-year ACS estimates. In addition, this project will maintain a grade separated crossing for people walking and cycling along the Luce Line State Trail, a significant recreational destination for the Metro area which is estimated to accommodate 66,000 visitors in the summer months alone.

At the time of application submittal, formal engagement for this project has not started. If the project is funded, Hennepin County staff will collaborate with the City of Orono, the City of Long Lake, MnDOT, and the Minnesota DNR to identify appropriate engagement strategies to inform project development and objectives, particularly concerning the engagement of BIPOC, low-income, youth, and elderly residents.

Historically, public engagement has included providing project updates across multiple communication streams as applicable; including a project website, mobile texts, social media, and portable message display boards prior to construction activities. Outreach efforts often also include direct conversations with businesses and residents impacted by the proposed project. Outreach efforts will likely include staff from the county's Communications Team to ensure the use of best practices and plain language during all public engagement efforts.

(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

Measure B: Disadvantaged Communities Benefits and Impacts

Describe the project?s benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, Iow-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Benefits could relate to:

- ? pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements;
- ? public health benefits;
- ? direct access improvements for residents or improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care, or other;
- ? travel time improvements;
- ? gap closures;
- ? new transportation services or modal options.
- ? leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments;
- ? and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.

This is not an exhaustive list. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to Disadvantaged communities residing or engaged in activities near the project area, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting Disadvantaged communities specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

Acknowledge and describe any negative project impacts to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Describe measures to mitigate these impacts. Unidentified or unmitigated negative impacts may result in a reduction in points.

Below is a list of potential negative impacts. This is not an exhaustive list.

- ? Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- ? Increased speed and/or ?cut-through? traffic.
- ? Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- ? Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.

The CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) Bridge Replacement Project will benefit BIPOC populations, low-income households, people with disabilities, youth, and other underrepresented communities through the preservation and expansion of modal options. Replacement of the CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) bridge will ensure the preservation of a grade separated crossing for the Luce Line State Trail, a key resource for active transportation that connects several communities in western Hennepin County starting as a regional trail in north Minneapolis at Theodore Wirth Pkwy before transitioning to a state trail in Plymouth.

It is anticipated that the replacement bridge will provide a wider shoulder to accommodate users walking, rolling, and biking along the corridor. Existing conditions force people walking and biking into a narrow 4 foot shoulder which leads to a dangerous and uncomfortable experience given the posted speed limit of 40 MPH. An expanded shoulder will advance the County's Complete and Green Streets Policy recently adopted in Fall 2023 by providing expanded modal options that match the surrounding rural residential context. This will provide benefits to all residents, particularly low-income residents or youth living in the project area who would walk or roll along the corridor to access the Luce Line State Trail for recreational or transportation uses. Replacement of the bridge will also preserve mobility for people driving throughout the corridor, as the bridge is currently load posted. Attachment 10 provides an overview of key community resources proximate to the proposed project. Most notably, CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) provides access for people south of the Luce Line Trail to Long Lake Library, childcare, and other educational resources in the City of Long Lake.

While future investments are needed to create robust multi-modal connections along the CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) corridor, the proposed project will ensure that future projects can connect to and leverage substantial County investments along CSAH 112 (Wayzata Blvd) to the north, which provides a key east/west all ages and abilities multiuse trail to the Orono Public Schools, grocery stores, retail, and other resources north of the project area. Without this investment, the CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) bridge would serve as a barrier for future multimodal projects.

During construction, increased noise and impacts to the travelling public are anticipated. Bridge closures and detours will be carefully coordinated with residents and stakeholders, and all efforts will be made to clearly communicate any construction impact via a project website, phone hotline, and appropriate signage.

(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

Measure C: Affordable Housing Access

Describe any affordable housing developments?existing, under construction, or planned?within ½ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the number of existing subsidized units, which will be provided on the Socio-Economic Conditions map. Applicants can also describe other types of affordable housing (e.g., naturally-occurring affordable housing, manufactured housing) and under construction or planned affordable housing that is within a half mile of the project. If applicable, the applicant can provide self-generated PDF maps to support these additions. Applicants are encouraged to provide a self-generated PDF map describing how a project connects affordable housing residents to destinations (e.g., childcare, grocery stores, schools, places of worship).

Describe the project?s benefits to current and future affordable housing residents within ½ mile of the project. Benefits must relate to affordable housing residents. Examples may include:

- ? specific direct access improvements for residents
- ? improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care or other;
- ? new transportation services or modal options;
- ? and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.

This is not an exhaustive list. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to residents of affordable housing, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting residents of affordable housing specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data. As identified in the Met Council generated Socio-Economic Conditions map, 44 subsidized units exist in census tracts within 0.5 miles of the project. In addition, there is one affordable housing development of note just outside the 0.5 mile buffer (0.58 miles), the Hillside Terrace Apartments. Attachment 11 provides an overview of the location of this development, as well as unit sizes and affordability limits. Hillside Terrace provides 44 subsidized units of senior housing, which represents a population of users who may walk or roll along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd). The City of Long Lake is also home to several senior living facilities such as Stone Bay, Orono Woods, and Long Lake Assisted Living which also houses residents that are more likely to walk or roll. For these residents, CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) would be the primary route to access the Luce Line State Trail for recreation and active transportation.

As mentioned previously, the Luce Line State Trail is a regional facility (identified as a tier 2 alignment in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network) that connects to several communities as well as the Three Rivers Park District's trail that begins in North Minneapolis at Theodore Wirth Regional Park, approximately one hour by bicycle to the east. Replacement of the CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) bridge will ensure that users can continue to enjoy a grade separated crossing for this important resource for active transportation and recreation for all, including residents of affordable housing along the trail to the east and west. Expansion of shoulder space on the new bridge will also remove a barrier for those walking, biking, and rolling along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) and set the stage for future complete streets opportunities along the corridor.

(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

| Measure D: BONUS POINTS | |
|--|--|
| Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty: | |
| Project?s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color (Regional Environmental Justice Area): | Yes |
| Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color (Regional Environmental Justice Area): | |
| Upload the ?Socio-Economic Conditions? map used for this measure. | 1701984168897_RS 2_CSAH 146 Brown Rd Socio Economic.pdf |
| Measure A: Bridge Condition | |
| Deck Rating: | 5.0 |
| Superstructure Rating: | 6.0 |
| Substructure Rating: | 6.0 |
| Channel Rating: | 0 |
| Culvert Rating: | 0 |
| Lowest National Bridge Inventory Condition Rating: | 5.0 |
| Upload Structure Inventory Report | 1701984307027_CSAH 146 Brown Rd Bridge Inspection Report.pdf |
| Please upload attachment in PDF form | |

Measure A: Infrastructure Age

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

Yes

Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

The CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) Bridge Replacement Project will benefit multimodal users. The completion of this project will ensure that a grade separated crossing of the Luce Line State Trail (RBTN Tier 2 Alignment) is retained to eliminate conflicts for people walking and biking along the trail underneath the bridge. The Luce Line State Trail extends from the City of Plymouth to Carver County (the regional trail section connects Minneapolis to Plymouth). The Luce Line State Trail is exclusive for people walking and biking. A map illustrating this project in relation to key multi-modal facilities, such as the Luce Line State Trail, is included in Attachment 12.

Additionally, the bridge structure along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) will include adequate shoulder width to accommodate on-road walking and biking. Should multimodal facilities be constructed along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) on either end of Bridge #90623 in the future, the proposed design of this project will not present a constraint for multimodal users.

At this time, there is no fixed transit service that currently operates along or across CSAH 146 (Brown Rd).

(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction

If the applicant is completing a transit 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 - Construction Projects

1. Public Involvement (20 Percent of Points)

Projects that have been through a public process with residents and other interested public entities are more likely than others to be successful. The project applicant must indicate that events and/or targeted outreach (e.g., surveys and other web-based input) were held to help identify the transportation problem, how the potential solution was selected instead of other options, and the public involvement completed to date on the project. The focus of this section is on the opportunity for public input as opposed to the quality of input. NOTE: A written response is required and failure to respond will result in zero points.

Multiple types of targeted outreach efforts (such as meetings or online/mail outreach) specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need.

100%

At least one meeting specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

50%

At least online/mail outreach effort specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

50%

No meeting or outreach specific to this project was conducted, but the project was identified through meetings and/or outreach related to a larger planning effort.

25%

No outreach has led to the selection of this project.

0%

Yes

Describe the type(s) of outreach selected for this project (i.e., online or in-person meetings, surveys, demonstration projects), the method(s) used to announce outreach opportunities, and how many people participated. Include any public website links to outreach opportunities.

Response:

This project was selected for pursuit of Regional Solicitation funding based on the overall asset condition. No public outreach specific to the project has taken place at this time, but it is expected to occur during the design phase of the project. Future outreach is likely to be coordinated with the City of Orono, City of Long Lake, MnDOT, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

2. Layout (25 Percent of Points)

Layout includes proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries. A basic layout should include a base map (north arrow, scale; legend,* city and/or county limits; existing ROW, labeled; existing signals;* and bridge numbers*) and design data (proposed alignments; bike and/or roadway lane widths; shoulder width;* proposed signals;* and proposed ROW). An aerial photograph with a line showing the project?s termini does not suffice and will be awarded zero points. *If applicable Lavout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties/MnDOT. If a MnDOT trunk highway is impacted, approval by MnDOT must have occurred to receive full points. A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points. 100% A layout does not apply (signal replacement/signal timing, stand-alone streetscaping, minor intersection improvements). Applicants that are not certain whether a layout is required should contact Colleen Brown at MnDOT Metro State Aid ? colleen.brown@state.mn.us. 100% For projects where MnDOT trunk highways are impacted and a MnDOT Staff Approved layout is required. Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted local jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties), and layout review and approval by MnDOT is pending. A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points. 75% Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must Yes be attached to receive points. 50% Layout has been started but is not complete. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points. 25% Layout has not been started 0% Attach Layout 1702334434989 Attachment 06 - Potential Concept.pdf Please upload attachment in PDF form **Additional Attachments** Please upload attachment in PDF form 3. Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 Percent of Points) No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an Yes identified historic bridge 100% There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of ?no historic properties affected? is anticipated. Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of ?no adverse effect? anticipated 80% Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of ?adverse effect? anticipated 40% Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological properties in the project area. 0% Project is located on an identified historic bridge 4. Right-of-Way (25 Percent of Points) Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit either not required or all have been acquired 100% Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete 50% Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT Yes agreement/limited-use permit required - parcels identified Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - parcels not all identified 0% 5. Railroad Involvement (15 Percent of Points) No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way agreement is Yes executed (include signature page, if applicable) 100% Signature Page

Please upload attachment in PDF form

Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun 50%

Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.

0%

Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

| Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): | \$3,340,000.00 |
|--|----------------|
| Enter Amount of the Noise Walls: | \$0.00 |
| Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls: | \$3,340,000.00 |
| Enter amount of any outside, competitive funding: | \$0.00 |
| Attach documentation of award: | |
| Points Awarded in Previous Criteria | |
| Cost Effectiveness | \$0.00 |
| | |

Other Attachments

| File Name | Description | File Size |
|--|--|-----------|
| Attachment 00 - List of Attachments.pdf | Attachment 00 - List of Attachments | 77 KB |
| Attachment 01 - Project Narrative.pdf | Attachment 01 - Project Narrative | 113 KB |
| Attachment 02 - Project Location Map.pdf | Attachment 02 - Project Location Map | 1.1 MB |
| Attachment 03 - MN Structure Inventory Report.pdf | Attachment 03 - MN Structure Inventory Report | 138 KB |
| Attachment 04 - Existing Condition Photos.pdf | Attachment 04 - Existing Condition Photos | 260 KB |
| Attachment 05 - Potential Typical Section.pdf | Attachment 05 - Potential Typical Section | 223 KB |
| Attachment 06 - Potential Concept.pdf | Attachment 06 - Potential Concept | 1.3 MB |
| Attachment 07 - Hennepin County 2024-2028 Transportation CIP.pdf | Attachment 07 - Hennepin County 2024-2028 Transportation CIP | 242 KB |
| Attachment 08 - Alternate Routes Map.pdf | Attachment 08 - Alternate Routes Map | 1.8 MB |
| Attachment 09 - 2040 Forecast Traffic Volumes.pdf | Attachment 09 - 2040 Forecast Traffic Volumes | 572 KB |
| Attachment 10 - Disadvantaged Communities and Resources Map.pdf | Attachment 10 - Disadvantaged Communities and Resources Map | 542 KB |
| Attachment 11 - Affordable Housing Access Map and Detail Summary.pdf | Attachment 11 - Affordable Housing Access Map and Detail Summary | 529 KB |
| Attachment 12 - Multimodal Connections Map.pdf | Attachment 12 - Multimodal Connections Map | 1.2 MB |
| Attachment 13 - City of Orono Support Letter.pdf | Attachment 13 - City of Orono Support Letter | 175 KB |
| Attachment 14 - MnDNR Support Letter.pdf | Attachment 14 - MnDNR Support Letter | 99 KB |
| | | |

| Regional Economy | Bridges Project: CSAH 14 | 16 (Brown Rd) Bridge Replacement I | Project Map ID: 1701982704305 | |
|--|---------------------------|---|--|--------------|
| | 146 | | | |
| | | | | |
| Results | | | | |
| WITHIN ONE MI of project: Postsecondary Students: 0 | | | | |
| Totals by City: Orono Population: 4494 | Ø | | | |
| Employment: 1891 Mfg and Dist Employment: 445 | 0.006miles | | | |
| | (146) | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| O Project Points | Manfacturing/Distribution | Centers | | |
| Project | Job Concentration Cente | rs | | |
| 0 0.0125 0.025 | 0.05 0.075 | 0.1 Created: 12/7/2023 Miles LandscapeRSA5 | For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit http://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissitenew/notice.aspx | METROPOLITAN |



| Socio-Economic Conditions | Bridges Project: CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) Bridge Replacement Project Map ID: 1701982704305 |
|---|--|
| | |
| Results | 146 |
| Total of publicly subsidized rental housing units in census tracts within 1/2 mile: 44 | |
| Project located in census tract(s) that are ABOVE the regional average for population in poverty or population of color. | |
| | • |
| | |
| | 146 |
| | |
| | |
| O Points Area of Con | ncentrated Poverty |
| Lines Regional Er | nvironmental Justice Area |
| 0 0.0125 0.025 0.05 | 0.075 0.1 Created: 12/7/2023 Miles LandscapeRSA2 For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit http://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissite/notice.aspx |

Date: 12/07/2023

MINNESOTA STRUCTURE INVENTORY REPORT

Bridge ID: 90623

S BROWN RD over LUCE LINE TRAIL

| | + GE | NERAL + | | | | |
|------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Agency Br. No | | | Crew | | | |
| District ME | TRO | Maint. | Area | | | |
| County | 27 - | HENNEP | IN | | | |
| City | OR | ONO | | | | |
| Township | | | | | | |
| Desc. Loc. | 0.9 MI \$ | S OF JCT | TH 12 | | | |
| Sect., Twp., Ra | inge | 03 - 117 | /N - 23W | | | |
| Latitude | 44d 5 | 8m 30.52s | ; | | | |
| Longitude | 93d 3 | 4m 25.43s | ; | | | |
| Custodian COUNTY | | | | | | |
| Owner | COUNT | ΓY | | | | |
| Insp Responsi | bility | HENNEP | IN COUNTY | | | |
| Year Built | 1955 | | | | | |
| Date Opened t | o Traffie | c 08 | -01-1967 | | | |
| MN Year Remo | deled | 1967 | 7 | | | |
| FHWA Year Re | constru | icted | | | | |
| Bridge Plan Lo | ocation | COUN | ITY | | | |
| Potential ABC | | N.A. | | | | |
| | + STR | UCTURE + | | | | |
| Service On | HWY; | PED | | | | |
| Service Under | F | PED;BICY | CLE | | | |
| Main Span Typ | e 7 | TIMB BEA | M SPAN | | | |
| Main Span Det | ail | | | | | |
| Appr. Span Ty | ре | | | | | |
| Appr. Span De | tail | | | | | |
| Skew | 15L | | | | | |
| Culvert Type | | | | | | |
| Barrel Length | | | | | | |
| No of Spans | Μ | ain: 5 Ap | or: 0 Total: 5 | | | |
| Main Span Ler | ngth | 22.0 ft | | | | |
| Structure Leng | | 96.8 ft | | | | |
| Deck Width | 38.8 | | | | | |
| Deck Material | C- | I-P CONC | RETE | | | |
| Deck Install Ye | ar | | | | | |
| Deck Rebar La | • | UNKN | | | | |
| Deck Rebar (N | | 0-NONE | | | | |
| Wear Surf Typ | • | | HIC CONC | | | |
| Wear Surf Inst | all Year | | | | | |
| Wear Course/F | | | | | | |
| Structure Area | | 3,756 sq ft | | | | |
| Roadway Area | | 2,906 sq ft | | | | |
| Sidewalk Widt | | 3.0 ft | 3.0 ft | | | |
| Curb Height - | L/R | 0.50 f | | | | |
| Rail Codes - L | /R | 35 | 35 | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| D Over LUC | | | L | |
|----------------|--------------|----------|-----------|------|
| | + ROADW | AY ON BE | RIDGE + | |
| Facility | CSAH | 146 | | |
| LRS Mile Poi | nt | | 1.566 | |
| Functional C | lass | MAJO | R COLLE | CTOR |
| Urban Code | 576 | 28 - TW | IN CITIES | 5 |
| ADT (YEAR) | | 3,587 | (2021) | |
| HCADT | | | | |
| Speed Limit | | | | |
| National High | nway Sy | stem | Ν | |
| Detour Lengt | h 🤅 |) mi. | | |
| Lanes 2 | Lanes C | N Bridg | e | |
| Control Secti | on (TH | Only) | | |
| Function M | AINLINE | - | | |
| Type 2 W/ | AY TRAF | = | | |
| Bridge Match | ID | 1 | | |
| Roadway Key | / 1-0 | N | | |
| | | | | |
| + RD) | WY DIMEN | ISIONS C | N BRIDGE | • |
| If Divided | | NB-EB | SB-WB | |
| Roadway Wid | dth | 3 | 30.0 ft | |
| Vertical Clear | rance | | | |
| Max. Vert. Cle | ear. | | | |
| Horizontal CI | ear. | 2 | 29.9 ft | |
| Appr. Surface | e Width | | 40.0 |) ft |
| Bridge Road | way Wid | th | 30.0 |) ft |
| Median Width | n on Brie | dge | I | NA |
| | + MISC. | BRIDGE I | DATA + | |
| Structure Fla | red | NO | | |
| Parallel Struc | ture | NON | E | |
| Field Conn. I | D | | | |
| Cantilever ID | | | | |
| | | NDATION | | |
| Abut. | CONC - | FTG PI | LE | |

| Cantilever II |) |
|---------------|--------------------|
| | + FOUNDATIONS + |
| Abut. | CONC - FTG PILE |
| Pier | TIMBER - PILE BENT |
| Historic Sta | us NOT ELIGIBLE |
| On - Off Sys | stem ON |
| | + PAINT + |
| Year Paintee | I |
| Painted Area | 1 |
| Primer Type | |
| Finish Type | |
| | + BRIDGE SIGNS + |
| Posted Load | VEHICLE ONLY |
| Traffic | NOT REQUIRED |
| Horizontal | OBJECT MARKERS |
| Vertical | NOT APPLICABLE |

| | + INS | PECTIC | N + | |
|-------------------|-------|---------|-----------|-----|
| Local Plan. Index | | | 58 | 8 |
| Overall Condition | 1 | FAIR | | |
| Last Routine Insp | Dat | e (| 07-31-20 | 23 |
| Routine Insp Free | quen | су | 24 | |
| Inspector Name | HE | ENNEF | PIN COU | NTY |
| Status F | P-LO/ | AD PO | STED | |
| | | | | |
| + NBI | COND | | RATINGS + | |
| Deck | | | 5 | |
| Superstructure | | | 6 | |
| Substructure | | | 6 | |
| Channel | | | Ν | |
| Culvert | | | Ν | |
| + NBI | APPR | AISAL F | RATINGS + | |
| Structure Evaluat | ion | | 6 | |
| Deck Geometry | | | 4 | |
| Underclearances | | | N | |
| Waterway Adequa | асу | | N | |
| Approach Alignm | ent | | 8 | |
| + S | | Y FEAT | | |
| Bridge Railing | - | | STANDA | |
| GR Transition | - | | STANDA | |
| Appr. Guardrail | - | | STANDA | |
| GR Termini | C |)-SUB | STANDA | RD |
| + SPI | | INSPE | CTIONS + | |
| NSTM | Ν | | | |
| Underwater | Ν | | | |

| Pinned Asbly. N |
|--|
| + WATERWAY + |
| Drainage Area |
| Waterway Opening |
| Navigation Control NOT APPL |
| Pier Protection |
| Nav. Vert./Horz. Clr. |
| Nav. Vert. Lift Bridge Clear. |
| MN Scour Code A-NON WATERWAY |
| Scour Evaluation Year 1991 |
| + CAPACITY RATINGS + |
| Design Load H 20 |
| 0 |
| Operating Rating HS 20.30 |
| |
| Operating Rating HS 20.30 |
| Operating Rating HS 20.30 Inventory Rating HS 14.00 |
| Operating RatingHS 20.30Inventory RatingHS 14.00PostingVEH: 32 SEMI:DBL: |

QTY

CS 4

12/07/2023

Crew:

MINNESOTA BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

| Crew: | | | INESO IA BRIDGE | INSPECTION REP | PORT | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|------------------|
| Insp Resp BRIDGE | | y: HENNEPIN COUNTY S BROWN RD OVE | R LUCE LINE TRAIL | | INSP. | DATE: 07-3 | 1-2023 |
| Main Spa NBI Decl Appraisal | RONO): 03 Town an Type: k: 5 S I Rating: | PIN ship: 117N Range: 23W TIMB BEAM SPAN uper: 6 Sub: 6 Chan: N Cu s - Approach: 8 Waterway: N Signs - Load Posting: VEHICLE Horizontal: OBJECT MA | Control Section: Local Agency Bridge Nbr: Open, Posted, C lv: N MN Scour ONLY Traffic: NOT REQ | Vile Pt: 1.566 Maint. Area: 430 Closed: LOAD POSTED Code: A-NON WATERWA UIRED | Rdwy Paint Culve Y Loca | Width: 38.8 ft | ,906 sq ft |
| ELEM NBR | | ELEMENT NAME | INSP. DATE | QUANTITY | QTY CS 1 | QTY CS 2 | QTY CS 3 |
| | CRITIC | AL DEFS OR SAFETY HAZARI | | 1 EA 1 EA | 1 1 | 0 | 0 |
| N | lotes: | 800. '23- No critical structural d | eficiencies or serious safety | hazards present at time of ins | spection. | | |
| 12 | REINF | DRCED CONCRETE DECK | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 3,756 SF 3,756 SF | 3,708 3,708 | 37 37 | 11 11 |
| | lotes: | 12. See General Notes. 1" nom various areas. Spall in deck co spalled on E side @ P4, also @ '14-Decayed knots in W bay of @ CL w/ conc exp. '21- 2 delams on E coping 1 ce horizontal crack in W coping @ splinters in wood form at N abu '23- No changes at time of insp | bing on W side over center s P1 w/ rebar exp. Forms are span 2 @ P2. Coping spall o nter in span 3 and 1 in cente P3. Timber form in span 3 (t, 1st bay W of C/L. | pan. Conc is thru forms in spa e charred over P2 @ 1st bay f on E side @ P4 has rebar exp er span 4. 1 Spall with rebar ex | an 4, 4th bay rom E. . Timber form xposed on W | from E. Coping ns cracked in sp coping @ P2. |) oan 3 3' |
| 510 V | VEARIN | G SURFACE | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 2,906 SF 2.906 SF | 1,249 1,249 | 1,636 1,641 | 9 9 |
| ۸ | Notes: | 510. Top of Concrete Deck wit '16-Unsound patches & areas areas. '21-1584 SF of sound concrete <1-1/2" deep). Cracks mostly s '23-Several areas of failed pate | h Uncoated Rebar Notes: have been sawed out & patc patches. Most temp epoxy j sealed - minor cracks in patc. | hed w/ conc. Diag cracking @ patches have partially or total. |) NE & NW c | orners in patch eral spalls (<1 \$ | ed |
| 301 | POURE | ED SEAL JOINT | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 121 LF 121 LF | 0 0 | 108 108 | 7 7 |
| N | lotes: | 301. '16-All 4 joints have been '21-Minor spalls affecting joint f '23-No change. | | oint material along all. Small a | areas of adhe | sion failure. | |
| 330 | METAL | BRIDGE RAILING | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 167 LF 167 LF | 158 158 | 5 5 | 4 4 |
| Ν | lotes: | 330. '21-4' of lower rail of W is '23-No change. | bent significantly. Minor surfa | | | | |
| 515 S | STEEL F | ROTECTIVE COATING | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 404 SF 404 SF | 0 0 | 362 362 | 32 32 |
| ٨ | Notes: | 515. '21-several small areas of '23-No change. | | | - | | |
| 331 | REINF | DRCED CONC BRIDGE RAILIN | G 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 28 LF 28 LF | 2 2 | 19 19 | 7 7 |
| Ν | lotes: | 331. '16-2 posts w/ rusted reba '21-most posts have minor spa | - | alls at bases of several. Vert c | racks in man | y. | |

'21-most posts have minor spalling along edges - larger spalls at bases of several. Vert cracks in many.

| | '23-No change. | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|------------|------|---|---|---|---|
| 822 | BITUMINOUS APPROACH ROADWAY | 07-31-2023 | 2 EA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | | 07-27-2021 | 2 EA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | |

Notes: 822. SOUTH: '21-1' full width bit patch is deteriorated. Potholes along deck. Large cracks in roadway adjacent to patch. '23-No change.

NORTH: '21-1' full width bit patch is deteriorated. Numerous large alligator cracks in bit adjacent to patch. Settlement at deck up to 3/4". '23-No change.

| | | '23-No change. | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------|--------|--|--|--|
| 215 | REINF | ORCED CONCRETE ABUTMENT | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 113 LF 113 LF | 87 88 | 16 15 | 10 10 | 0 0 | | | |
| | Notes: | 215. Vert cracks in both, some w/ rust s | tains. | | | | | | | | |
| | | NORTH: '14-Paint flaking. 7 cracks | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '16-Paint flaking & peeling. Several crack | | of dools 2 arooks aro | rupt stained | | | | | | |
| | | '17-2 spalls in parapet total 1 SF. Crack '19-Min-mod efflor across, large spall ne | | of deck. 5 clacks are | rust stained. | | | | | | |
| | | '23- Many of cracks in parapet have inc | | | | | | | | | |
| | | SOUTH: '14-paint flaking. 5 cracks. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '15-cracks are minor to mod in size. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '16- Paint flaking & peeling. 3 cracks w/'23- Spall under 4th beam from East. | rust stains. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Wingwall notes: '23-All in good conditio | n. | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | TIMBE | R STRINGER | 07-31-2023 | 2,113 LF | 1,974 | 124 | 15 | 0 | | | |
| | Notosi | 117 Son Conorol Noton Dissolation of | 07-27-2021 | 2,113 LF | 1,974 24 are areaked @ | 124 | 15 | 0 | | | |
| | Notes: | 117. See General Notes. Discoloring of '14-Min-mod checks & splits in all spans | | ringers in span 5 @ F | 4 are cracked @ | y cap notch. | | | | | |
| | | '16-Surface rust on few tie bolts in main | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '21- 8' Horizontal check In 2nd From W'23-No changes at time of inspection. | Near P2. | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | TIMBE | R PILING | 07-31-2023 | 28 EA | 0 | 25 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| | | | 07-27-2021 | 28 EA | 0 | 25 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| | Notes: | 228. Read General Notes. Several colu | mns are split, some up to | o 1". | | | | | | | |
| | | Bent 1: 2nd column from E is split +/- 1' | ". Several columns are pr | ojecting 1" to S of ca | 0. | | | | | | |
| | | '15-the center column is 1" - 1 1/2" S of | cap. | | | | | | | | |
| | | '23-no changes at time of inspection. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Bent 2: Piles appear twisted. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '14-E & W columns have 3/4" split. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '16-columns are narrower @ bottom tha '23- no changes at time of inspection. | an top & some have signs | s of fire damage. | | | | | | | |
| | | Bent 3: Piles appear twisted. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 23- No changes at time of inspection. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Bent4: 2nd column from E moved 2.5". Also, several have moved +/- 1" to N and small portion of columns are projecting off | | | | | | | | | |
| | | cap. '11-2nd column from E is now 3" off cap | o-continue to monitor. | | | | | | | | |
| | | '15-2nd column from E measures 3 1/4' | " off cap, measured on th | | | | | | | | |
| | | '16-2nd column from W is not fully supp | oorting cap-daylight can b | e seen. | | | | | | | |
| | | '19-2nd from E is 3-1/4" off cap. '23-no changes at time of inspection. | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | TIMBE | R PIER CAP | 07-31-2023 | 157 LF | 66 | 88 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| | | | 07-27-2021 | 157 LF | 66 | 88 | 3 | 0 | | | |
| | Notes: | 235. Read General Notes. '10-Currently P1-Ok. | / raining & all caps wet in | places. | | | | | | | |
| | | P2-full length horiz crack. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '14-22' horiz crack. '23- no changes at time of inspection. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | P3-horiz crack in cap about halfway up, | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '14-40' horizontal crack. Full length hori | | | | | | | | | |
| | | '15-Cap is resting on E Pile on East edg '23- No changes at time of inspection. | je. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

P4-splinter in cap. horiz cracks @ W end and +/- 25' long, also 6' long @ E end.

'14-35' horiz crack.

'15-Cap doesn't appear to be resting on pile @ 2nd column from W. x

'16-some very minor crushing of cap over piles adj to a pile not supporting cap.

| | | '23- No changes at time of inspection. | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------|---|
| 855 | SECO | NDARY MEMBERS (SUPER) | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 0 0 | 1 1 | 0 0 | (|
| | Notes: | 855. A few diaphragms have minor sp | | | - | - | 0 | (|
| | NOLES. | '13-some x-brace bolt heads rusting & | - | ices. A-bracing is spin | . W center span | • | | |
| | | '23-no changes at time of inspection. | 5 | | | | | |
| 890 | LOAD | PST OR VERTICAL CLR SIGNING | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | (|
| | | | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | (|
| | Notes: | 890. '14-Load posting signs installed 8 | | | | | | |
| | | '15-Signs in place and in good condition '23-No change. | on. | | | | | |
| 891 | OTHE | R BRIDGE SIGNING | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | (|
| 001 | OTTL | | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Notes: | 891. Horiz clearance marker X4-4 and | l plow up/down X4-5 @ all c | orners. | | | | |
| | | '19-Brown Rd sign for trail on E side @ | | | | | | |
| | | '21-X4-5 in SE is slightly faded. | | | | | | |
| | | '23-No change. | | | | | | |
| 892 | SLOPI | ES & SLOPE PROTECTION | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 1 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | |
| | Notes: | 892. Minor cracks in grout on abut slo | | I LA | I | 0 | 0 | |
| | Notes. | '23-no change. | pes. | | | | | |
| 893 | GUAR | <u> </u> | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| | | | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| | Notes: | 893. '17-Beam rusted through @ NE r | ail post-does not affect anch | orage to post. | | | | |
| | | '21-NE & SE rails have minor impact of | lamage. NW & SW in good o | condition. | | | | |
| | | '23-No change. | | | | | | |
| 894 | DECK | & APPROACH DRAINAGE | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | |
| | Notes: | 804 14" CMD @ SE and SW 116 Car | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | notes. | 894. 14" CMP @ SE and SW. '16-Cor '17-SE CMP has 8" separation +/- 25' | | nng in n∈. | | | | |
| | | '21-SE pipe is plugged where it is separate | | | | | | |
| | | '23-Flume failing in SE. | | | | | | |
| 895 | SIDEV | VALK, CURB, & MEDIAN | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| | | | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| | Notes: | 895. Trans cracks in walk-sealed. Con | | • | side @ pier 4 c | oping. Spall w | // | |
| | | rebar exp E side above pier 2. Walk sp '16-most cracks in walk have been sea | | | | | | |
| | | '17-Sealant deteriorated @ some walk | | | | | | |
| | | '21-sealant is still mostly intact. All bit | | settlement, up to 2". N | linor spall in W | walk @ P3. S | pall in | |
| | | NW is large. | | | | | | |
| | | '23-Spall at North end of West sidewa | | | | | | |
| 899 | MISCE | ELLANEOUS ITEMS | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | |
| | Notoo | 800 48" DCD culturet for stream runni | | | • | | | |
| | Notes: | 899. 48" RCP culvert for stream runnin cable @ E. O/H power on W side and | | . 6 and 4 pipes on it | op of bents @ E | side. Duried i | lei | |
| | | '21-conduit on E side is cut at abutme | | round. | | | | |
| | | '23- No change. | | | | | | |
| | | ECTED SPECIES | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 900 | PROT | | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 900 | PROT | | | | | | | |
| 900 | PROT Notes: | 900. '23- No change. | | | | | | |
| | Notes: | | | 24/02 ADT | Non- | ut apprende d | lata | |
| 900 | Notes: General | Bridge 90623 (430) CSAH 146 (S Brown | | 31/23. ADT and MAM | . No paper repo | rt generated o | lata | |
| | Notes: General Notes: | | n Rd) over Luce Line Trail 7/ | | | - | data | |

READ: Plans show bents numbered 1-4 from north to south. They are called bents or piers in this report, but all references to

Recommended Repairs:

301. Reseal poured deck joints.

- 331. Possibly modify or replace bridge railing. Does not meet AASHTO standards.
- 510. Epoxy seal new cracks in repaired areas of deck.
- 894. Clear veg from CMP inlets in NE, SE & SW. Reconnect CMP in SE slope.
- 895. Sealant deteriorated at some walk cracks. Reseal.
- Deck: [5] '19-Many patches in top of deck. Some spalled patches have been refilled with bit. '23-(5) Permanent patches are failing.
- Superstructure: [6] '23-(6) Moderate splitting with minor decay.
- Substructure: [6] '23-(6) Several columns have mod to large checks in them.
- Appr Roadway [8] '23- (8) No speed reduction needed.

Alignment:

Attachment 06 | Potential Concept

HENNEPIN COUNTY





Attachment 00 | List of Attachments

- 1. Project Narrative
- 2. Project Location Map
- 3. Minnesota Structure Inventory Report
- 4. Existing Condition Photos
- 5. Potential Typical Section
- 6. Potential Concept
- 7. Hennepin County 2024-2028 Transportation CIP
- 8. Alternate Routes Map
- 9. Forecast 2040 Traffic Volumes Map
- 10. Disadvantaged Communities and Resources Map
- 11. Affordable Housing Access Map and Detail Summary
- 12. Multimodal Connections Map
- 13. City of Orono Support Letter
- 14. MnDNR Support Letter

Attachment 01 | Project Narrative

Project Name

CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) Bridge Replacement Project

City(ies) Orono

Commisioner District(s)

6

Capital Project Number 2181800

Scoping Manager Emily Buell Project Category Bridge Replacement Scoping Form Revision Dates 11/15/2023

Project Summary

Replace Bridge #90623 along Brown Road (CSAH 146) over the Luce Line State Trail in the City of Orono.

Roadway History

The existing bridge (built in 1955) consists of a timber structure with a concrete deck that extends over the Long Lake Creek and Luce Line State Trail. The timber material throughout the structure has experienced advanced deterioration. In addition, the concrete deck is showing signs of extensive wear due to the frequency and size of visible cracking. A full replacement is being recommended as maintenance activities are no longer cost effective in preserving this bridge asset. Weight restrictions were introduced on this bridge in 2014, based on the results of a routine inspection, that prohibit certain types of commercial vehicles.

Project Description and Benefits

The proposed project will introduce a new bridge structure that is designed for a 75-year service life. The completion of this project will ensure that a grade separated crossing of the Luce Line State Trail is retained to eliminate conflicts for people walking and biking along the trail underneath the bridge. Additionally, the existing railing and guardrail will be upgraded to satisfy current design standards to ensure user safety. Furthermore, this project will eliminate weight restrictions along a collector route through the Lake Minnetonka Area.

Project Risks & Uncertainities

It's desirable to minimize construction impacts to people walking and biking along the Luce Line State Trail, as well as people driving through the Lake Minnetonka area.



Initial Project Timeline

Scoping: 2019 - 2025 Design: Q1 2026 - Q4 2028 R/W Acquisition: Q1 2027 - Q4 2028 Bid Advertisement: Q1 2029 Construction: Q2 2029 - Q3 2029

Project Delivery Responsibilities

Preliminary Design: Hennepin County Final Design: Hennepin County Construction Services: Hennepin County

| Project Budget - | Project Level |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Construction: | \$ 2,570,000 |
| Cost Estimate Year: | 2023 |
| Construction Year: | 2029 |
| Annual Inflation Rate: | 2.0% |
| Inflated Construction: | \$ 2,890,000 |
| Design Services: | \$ 250,000 |
| R/W Acquisition: | \$ 230,000 |
| Other (Utility Burial): | \$ - |
| Construction Services: | \$ - |
| Contingency: | \$ 870,000 |
| Total Project Budget: | \$ 4,240,000 |

Funding Notes

This project is eligible for federal funding through the Metropolitan Council's Regional Solicitation given the roadway's functional classification of Major Collector and a Local Planning Index value of 58.

HENNEPIN COUNTY MINNESOTA

Attachment 02 | Project Location Map



0.5

Miles

shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.

Attachment 03 | MN Structure Inventory Report

MINNÉSOTA STRUCTURE INVENTORY REPORT

Bridge ID: 90623

S BROWN RD over LUCE LINE TRAIL

| Blidge ID. 90625 5 BROWN R | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| + GENERAL + | + ROADWAY ON BRIDGE + |
| Agency Br. No. 430 Crew | Facility CSAH 146 |
| District METRO Maint. Area | LRS Mile Point 1.566 |
| County 27 - HENNEPIN | Functional Class MAJOR COLLECTOR |
| City ORONO | Urban Code 57628 - TWIN CITIES |
| Township | ADT (YEAR) 3,587 (2021) |
| Desc. Loc. 0.9 MI S OF JCT TH 12 | HCADT |
| Sect., Twp., Range 03 - 117N - 23W | Speed Limit |
| Latitude 44d 58m 30.52s | National Highway System N |
| Longitude 93d 34m 25.43s | Detour Length 9 mi. |
| Custodian COUNTY | Lanes 2 Lanes ON Bridge |
| Owner COUNTY | Control Section (TH Only) |
| Insp Responsibility HENNEPIN COUNTY | Function MAINLINE |
| Year Built 1955 | Type 2 WAY TRAF |
| Date Opened to Traffic 08-01-1967 | Bridge Match ID 1 |
| MN Year Remodeled 1967 | Roadway Key 1-ON |
| FHWA Year Reconstructed | |
| Bridge Plan Location COUNTY | + RDWY DIMENSIONS ON BRIDGE + |
| Potential ABC N.A. | If Divided NB-EB SB-WB |
| + STRUCTURE + | Roadway Width 30.0 ft |
| Service On HWY;PED | Vertical Clearance |
| Service Under PED;BICYCLE | Max. Vert. Clear. |
| Main Span Type TIMB BEAM SPAN | Horizontal Clear. 29.9 ft |
| Main Span Detail | Appr. Surface Width 40.0 ft |
| Appr. Span Type | Bridge Roadway Width 30.0 ft |
| Appr. Span Detail | Median Width on Bridge NA |
| Skew 15L | + MISC. BRIDGE DATA + |
| Culvert Type | Structure Flared NO |
| Barrel Length | Parallel Structure NONE |
| No of Spans Main: 5 Appr: 0 Total: 5 | Field Conn. ID |
| Main Span Length22.0 ft | Cantilever ID |
| Structure Length 96.8 ft | + FOUNDATIONS + |
| Deck Width 38.8 ft | Abut. CONC - FTG PILE |
| Deck Material C-I-P CONCRETE | Pier TIMBER - PILE BENT |
| Deck Install Year | Historic Status NOT ELIGIBLE |
| Deck Rebar Layers UNKN | On - Off System ON |
| Deck Rebar (NBI) 0-NONE | + PAINT + |
| Wear Surf Type MONOLITHIC CONC | Year Painted |
| Wear Surf Install Year | Painted Area |
| Wear Course/Fill Depth | Primer Type |
| Structure Area 3,756 sq ft | Finish Type |
| Roadway Area 2,906 sq ft | + BRIDGE SIGNS + |
| Sidewalk Width - L/R 3.0 ft 3.0 ft | Posted Load VEHICLE ONLY |
| Curb Height - L/R 0.50 ft 0.50 ft | Traffic NOT REQUIRED |
| Rail Codes - L/R 35 35 | Horizontal OBJECT MARKERS |
| | Vertical NOT APPLICABLE |

| | Date: 12/07/2023 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| + 11 | NSPECTION + |
| Local Plan. Index | 58 |
| Overall Condition | FAIR |
| Last Routine Insp D | ate 07-31-2023 |
| Routine Insp Freque | |
| | HENNEPIN COUNTY |
| • | OAD POSTED |
| | |
| + NBI CO | NDITION RATINGS + |
| Deck | 5 |
| Superstructure | 6 |
| Substructure | 6 |
| Channel | Ν |
| Culvert | Ν |
| + NBI API | PRAISAL RATINGS + |
| Structure Evaluation | n 6 |
| Deck Geometry | 4 |
| Underclearances | Ν |
| Waterway Adequacy | / N |
| Approach Alignmen | t 8 |
| + SAFI | ETY FEATURES + |
| Bridge Railing | 0-SUBSTANDARD |
| GR Transition | 0-SUBSTANDARD |
| Appr. Guardrail | 0-SUBSTANDARD |
| GR Termini | 0-SUBSTANDARD |
| + SPECIA | AL INSPECTIONS + |
| NSTM N | |
| Underwater N | |
| Pinned Asbly. N | |
| + 1 | WATERWAY + |
| Drainage Area | |
| Waterway Opening | |
| Navigation Control | NOT APPL |
| Pier Protection | |
| Nav. Vert./Horz. Clr. | |
| Nav. Vert. Lift Bridge | |
| MN Scour Code | A-NON WATERWAY |
| Scour Evaluation Ye | - |
| | ACITY RATINGS + |
| | H 20 |
| Operating Rating | HS 20.30 |
| Inventory Rating | HS 14.00 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 32 SEMI: DBL: |
| | -23-2013 |
| Overweig | Iht Permit Codes |

A: N B: N C: N

Attachment 03 | MN Structure Inventory Report 12/07/2023 Crew:

MINNESOTA BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

Insp Responsibility: HENNEPIN COUNTY BRIDGE 90623

S BROWN RD OVER LUCE LINE TRAIL

| BRIDG | SE 9062 | 3 S BROWN RD OVE | R LUCE LINE T | RAIL | | INSP. | DATE: 07-3 | 1-2023 | |
|-------------------|---------|---|--|---|--|--|--|-------------|-------------|
| City: C Townsh | • | PIN Iship: 117N Range: 23W | Location: 0.9 M Facility: CSAH 1 Control Section: Local Agency Brid | Mair | 1.566 nt. Area: | Rdw | Width: 38.8 ft | 906 sq ft | |
| | | TIMB BEAM SPAN uper: 6 Sub: 6 Chan: N Ci | Open, ılv: N | , Posted, Closed: | LOAD POSTED | Culv | ert: N/A Postings: 32 - | - | |
| | - | s - Approach: 8 Waterway: N Signs - Load Posting: VEHICLE Horizontal: OBJECT MA | ONLY Traffic: N | MN Scour Code: NOT REQUIRED al: NOT APPLICA | | | al Plan. Index rall Condition: | Fair | 58 |
| ELE NBF | ۲ | ELEMENT NAME | | P. DATE | QUANTITY | QTY CS 1 | QTY CS 2 | QTY CS 3 | QTY CS 4 |
| 800 | | AL DEFS OR SAFETY HAZAR | 07-2 | 31-2023 27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 1 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 |
| | Notes: | 800. '23- No critical structural | deficiencies or serio | us safety hazard | s present at time of insp | ection. | | | |
| 12 | REINF | ORCED CONCRETE DECK | 07-2 | 31-2023 27-2021 | 3,756 SF 3,756 SF | 3,708 3,708 | 37 37 | 11 11 | 0 0 |
| | Notes: | 12. See General Notes. 1" nor various areas. Spall in deck co spalled on E side @ P4, also ('14-Decayed knots in W bay or @ CL w/ conc exp. '21- 2 delams on E coping 1 co horizontal crack in W coping @ splinters in wood form at N ab '23- No changes at time of insp | ping on W side ove P 1 w/ rebar exp. span 2 @ P2. Cop enter in span 3 and P3. Timber form ir ut, 1st bay W of C/L | er center span. Co Forms are charre ing spall on E sic 1 in center span n span 3 @ CL @ | onc is thru forms in span ed over P2 @ 1st bay fro de @ P4 has rebar exp. 4. 1 Spall with rebar exp | 4, 4th bay om E. Timber forn oosed on W | from E. Coping ns cracked in sp / coping @ P2. 3 | oan 3 3' | |
| 510 | WEARIN | IG SURFACE | 07-3 | 31-2023 | 2,906 SF | 1,249 | 1,636 | 9 | 12 |
| | Notes: | 510. Top of Concrete Deck wi '16-Unsound patches & areas areas. '21-1584 SF of sound concret <1-1/2" deep). Cracks mostly '23-Several areas of failed pa | th Uncoated Rebar have been sawed e patches. Most ten sealed - minor crac | out & patched w/ np epoxy patches ks in patches are | s have partially or totally | failed. Sev | eral spalls (<1 S | | 7 |
| 301 | POURE | ED SEAL JOINT | 07-3 | 31-2023 | 121 LF | 0 | 108 | 7 | 6 |
| | Notes: | 301. '16-All 4 joints have been '21-Minor spalls affecting joint '23-No change. | cut & redone since | | 121 LF terial along all. Small are | 0 eas of adhe | 108 esion failure. | 7 | 6 |
| 330 | METAL | BRIDGE RAILING | | 31-2023 27-2021 | 167 LF 167 LF | 158 158 | 5 5 | 4 4 | 0 0 |
| | Notes: | 330. '21-4' of lower rail of W is '23-No change. | bent significantly. N | <i>l</i> inor surface rus | t at several rail/post con | nections. | | | |
| 515 | STEEL F | PROTECTIVE COATING | | 31-2023 | 404 SF | 0 | 362 | 32 | 10 |
| | Notes: | 515. '21-several small areas c '23-No change. | | 27-2021 post connections | 404 SF . Heavy chalking on seve | 0 eral bottom | 362 rails of both. | 32 | 10 |
| 331 | REINF | ORCED CONC BRIDGE RAILIN | | 31-2023 27-2021 | 28 LF 28 LF | 2 2 | 19 19 | 7 7 | 0 0 |
| | Notes: | 331. '16-2 posts w/ rusted reba '21-most posts have minor spa '23-No change. | - | larger spalls at b | ases of several. Vert cra | cks in man | у. | | |
| 822 | BITUM | INOUS APPROACH ROADWA | | 31-2023 27-2021 | 2 EA 2 EA | 0 0 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 0 0 |

822. SOUTH: '21-1' full width bit patch is deteriorated. Potholes along deck. Large cracks in roadway adjacent to patch. Notes: '23-No change.

Attachment 03 | MN Structure Inventory Report

'23-No change.

NORTH: '21-1' full width bit patch is deteriorated. Numerous large alligator cracks in bit adjacent to patch. Settlement at deck up to 3/4".

Page No:

3

| | | '23-No change. | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------|--------|
| 215 | REINF | ORCED CONCRETE ABUTMENT | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 113 LF 113 LF | 87 88 | 16 15 | 10 10 | 0 0 |
| | Notes: | 215. Vert cracks in both, some w/ rust si | tains. | | | | | |
| | | NORTH: '14-Paint flaking. 7 cracks | | | | | | |
| | | '16-Paint flaking & peeling. Several crac '17-2 spalls in parapet total 1 SF. Crack | | of deck. 3 cracks are | rust stained. | | | |
| | | '19-Min-mod efflor across, large spall ne | _ | | | | | |
| | | '23- Many of cracks in parapet have inc | reased effloresces. | | | | | |
| | | SOUTH: '14-paint flaking. 5 cracks. | | | | | | |
| | | '15-cracks are minor to mod in size. '16- Paint flaking & peeling. 3 cracks w/ | rust stains | | | | | |
| | | 23- Spall under 4th beam from East. | Tust stallis. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| - | | Wingwall notes: '23-All in good condition | | 0.44015 | 4.074 | 404 | 45 | |
| 7 | TIMBE | R STRINGER | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 2,113 LF 2,113 LF | 1,974 1,974 | 124 124 | 15 15 | 0 0 |
| | Notes: | 117. See General Notes. Discoloring of | | | | | | Ū |
| | | '14-Min-mod checks & splits in all spans | алана 8. | 5 1 20 | C | | | |
| | | '16-Surface rust on few tie bolts in main '21- 8' Horizontal check In 2nd From W | • | | | | | |
| | | 21- 8 Horizontal check in 2nd From W '23-No changes at time of inspection. | Near P2. | | | | | |
| 8 | TIMBE | RPILING | 07-31-2023 | 28 EA | 0 | 25 | 3 | 0 |
| | Notes: | 228. Read General Notes. Several colu | 07-27-2021 mns are split. some up to | 28 EA o 1". | 0 | 25 | 3 | 0 |
| | | | ····· | | | | | |
| | | Bent 1: 2nd column from E is split +/- 1" | | rojecting 1" to S of ca | э. | | | |
| | | '15-the center column is 1" - 1 1/2" S of '23-no changes at time of inspection. | cap. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | Bent 2: Piles appear twisted. | | | | | | |
| | | '14-E & W columns have 3/4" split. '16-columns are narrower @ bottom tha | an top & some have signs | s of fire damage. | | | | |
| | | 23- no changes at time of inspection. | | 5 | | | | |
| | | Bent 3: Piles appear twisted. | | | | | | |
| | | '23- No changes at time of inspection. | | | | | | |
| | | Bent4: 2nd column from E moved 2.5". | Also, several have move | ed +/- 1" to N and sma | II portion of colur | nns are projec | ting off | |
| | | cap. '11-2nd column from E is now 3" off cap | -continue to monitor | | | | | |
| | | '15-2nd column from E measures 3 1/4" | | e north side. | | | | |
| | | '16-2nd column from W is not fully supp | | | | | | |
| | | '19-2nd from E is 3-1/4" off cap. | | | | | | |
| 35 | TIMBE | '23-no changes at time of inspection. | 07-31-2023 | 157 LF | 66 | 88 | 3 | 0 |
| Ū | | | 07-27-2021 | 157 LF | 66 | 88 | 3 | 0 |
| | Notes: | 235. Read General Notes. '10-Currently P1-Ok. | raining & all caps wet in | places. | | | | |
| | | P2-full length horiz crack. | | | | | | |
| | | '14-22' horiz crack. | | | | | | |
| | | '23- no changes at time of inspection. | | | | | | |
| | | P3-horiz crack in cap about halfway up, | | | | | | |
| | | '14-40' horizontal crack. Full length horiz | | | | | | |
| | | '15-Cap is resting on E Pile on East edg '23- No changes at time of inspection. | je. | | | | | |

'23- No changes at time of inspection.

Attachment 03 | MN Structure Inventory Report

Page No: 4

| 855 | SECO | '23- No changes at time of inspection NDARY MEMBERS (SUPER) | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 0 | 1 | 0 | (|
|-----|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------|---|
| | Notoo | 955 A four disphragma have minor a | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 0 Cantor anon | 1 | 0 | (|
| | Notes: | 855. A few diaphragms have minor s '13-some x-brace bolt heads rusting a '23-no changes at time of inspection. | & some sheet rusting. | aces. A-bracing is spin | . @ center span | | | |
| 890 | LOAD | PST OR VERTICAL CLR SIGNING | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | (|
| | | | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | (|
| | Notes: | 890. '14-Load posting signs installed '15-Signs in place and in good condit '23-No change. | | | | | | |
| 891 | OTHEF | R BRIDGE SIGNING | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Notes: | 891. Horiz clearance marker X4-4 an '19-Brown Rd sign for trail on E side '21-X4-5 in SE is slightly faded. '23-No change. | | | | | | |
| 892 | SLOPE | ES & SLOPE PROTECTION | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | 07-27-2021 | 1 EA | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Notes: | 892. Minor cracks in grout on abut slo '23-no change. | opes. | | | | | |
| 893 | GUARI | DRAIL | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 1 | |
| | Notes: | 893. '17-Beam rusted through @ NE '21-NE & SE rails have minor impact '23-No change. | • | 0 1 | | | | |
| 894 | DECK | & APPROACH DRAINAGE | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | |
| | Notes: | 894. 14" CMP @ SE and SW. '16-Co '17-SE CMP has 8" separation +/- 25 '21-SE pipe is plugged where it is sep '23-Flume failing in SE. | ' down slope. | /ing in NE. | | | | |
| 895 | SIDEW | ALK, CURB, & MEDIAN | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 1 | |
| | Notes: | 895. Trans cracks in walk-sealed. Co rebar exp E side above pier 2. Walk s '16-most cracks in walk have been se '17-Sealant deteriorated @ some wal '21-sealant is still mostly intact. All bit NW is large. '23-Spall at North end of West sidewa | spalled on W side in span 2, e ealed. Spall @ exp joint over lk cracks. t approach walks have some | < 1 SF. P1. | | | | |
| 899 | MISCE | LLANEOUS ITEMS | 07-31-2023 07-27-2021 | 1 EA 1 EA | 1 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | |
| | Notes: | 899. 48" RCP culvert for stream runn cable @ E. O/H power on W side and '21-conduit on E side is cut at abutme '23- No change. | ing diag under bents 1, 2 & 3 d E to W over S span. | | op of bents @ E | side. Buried t | el | |
| 900 | PROTE | ECTED SPECIES | 07-31-2023 | 1 EA 1 EA | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| | Notes: | 900. '23- No change. | 07-27-2021 | I EA | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| (| General E | Bridge 90623 (430) CSAH 146 (S Brow | /n Rd) over Luce Line Trail 7/ | 31/23. ADT and MAM | . No paper repo | rt generated o | lata | |

Attachment 03 | MN Structure Inventory Report

piers, bents, spans, etc are labeled to match plans.

Recommended Repairs:

301. Reseal poured deck joints.

- 331. Possibly modify or replace bridge railing. Does not meet AASHTO standards.
- 510. Epoxy seal new cracks in repaired areas of deck.
- 894. Clear veg from CMP inlets in NE, SE & SW. Reconnect CMP in SE slope.
- 895. Sealant deteriorated at some walk cracks. Reseal.
- Deck: [5] '19-Many patches in top of deck. Some spalled patches have been refilled with bit. '23-(5) Permanent patches are failing.
- Superstructure: [6] '23-(6) Moderate splitting with minor decay.
- Substructure: [6] '23-(6) Several columns have mod to large checks in them.
- Appr Roadway [8] '23- (8) No speed reduction needed. Alignment:

Attachment 04 | Existing Condition Photos



Side profile of the existing bridge, as viewed from the Luce Line State Trail.



Timber framed substructure and superstructure.



Side profile of the existing bridge, as viewed from the Luce Line State Trail from below.



Patches and sealed cracks on the bridge deck.

Hennepin County Public Works 1600 Prairie Drive, Medina, MN 55340 612-596-0300 | hennepin.us



Attachment 05 | Potential Typical Section



Attachment 07 | Hennepin County 2024-2027 Transportation CIP

Project Name:
Major Program:2181800 CSAH 146 - Replace Bridge #90623 over Luce Line Trail
Public WorksDepartment:Transportation Roads & Bridges

Summary:

Replace Bridge #90623 along Brown Road (CSAH 146) over the Luce Line State Trail in the City of Orono.

Purpose & Description:

The existing bridge (built in 1955) consists of a timber structure with a concrete deck that extends over the Long Lake Creek and Luce Line State Trail. The timber material throughout the structure has experienced advanced deterioration. In addition, the concrete deck is showing signs of extensive wear due to the frequency and size of visible cracking. A full replacement is being recommended as maintenance activities are no longer cost effective in preserving this bridge asset. Weight restrictions were introduced on this bridge in 2014, based on the results of a routine inspection, that prohibit certain types of commercial vehicles.

The proposed project will introduce a new bridge structure that is designed for a 75-year service life. The completion of this project will ensure that a grade separated crossing of the Luce Line State Trail is retained to eliminate conflicts for people walking and biking along the trail underneath the bridge. Additionally, the existing railing and guardrail will be upgraded to satisfy current design standards to ensure user safety. Furthermore, this project will eliminate weight restrictions along a collector route through the Lake Minnetonka Area.



2024

Funding Start:

| REVENUE | Budget To-Date | Act & Enc | Balance | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | Future | Total |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----------|
| Mn/DOT State Aid - Regular | | | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | 1,200,000 | | 6,350,000 |
| Total | | | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | 1,200,000 | | 6,350,000 |
| EXPENSE | Budget To-Date | Act & Enc | Balance | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | Future | Total |
| Right of Way | | | | | 80,000 | 120,000 | | | | 200,000 |
| Construction | | | | | | | 4,000,000 | 1,000,000 | | 5,000,000 |
| Consulting | | | | 50,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | | | | 250,000 |
| Contingency | | | | | 25,000 | 75,000 | 600,000 | 200,000 | | 900,000 |
| Total | | | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | 1,200,000 | | 6,350,000 |

Attachment 07 | Hennepin County 2024-2027 Transportation CIP

| Project Name: 2181800 CSAH 146 - Rep Major Program: Public Works Department: Transportation Roads & Br | lace Bridge #90623 c | | | | | Funding Start:2024Funding Completion:2028 | | | |
|---|---|---|---------|---------|-----------|---|--------|-----------|--|
| Current Year's CIP Process Summary | Budget To-Date | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | Future | Total | |
| Department Requested | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | 1,200,000 | | 6,350,000 | |
| Administrator Proposed | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | 1,200,000 | | 6,350,000 | |
| CBTF Recommended | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | 1,200,000 | | 6,350,000 | |
| Board Approved Final | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | 1,200,000 | | 6,350,000 | |
| Activity Anticipated Timeframe Planning 2020 - 2023 Design Q1 2024 - Q4 2026 Bid Advertisement Q1 2027 Construction Q2 2027 - Q3 2027 Completion Q 2028 Project's Effect on the Operating Budget: Staff does not anticipate that this project will have it staff or annual operating costs. The proposed projet assets in-kind. Project's Effect on County Priorities: This project will advance disparity reduction efforts replacing a bridge nearing the end of its useful life, particular, this project will maintain a grade separat state trail that passes under Brown Road (CSAH 14) Changes from Prior CIP: • No changes to the overall Project Budget single | in the transportation d ensuring mobility for a ed crossing for the Luc 46). | e existing bridge omain by Il modes. In the Trail, a | | | | | | | |
| Last Year's CIP Process Summary | Budget To-Date | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | Future | Total | |
| Department Requested | | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | | 5,150,00 | |
| Administrator Proposed | | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | | 5,150,0 | |
| CBTF Recommended | | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | | 5,150,0 | |
| Board Approved Final | | | 50,000 | 205,000 | 295,000 | 4,600,000 | | 5,150,0 | |

Attachment 08 | Alternate Routes Map



Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.



CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) Bridge Replacement Project Attachment 09 | Forecast 2040 Traffic Volumes Map



10 Hennepin Miles

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.

Publication date: 7/13/2023

Data sources: SRF Consulting, Hennepin County Transportation Planning

Attachment 10 | Disadvantaged Communities and Resources Map



0.47

0.95 Miles

with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.

Attachment 11 | Affordable Housing Access Map and Detail Summary



0.5

1 Miles

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.

Attachment 11 | Affordable Housing Access Map and Detail Summary

| Property ID F | Property Name | Total Units | Affordable Units | 30% AMI | 50% AMI | 60% AMI | 0 BR | 1 BR | 2 BR | 3 BR | 4 BR |
|---------------|------------------------------|-------------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 9522 F | Hillside Terrace - Long Lake | 44 | 44 | 44 | ļ | 0 | 0 | 0 3 |) (| 5 8 | 30 |

Attachment 12 | Multimodal Connections Map



0.5

Miles

Disclaimer: This map (i) is furnished "AS IS" with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this map.





Attachment 13 | City of Orono Support Letter



2750 Kelley Parkway, Orono, Minnesota 55356 www.oronomn.gov

2 November 2023

Carla Stueve, P.E. Director and County Highway Engineer Hennepin County Transportation Project Delivery 1600 Prairie Drive Medina, MN 55340

Dear Ms. Stueve:

The City of Orono hereby expresses its support for Hennepin County's Regional Solicitation federal funding application to replace Bridge #90623 along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) over the Luce Line State Trail in the City of Orono.

This project will involve the replacement of Bridge #90623 along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) over the Luce Line State Trail that is nearing the end of its useful life. The completion of this project will also ensure that a grade separated crossing of the Luce Line Regional Trail is retained to eliminate conflicts for people walking and biking along the trail underneath the bridge. This project presents an opportunity to replace a critical asset that currently includes weight restrictions, and also introduce a new bridge section that better accommodates people walking and biking through the area; thereby enhancing the livability and quality of life for Orono and Hennepin County residents.

The City of Orono acknowledges that the city may be required to cost participate in this project as outlined in the Hennepin County Cost Participation policy. Specific details regarding cost participation and maintenance responsibilities are anticipated to be determined during the design process as project development is advanced.

Thank-you for making us aware of this application and project, and the opportunity to provide support. The City of Orono looks forward to working with you on this project.

Am 1 Edus

Adam T. Edwards, P.E. City Administrator / City Engineer Orono

Attachment 14 | MnDNR Support Letter



Parks and Trails Division 1200 Warner Road Saint Paul, MN 55106

November 29, 2023

Dear Ms. Stueve:

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR) hereby expresses its support for Hennepin County's Regional Solicitation federal funding application to replace Bridge #90623 along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) over the Luce Line State Trail in the City of Orono.

This project will involve the replacement of Bridge #90623 along CSAH 146 (Brown Rd) over the Luce Line State Trail that is nearing the end of its useful life. The completion of this project will also ensure that a grade separated crossing of the Luce Line Regional Trail is retained to eliminate conflicts for people walking and biking along the trail underneath the bridge. This project presents an opportunity to replace a critical asset that currently includes weight restrictions, and introduce a new bridge section that better accommodates people walking and biking through the area; thereby enhancing the livability and quality of life for Orono and Hennepin County residents.

As the current owner and operator of the Luce Line State Trail, the MNDNR agrees to continue maintaining the Luce Line State Trail that extends underneath Bridge #90623 for the useful life of improvements.

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

Sincerely,

David Olsen Digitally signed by David Olsen Date: 2023.11.29 12:31:38

David Olsen Acting Area Supervisor

Equal Opportunity Employer

CC:

Grant Wilson, Central Regional Director Martha Reger, Acting Parks and Trails Central Regional Manager Rachel Henzen, Acting Parks and Trails District 7 Supervisor