



# Blatnik Bridge

---

## Step 3A Comment Summary

February 2022

State Project # 6981-26



# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Outreach Methodology .....	1
Summary of Comments Received.....	2
Bridge Alternatives .....	3
Bike/Pedestrian .....	3
Bridge Connections.....	4
Bridge Design.....	4
Environmental/Environmental Justice .....	4
Property Impacts .....	5
Transit.....	5
Traffic/Geometrics.....	5
Other Comments .....	5
Stakeholder One-on-One Meetings.....	6

# Introduction

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) are planning improvements to the Blatnik Bridge to develop an interstate highway connection across the St. Louis Bay that does not restrict the movements of freight and provides local, regional, and international movement in a reliable and efficient manner.

In October 2021, the project team released the [Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo \(Step 3a\)](#) for public review and feedback. This memo summarized the findings from Step 3a of the alternatives development, screening, and evaluation process, which evaluated the bridge alternatives against Social, Economic, and Environmental (SEE) impacts. The project team asked stakeholders and the public for their feedback on the following bridge alternatives evaluated in Step 3a:

## Alternative Options

- Alternative A: Existing Alignment
- Alternative B: West Alignment
- Alternative C: East Alignment
- Alternative D: West/Existing Combination Alignment
- Alternative E: East/Existing Combination Alignment
- Alternative F: East/West Combination Alignment

## Connection Options

- Connection 1: Garfield Avenue to Hammond Avenue
- Connection 2: Garfield Avenue to US 53

This document summarizes the methods used to collect comments on the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo (Step 3a), the types of comments received, and how comments were considered.

## Outreach Methodology

The following events and platforms advertised the availability of the Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo to the public and facilitated comment on the bridge alternatives evaluated in Step 3a:

- Agency Meeting #4 – October 27, 2021
- Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #5 – December 2, 2021
- Public Open House – December 9, 2021
- Stakeholder One-on-One Meetings
  - Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) – January 7, 2022
  - Duluth Ready Mix, Inc. – January 7, 2022
  - City of Superior – January 12, 2022
  - United Postal Service (UPS) – January 12, 2022
  - Fraser Shipyards – January 12, 2022
  - Duluth Seaway Port Authority – January 13, 2022



- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) – January 14, 2022
- AMI Consulting Engineers – January 18, 2022
- Cenex Harvest State (CHS) – January 21, 2022
- Project website, which included project information, contacts, and an interactive feedback map to provide input

The public open house was advertised through MnDOT and WisDOT social media platforms (Facebook and Twitter), including some paid advertisements to increase reach. The DOTs provided advance press releases to relevant news outlets to garner interest in the project, and a GovDelivery email to the project’s distribution list. In an effort to try and reach more underrepresented community groups, copies of the open house notice were distributed to the Douglas County Courthouse, Superior Library, Superior DMV, to PAC members to distribute through their communication channels, and to the project’s tribal contacts. The PAC and agency meetings are regularly standing project meetings and received specific presentations related to the alternatives screening process. The DOTs directed agencies, PAC members, and the general public to provide comments on the project website ([www.dot.state.mn.us/d1/projects/blatnik-bridge/](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/d1/projects/blatnik-bridge/)) by using an online interactive feedback map or by contacting the project contacts by mail, email, or phone. Users provided feedback on the interactive map by placing a comment on the map related to locations of concern or opportunity on the bridge alternatives and connection options. The project accepted comments through January 10, 2022.

The project team also hosted one-on-one meetings with property owners located directly adjacent to the existing bridge north of 1<sup>st</sup> Street in Wisconsin between January 7 and January 21, 2022. These stakeholders may be directly impacted by one or more of the alternatives under consideration.

## Summary of Comments Received

During the comment period (October 27, 2021 – January 10, 2022), a total of 82 comments were received:

- One emailed comment from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- Eight comments at the Agency Meeting #4 on October 27, 2021.
- Nine comments at the PAC #5 meeting on December 2, 2021.
- The public provided 64 comments during the public comment period (December 9, 2021 – January 10, 2022).

The comments have been separated into groups by topic including:

- Bridge alternatives
- Bike/pedestrian
- Bridge connections
- Bridge design
- Environmental/environmental justice
- Property impacts
- Transit
- Traffic/geometrics
- Other comments

The following sections explain how comments received on these topics were considered in the alternatives screening. Table 1 includes a matrix of all comments received, organized by commenter.

## Bridge Alternatives

Several commenters noted no substantive feedback on the bridge alternatives under evaluation in Step 3a or suggested keeping all alternatives on the table. Many comments stated support or opposition for certain bridge alternatives. Representative comments include:

- Support for Alternative A due to perception of being less costly while providing opportunity to make changes to touchdown in Superior; however, the commentator noted the bridge’s age would need to be considered in order for any of the structure to be reused on the current alignment.
- Alternatives B and C could allow for a dual span bridge, which provides better weight capacity and eases the flow of traffic/pedestrians.
- Support for Alternative D because it minimizes impacts to businesses on Connor’s Point and Rice’s Point and does not change the alignment with the Hammond Avenue intersection.
- Support for Alternative E because its approach allows for a better connection to Connection 2. Alternative E could allow for a dual span bridge or a single span with a median in the middle and three travel lanes in each direction.
- Several challenges with Alternative F, including the shortness of the curve for larger loads and access to the north end of Superior. Others support Alternative F because it provides less of a curve for wider loads to navigate for the Connection 2 option.

The comments received affirmed there are pros and cons with each of the current bridge alignments which is currently documented in the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo; **therefore, the project team made no further changes/additions to the document based on these comments.** Alternative development will continue in Step 3b with a focus on understanding more about property impacts. Traffic studies including analysis of how OSOW vehicle mobility is affected through the corridor will be studied in Step 4.

## Bike/Pedestrian

The project team received several questions about the status of bike/pedestrian infrastructure, specifically, if it’s still being considered and how the project team is demonstrating a need for it. A commentator asked why the Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council’s (MIC) Bike/Pedestrian Plan was not included as part of the Step 3a evaluation criteria. Other comments noted that a movable bridge type may be favorable to bikes/pedestrians and requested no bike lanes unless physically separated from vehicle traffic.

MnDOT/WisDOT recognize the importance of this issue to stakeholder which is why Bikeability/Walkability is documented as a project need in the project [Purpose and Need Statement](#). Furthermore, one of the objectives of the project is to “consider multi-modal facilities” which has led to the formation of a Bike/Pedestrian Technical Working Group (TWG) that will meet regularly throughout the alternative’s development process. The TWG includes technical experts from both DOTs, the Duluth-Superior MIC, the Federal Highway Administration, and a public member from a local stakeholder group. Issues the TWG will be working on include, but are not limited to, gathering data about bike/pedestrian users in the community and facilitating alternatives development and evaluations as it relates to bike/pedestrian accommodations. A component of the Bike/Pedestrian TWG analysis will include an evaluation of existing comprehensive plans as it relates to the project which will include the MIC’s Bike/Pedestrian Plan.

Walkability/Bikeability remains an [Evaluation Criteria](#) for the project and all alternatives that have been developed include bike/pedestrian infrastructure, which is why it was not used to compare alternatives in Step 3a. **Therefore, the project team made no further changes/additions to the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo because of these comments.** Findings and recommendations from the Bike/Pedestrian TWG will be incorporated into the alternative's development and evaluation documentation.

## Bridge Connections

The project team received several comments expressing concerns with Connection 1, direct to Hammond Avenue, because current bridge access on Hammond Avenue creates issues. Commenters noted that vehicles travel too fast coming off the bridge onto Hammond Avenue, leading to blind merging, pedestrian safety issues, and a high number of traffic incidents at the base of the bridge. The project team also received comments about Connection 2 and if it would cause US 53 to become a bypass for Superior. Other comments expressed support for Connection 2 because it would be more convenient to head southbound off the bridge onto US 53 without having to take the cloverleaf and stop at a stop sign/traffic signal. Other comments focused on interchange types (e.g., roundabouts, on/off ramps), interchange locations/access (e.g., to Garfield Avenue, Hammond Avenue, Hwy 35, other local roads), number of travel lanes at the interchanges, and the timeline for constructing the interchanges.

MnDOT/WisDOT understand the existing problems with how the current bridge ties into the local road system in Superior, as documented in the project [Purpose and Need Statement](#). The next phase of alternatives development will include refinement of interchanges in Superior. Alternatives will be evaluated for ability to address the identified vehicle safety and mobility issues.

Because the focus of Step 3A is on primary bridge alignment/location and not interchange alternatives, **the project team made no further changes/additions to the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo because of these comments.**

## Bridge Design

The project team received several comments asking about vertical clearance (e.g., over Howard's Pocket, whether it will be the same) and stating support for or against certain bridge types (e.g., a tunnel, movable spans, single vs dual span). Several expressed opposition to movable spans because of impacts on traffic and shipping timing.

These elements have yet to be determined and will be analyzed in Step 4; **therefore, the project team made no further changes/additions to the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo because of these comments.**

## Environmental/Environmental Justice

The project team received several comments about environmental concerns because of the project such as impacts on species (e.g., bald eagles), water bodies (open water impacts to St. Louis River), and environmental justice populations (e.g., areas of concentrated poverty).

The ability to identify and avoid impacts to social, economic, and/or environmental resources have been included as [Evaluation Criteria](#) for the alternative's development and evaluation process. As documented in the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo, there have not been substantial differences between any of the alternatives for potential impacts to these resources because the alternatives being considered are all in generally the same location as the existing bridge (i.e., either following the existing alignment or offsets of the existing alignment). **Therefore, the**

**project team made no further changes/additions to the document because of these comments.** As the alternative's development and evaluation process continues in Step 3b and Step 4 in 2022, the project team will continue to consider potential impacts to these resources in determining the preferred alternative, anticipated in early 2023.

## Property Impacts

The project team received several comments about the bridge alternatives' impacts to the businesses and new development on Connor's Point. Commenters expressed concern about the bridge devaluing new development; safety, noise, and traffic impacts; debris from the bridge; restriction of boat launch and harbor access; and lack of sunlight to the building site. Other comments expressed support for Alternative A, Alternative B, and Alternative D because they have fewer impacts on Connor's Point development and cultural/historical resources than others. Another comment expressed concern about property impacts due to right-of-way expansion.

MnDOT/WisDOT recognize the implications of potential property impacts for a project of this scale, which is why the ability to avoid property impacts has been included as an [Evaluation Criteria](#) for the alternative's development and evaluation process. This was a primary reason behind scheduling one-on-one meetings with property owners directly adjacent to the bridge to better understand how alternatives will affect existing and future operations. These discussions will be documented to aid in the decision-making process for determining a preferred alternative. Further refinements of potential for property impacts will be included as part of Step 3b, specifically the potential for an alternative to result in relocation; **therefore, the project team made no further changes/additions to the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo because of these comments.**

## Transit

The project team received a comment about the impacts to the Hammond Avenue/5th Street intersection because Duluth Transit Authority bus routes use this intersection. MnDOT/WisDOT will coordinate with affected stakeholders on project implications to transit systems when a preferred alternative is determined. Due to the primary focus of project development at this phase on identifying a preferred alternative; **the project team made no further changes/additions to the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo because of these comments.**

## Traffic/Geometrics

The project team received several comments stating this project can fix connectivity issues between the residential neighborhood south of US 53 and industrial jobs north of US 53. The project team also received comments expressing concern about traffic impacts (e.g., at Hammond Avenue/Belknap Street during construction) and minimizing traffic delays. Several comments noted challenges with alternatives (e.g., Alternative C, Alternative E) due to the perceived shortness of the curve for wider loads and providing access to/from the north end of Superior.

Traffic studies will be developed in conjunction with alternatives development to fully evaluate the alternatives' impacts on vehicle mobility and safety in the Step 4 evaluation. **Therefore, the project team made no further changes/additions to the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo because of these comments.**

## Other Comments

The project team received three other comments that are not central to the purpose of soliciting feedback at this stage of the project. These comments are detailed in Table 1, specifically, comments 17, 18, and 24. **The project team**

made no further changes/additions to the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo because of these comments.

## Stakeholder One-on-One Meetings

The project team held one-on-one meetings in January 2022 with nine stakeholders that are near the Blatnik bridge, including Minnesota DNR, Duluth Ready Mix, Inc, City of Superior, UPS, Fraser Shipyards, CHS, AMI Consulting Engineers, BNSF, and Duluth Seaway Port Authority. The purpose was to discuss the bridge alternatives, hear stakeholders' perspectives, and gather data for evaluation to help the project team make recommendations on which alternatives should or should not move forward. Stakeholder preferences on alternatives are summarized below and Table 2 includes key takeaways.

The Duluth Seaway Port Authority, AMI Consulting Engineers, and Fraser Shipyards expressed a preference for the west alignment (Alternatives B or D). Conversely, CHS representatives noted that a west alignment (Alternative B) could impact an existing rail spur that is critical to their operations. BNSF representatives noted that CHS is the owner of the rail spur. UPS did not express a preference but noted that the east alignment (Alternatives C, E or F) would affect their operations the most. Duluth Ready Mix said none of the alternatives would influence their long-term operations, but they favor an alternative with the shortest bridge closure duration. Minnesota DNR favors either the existing (Alternative A) or west alignment (Alternatives B or D). City of Superior staff and elected officials did not express preferences on bridge alternatives but have a strong desire not to connect directly to Hammond Avenue (Connection 1).

This feedback will be considered in the decision-making process as alternative design advances and all evaluation criteria is weighed. **The project team made no further changes/additions to the Evaluation of Feasible Alternatives Tech Memo because of these comments.**



**TABLE 1: COMMENT MATRIX (FROM AGENCY, PAC, AND GENERAL PUBLIC)**

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
1	10/27/21	US EPA	Agency Meeting #4	How will interchange project interact with the Blatnik Bridge project? Are they on the same timeline?  Is trail crossing still being considered?	Bridge Connections, Bike/Pedestrian
2	10/27/21	Duluth Transit Authority	Agency Meeting #4	Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to intersection at Hammond and 5th – bus routes use this intersection and are concerned about impacts to areas of concentrated poverty</li> <li>Right-of-way expansion impacts</li> <li>Connectivity between residential neighborhood south of US 53 and industrial jobs north of US 53</li> </ul>	Transit, Environmental/Environmental Justice, Traffic/Geometrics
3	10/27/21	City of Superior Public Works	Agency Meeting #4	Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction phase traffic impacts at Hammond Ave and Belknap St intersection, concerned about using Belknap Street as a bypass.</li> <li>Could Connection 2 (direct to US 53 connection) cause US 53 to become a bypass for Superior?</li> <li>Hammond shouldn't be a straight shot off the bridge as it is now.</li> </ul> Opportunity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sees an opportunity to fix connectivity problems between residential neighborhood and industrial areas.</li> </ul>	Traffic/Geometrics, Bridge Connections
4	10/27/21	City of Superior Planning Dept.	Agency Meeting #4	Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impacts to Connor's Point businesses.</li> </ul> Opportunity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West alignment may have less impact.</li> </ul>	Property Impacts
5	10/27/21	Port Authority	Agency Meeting #4	Are navigation channels considered in the evaluation?	Other Comment
6	10/27/21	MnDOT Protected Species	Agency Meeting #4	Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bald eagle nest located west of existing bridge.</li> </ul> Opportunity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity to use sand from the project to create beach wildlife habitat.</li> </ul>	Environmental/Environmental Justice
7	10/27/21	WisDNR	Agency Meeting #4	Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open water impacts to St. Louis River.</li> </ul>	Environmental/Environmental Justice

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
8	10/27/21	MIC	Agency Meeting #4	Where are we in the process of demonstrating need for bike/ped infrastructure?	Bike/Pedestrian
9	12/2/21	Jon Olney (Western Great Lakes)	PAC #5	Is the vertical clearance of the bridge going to be the same?	Bridge Design
10	12/2/21	Cari Pedersen (City of Duluth)	PAC #5	No questions/comments at this stage. Will facilitate feedback from my team. For meeting notes, I do not like the idea of movable bridges due to impacts on traffic.	Bridge Design, Traffic/Geometrics
11	12/2/21	Wendy Meierhoff-Aldrich (Bend Tec)	PAC #5	No questions/comments at this stage but will review documents later. Main concern moving forward is minimizing delays to traffic.	Traffic/Geometrics
12	12/2/21	Todd Janigo (City of Superior)	PAC #5	Lots of concerns with Connection 1, direct to Hammond Avenue. The easiest access to bridge is on Hammond Avenue currently, which creates a lot of issues. Want to make sure we are looking at things more closely.	Bridge Connections
13	12/2/21	Jenny VanSickle (City of Superior, City Council)	PAC #5	The City Council also has concerns with Connection 1, direct to Hammond Avenue. The Superior Police Department also are concerned with the high number of traffic incidents concentrated at the base of the bridge.	Bridge Connections, Traffic/Geometrics
14	12/2/21	Kate Ferguson (Port Authority)	PAC #5	No comments on current alternatives reviewed but want to assert that a movable bridge might not be supported by the Port Authority as there is a very real impact on timing for shipping on movable bridges.	Bridge Design
15	12/2/21	Ian Schoenike (Jeff Foster Trucking)	PAC #5	Do the thicker colored interchange options equate to more than one lane of travel in each direction?	Bridge Connections
16	12/2/21	Jim Foldesi (St. Louis County)	PAC #5	Agree with conclusions to keep all alternatives on the table for now. Like the Connection 2 direct to US 53 option.	Bridge Alternatives, Bridge Connections

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
17	12/2/21	Mike Casey & Prescott Morrill (We Walk Duluth)	PAC #5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why is the MICs bike/ped plan not included in consistency with regional plan evaluation criteria?</li> <li>2. Concern with where the paths touchdown on either side of the bridge; suggest keeping the connections with the community rather than the road network.</li> <li>3. Project should focus on what we want to see in the future, not entirely focus on existing needs.</li> <li>4. Discuss the span over Howards Pocket.</li> <li>5. Bike/ped might like a movable structure.</li> </ol>	Bike/Pedestrian, Bridge Connections, Bridge Design, Other Comments
18	11/24/21	LaRae Lehto, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	Email	<p>John,</p> <p>The MPCA St. Louis River AOC coordinators reviewed the Blatnik Bridge Alternatives Tech Memo and do not have any substantive comments or objections to the proposed bridge alignment in alternative 3A.</p> <p>You may receive comments from other MPCA programs, and/or the MNDNR, WDNR and Fond du Lac SLRAOC coordinators separately. We reviewed the proposed alternative specifically from the MPCA SLRAOC perspective.</p> <p>If you are making grammatical edits to the alternatives memo, here are a couple of suggestions...</p> <p><b>Avoid Impacting Past, Current, and Planned St. Louis River Area of Concern Projects</b></p> <p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>The US-Canada Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement defines an Area of Concern (AOC) as a location that has experienced significant impairment because of human activities. The St. Louis River AOC covers an area on the western arm of Lake Superior and all of Duluth and Superior. Several collaborating agencies, including the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), the MN DNR, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), and the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa (FdL), along with the St. Louis River AOC's designated Citizen Action Committee (CAC), <del>which is</del> and the St. Louis River Alliance (SLRA), developed a remedial action plan for the St. Louis River AOC. This plan, last updated in <del>2021</del>2020, identifies several projects to address impairments associated with <u>degraded</u></p>	Bridge Alternatives, Other Comments

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
				<u>habitat and</u> sediments containing toxic or bio-accumulative contaminants in the St. Louis River and surrounding area. Thank you for the coordination and the opportunity to review the proposed alternative.	
19	1/4/22	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	Has any thought gone into a tunnel instead of a bridge?	Opportunity (Bridge Design)
20	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	I like the idea of a roundabout in this general location to provide easier access to local roads	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
21	1/4/22	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	I like the idea of some sort of interchange here like a roundabout	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
22	12/31/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	It would be more convenient to be able to come off the bridge Southbound and head south on 53 without taking the cloverleaf and stopping at a stop sign and a stoplight. Perhaps a right exit sooner off the bridge and then underpass the bridge to a dedicated lane to 53 without intersections? This could also potentially send traffic onto 35 as well.	Opportunity (Bridge Connections, Traffic/Geometrics)
23	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	Using the existing alignment could provide a couple of benefits: (1) less costly; and (2) some changes could be made to the current connections depending on what the final contender is. However, one negative with this alternative is the infrastructure age which means the current bridge alignment/alternative A would need to be rehabilitated to some extent	Opportunity (Bridge Alternatives)
24	12/11/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	What would the service life of the Blatnik Bridge be if all trucks were routed onto the Bong Bridge? Say anything over 15,000 pounds. If this would extend the service life who is the cost/impact of doing this?	Opportunity (Other Comments)
25	1/4/22	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	Most unwise! What a boondoggle that would be!	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
26	1/4/22	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	Not a good thing for semis and heavily loaded trucks. Absolutely not!	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
27	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	Please, God, NO more roundabouts. Please no. Please no	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
28	12/13/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	No the current interchange works well	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
29	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative A	And let's say that there is a tie between the concept designs? This option could provide rehabilitative work if nothing is decided upon and another option opens up.	Opportunity (Bridge Alternatives)
30	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	blocking marina access	Challenge (Property Impacts)
31	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	I like the idea of an Interchange such as a roundabout to give access to U.S. 35	Interchange (Bridge Connections)
32	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	Love this option moving it further from Connor's point developments.	Opportunity (Property Impacts)
33	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	New 80x100ft commercial building in progress to be built by spring 2022.	Challenge (Property Impacts)
34	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	private property to be utilized as party of commercial property development being currently built.	Challenge (Property Impacts)
35	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	these areas of wetlands are being graded for development and replaced in wetland bank credits. Wetland credits already purchased.	Challenge (Property Impacts)
36	12/6/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	This design alignment could for sure allow for a dual-span bridge.	Opportunity (Bridge Alternatives, Bridge Design)
37	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	West and existing alignment would eliminate impacts to existing development and commercial development that is already designed.	Opportunity (Property Impacts)
38	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	West and existing alignment would reduce potential historical cultural impacts since more of the new alignment would be located over previously filled lands.	Opportunity (Environmental/Environmental Justice)



Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
39	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	Would there be an Interchange here whether a roundabout or something else such as on and off ramps?	Interchange (Bridge Connections)
40	12/6/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	Would there be some sort of on/off ramps to access Hammond Avenue?	Challenge (Bridge Connections)
41	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	State Highway 35	Interchange
42	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative B	And potentially other roads in the area	Interchange
43	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	bridge will shadow and cutoff light to our site and buildings. We will see salt spray, garbage and damage. We see debris fly off the bridge so any movement of bridge east will affect safety to our facility.	Challenge (Property Impacts)
44	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	consumes our boat launch and harbor access.	Challenge (Property Impacts)
45	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	I like the idea of an Interchange or two being in this general vicinity to provide easier access to local roads	Interchange (Bridge Connections)
46	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	new 80x100 building be built here!	Challenge (Property Impacts)
47	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	our storm water system for site. This project significantly devalues our overall development!	Challenge (Property Impacts)
48	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	Safety concern during construction! Protecting all the staff working at the commercial building! Noise and traffic concerns.	Challenge (Property Impacts)
49	1/4/22	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	This east alignment only looks to cross several commercial sites on both MN and WI sides of the bridge. Anticipate this to be bad for the industrial area.	Challenge (Property Impacts)

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
50	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	This option could provide for a dual-span bridge for better weight capacity and to ease the flow of traffic/pedestrians. Or instead of a dual-span bridge, portions of the old bridge could be used as an off-ramp to access Hammond Avenue in Superior.	Opportunity (Bridge Alternatives, Bridge Design)
51	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	What may be a challenge would be the shortness of the curve for larger loads to navigate. Another challenge would be providing direct access to downtown Superior unless an off- and on- ramp are added which the current alignment could provide.	Challenge (Traffic/Geometrics)
52	12/6/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	Would there be some sort of Interchange here to access Garfield Avenue and the bridge? I wouldn't mind either on/off ramps here or some other sort of Interchange such as a roundabout	Interchange (Bridge Connections)
53	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative C	I like a dual span for the reasons stated.	Opportunity (Bridge Design)
54	1/4/22	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative D	Good choice for alignment. Minimize impacts to commercial residents on Connor's and Rice's Points, as well as not change major alignment with Hammond intersection.	Opportunity (Bridge Alternatives, Property Impacts)
55	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	A couple of negatives with this option are: 1) the shortness of the curve for wider loads; and 2) providing access to and from the North End of superior	Challenge (Bridge Alternatives, Traffic/Geometrics)
56	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	bridge will shadow and cutoff light to our site and buildings. We will see salt spray, garbage and damage. We see debris fly off the bridge so any movement of bridge east will affect safety to our facility. (Challenge)	Challenge (Property Impacts)
57	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	I like the idea of several interchanges in this general area to provide access to the local roads	Interchange (Bridge Connections)
58	12/6/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	I like this approach here because it could allow for a better connection to the connection 2 approach.	Opportunity (Bridge Alternatives, Bridge Connections)
59	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	new 80x100 building be built here!	Challenge (Property Impacts)

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
60	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	What if instead of being one span, there were two spans? One with the existing alignment and one with this alignment? This would be an interesting idea because two separate spans could handle the weight of six lanes of traffic (two in each direction for cars and one in each direction for buses and trucks that impede traffic) and a bike lane. Or instead of being two two separate spans, there could be one span with a median (the current bridge alignment) and three lanes of traffic in each direction.	Opportunity (Bridge Alternatives, Bridge Design)
61	12/6/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	Would there be some sort of Interchange here to access Garfield Avenue and the bridge? I wouldn't mind either on/off ramps here or some other sort of Interchange such as a roundabout	Interchange (Bridge Connections)
62	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	No bike lanes unless it is physically separate from motorized vehicle traffic similar to how the Bong Bridge is currently! The bridge carries an Interstate highway and bicycles in the main traffic lanes are incompatible with Interstate traffic volumes and speeds.	Opportunity (Bike/Pedestrian)
63	12/6/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	However, would on/off ramps be added to access the North End of Superior?	Opportunity (Traffic/Geometrics)
64	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative E	A dual-span bridge is the correct terminology	Opportunity (Bridge Design)
65	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	A couple of challenges with this option would be: 1) the shortness of the curve for larger loads; and 2) access to the North End of superior	Challenge (Bridge Alternatives, Traffic/Geometrics)
66	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	bridge will shadow and cutoff light to our site and buildings. We will see salt spray, garbage and damage. We see debris fly off the bridge so any movement of bridge east will affect safety to our facility.	Challenge (Property Impacts)
67	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	I like the idea of several interchanges such as roundabouts to provide access to local roads	Interchange (Bridge Connections)
68	12/6/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	I like this approach here because it would provide less of a curve that wider loads have to navigate for the connection 2 option	Opportunity (Bridge Alternatives, Bridge Connections)

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
69	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	new 80x100 building be built here!	Challenge (Property Impacts)
70	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	What if instead of being one span, there were two spans? One with the existing alignment and one with this alignment? This would be an interesting idea because two separate spans could handle the weight of six lanes of traffic (two in each direction for cars and one in each direction for buses and trucks that impede traffic) and a bike lane. Or instead of being two two separate spans, there could be one span with a median (the current bridge alignment) and three lanes of traffic in each direction.	Opportunity (Bridge Design)
71	12/6/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	Would there be some sort of Interchange here to access Garfield Avenue and the bridge? I wouldn't mind either on/off ramps here or some other sort of Interchange such as a roundabout	Interchange (Bridge Connections)
72	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	Same concerns regarding bike lanes and Interstate traffic as noted on Alternative E.	Opportunity (Bike/Pedestrian)
73	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Alternative F	A dual-span bridge is the correct terminology I am looking for	Opportunity (Bridge Design)
74	1/4/22	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 1	Vehicles coming off of the bridge on to Hammond Ave often traveling at high rate of speed. Consideration should be given to try and reduce the speed of traffic continuing on to Hammond Ave.	Challenge (Bridge Connections, Traffic/Geometrics)
75	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 1	With this connection point direct to Hammond Avenue, the speed of the traffic is a concern which comes with a whole bunch of other negatives such as blind mergers, pedestrian safety, etc	Challenge (Bridge Connections, Traffic/Geometrics)
76	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 2	I like connection 2 because it provides for a straighter span for wider loads	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
77	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 2	I like the idea of an exit ramp here because it would allow traffic to access the North End of Superior	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)

Comment ID	Date	From	Via	Comment	Topic/Theme
78	12/14/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 2	if possible, route both lanes of 53 to be direct on and off the bridge, eliminating the traffic signal. It would reduce incidents do to lane cutting and relieve traffic that goes down Hammond, turns left on 5th st and then take Grand back to 53. Hammond still needs connection but the primary connection should be with US 53.	Opportunity (Bridge Connections, Traffic/Geometrics)
79	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 2	Agree	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
80	12/10/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 2	Agree	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
81	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 2	There could also be additional interchanges to provide better access for local roads	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)
82	12/7/21	Public comment	Interactive Map, Connection 2	And on ramp too for motorists of Hammond Avenue	Opportunity (Bridge Connections)



**TABLE 2: COMMENT MATRIX (FROM ONE-ON-ONE STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS)**

Date	Stakeholder	Attendees/Role	Comment	Topic/Theme
1/7/22	Minnesota DNR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kent Skaar – manages public water accesses throughout the state</li> <li>• Kevin Johnson – area supervisor (oversees Rice’s Point public water access)</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conditional use permits and leases to operate Rice’s Point public water access (under Minnesota approach) from Port Authority, MnDOT, Minnesota Power Authority, and the City of Duluth</li> <li>• MnDNR would favor either the existing (Alternative A) or west alignment (Alternatives B or D) because the existing boat launch location (along the east side of bridge) is in a good spot</li> <li>• East alignment (Alternatives C, E, or F) would not be detrimental, depends on pier locations</li> <li>• Project team will continue to coordinate construction related considerations with the MnDNR as the project development continues</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives
1/7/22	Duluth Ready Mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tom Robertson – principal owner</li> <li>• Brooks Robertson – represents interest of future owners</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Own parcel west of Minnesota approach</li> <li>• No noted concerns from DRM for long term operations to be influenced by any of the alternatives</li> <li>• Would prefer an alternative with shorter anticipated bridge closure during construction</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives
1/12/22	City of Superior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jason Serck – Planning, Economic Development, and Port Director</li> <li>• Todd Janigo – Public Works Director</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Own parcels west of bridge on Connor’s Point</li> <li>• The City is not aware of development plans on Connor’s Point that would be affected by bridge alignment alternatives (with the exception of current expansion efforts at AMI)</li> <li>• City staff and elected officials have a strong desire to not directly connect to Hammond (Connection 1 alternatives) due to existing vehicle safety and mobility reasons that were outlined in the project’s purpose and need statement</li> <li>• WisDOT and the project team will need to coordinate potential local road improvements (e.g., Winter Street) with City required for effective traffic detours while the Blatnik bridge is being constructed</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives

Date	Stakeholder	Attendees/Role	Comment	Topic/Theme
1/12/22	UPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ray Mathies – buildings and facilities manager</li> <li>Darrin Gode – business manager at the Duluth facility</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lease parcel east of Minnesota approach from Port Authority</li> <li>East alignment (Alternatives C, E, or F) is going to affect UPS the most as it will likely result in a physical impact and relocation of the facility</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives
1/12/22	Fraser Shipyards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dave Steininger – operations (focus is filling up yard with repair and construction)</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Own parcels east of Wisconsin approach</li> <li>Fraser Shipyards has definite preference for the west alignment (Alternative B) as the existing or east alignments may result in potential impacts to their operations on Cumming Slip</li> <li>Concerns over preserving future use of land east of the bridge</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives
1/13/22	Duluth Seaway Port Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deb DeLuca – Executive Director</li> <li>Kate Ferguson – Director of Trade and Business Development</li> <li>Kevin Beardsley – Chief Financial Officer</li> <li>Dean Lembke – Facilities Manager</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Own parcels near Garfield Avenue interchange in Minnesota</li> <li>At this point in time, the Port Authority prefers a west alignment (Alternatives B or D) because anticipated right-of-way impacts and the length of bridge closure are less than other alternatives</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives
1/14/22	BNSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alex Fiorini</li> <li>Jake Rzewnicki</li> <li>Dan Peltier</li> <li>Mark Gjevre</li> <li>Jordan Burns</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BNSF/CHS operate locomotives on tracks under and adjacent to Wisconsin approach. Tracks in-use 365 days a year.</li> <li>BNSF owns “New Running Track” (furthest south east/west track under Wisconsin Approach)</li> <li>CHS owns and maintains track parallel and north of the New Running Track and Freeman 1 &amp; 2 Tracks (rail spur parallel to the west of the Wisconsin approach)</li> <li>Alternatives with direct connector ramps that cross tracks deeper into the “Y” at angles/skews present challenges.</li> <li>Permanent and construction vertical clearances will need to be considered as alternatives/designs are progressed.</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives

Date	Stakeholder	Attendees/Role	Comment	Topic/Theme
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design requirements. Default to BNSF requirements (23-foot, 6-inch vertical clearance and 9-foot horizontal offset from centerline) and coordinate with CHS as exceptions are needed.</li> </ul>	
1/18/22	AMI Consulting Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chad Scott – Vice President / Principal</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Own land east of bridge on Connor’s Point</li> <li>Currently expanding operations with a new facility directly east of the bridge, constructed anticipated to start in April 2022</li> <li>Major disruptions would occur with any of the east alignments (Alternatives C, E, and F) as it is likely to result in physical impacts to facilities and operations and require a relocation</li> <li>Current location is critical to their operations as their business largely is focused on waterfront based services (port/harbor development, inspections, etc) and presence of marina</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives
1/21/22	CHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Daniel Vandenhouton – terminal manager</li> <li>Carson Pester – CHS representative</li> <li>Jake Hamlin - State Govt Affairs</li> <li>Greg Oberle – CHS representative</li> <li>Daniel Mauer – public affairs</li> </ul>	<p>Key takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CHS owns and maintains track parallel and north of the New Running Track and Freeman 1 &amp; 2 Tracks (rail spur parallel to the west of the Wisconsin approach)</li> <li>Bridge closure duration less of an issue for CHS; rail logistics are the most important for their operations</li> <li>Track clearances are the same as BNSF standards (23-foot, 6-inch vertical clearance and 9-foot horizontal offset from centerline)</li> <li>West alignment (Alternative B) would potentially impact future expansion of adding additional spur tracks</li> </ul>	Bridge Alternatives