Appendix O

Public Involvement Summary
Press Release

Public Information Meeting for CSAH 1 Corridor Preservation Study in Northfield/Dundas Area

September 21, 2006

A public information meeting regarding a planning study for a potential new east-west highway corridor has been scheduled. The purpose of the meeting is to present the need for the corridor, present planning alignment concepts under consideration, and to receive public input for consideration in the process. The public, landowners within the study area, and other interested parties are encouraged to attend.

A copy of draft study information can be viewed on the Rice County website at:

http://www.co.rice.mn.us/highway/CSAH1.php

The Meeting will be held:

- Thursday, October 12, 2006 – Bridgewater Township Hall (500 Railway St. S.) from 6:30 – 9:00 PM, with a presentation at 7:30 PM.

This meeting will be repeated the following day for those unable to attend Thursday night. The repeated meeting will be held:

- Friday, October 13, 2006 – Bridgewater Township Hall (500 Railway St. S.) from 7:00 – 9:00 AM, with a presentation at 7:30 AM.

CONTACTS

DENNIS LUEBBE, HIGHWAY ENGINEER, (507) 332-6110

GARY WEIERS, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR, (507) 332-6121
Purpose of Meeting

- What is a Corridor Preservation Study?
- Why is a Study Needed?
- Who is Involved?
- What are the Alignments Under Consideration?
- What are Your Thoughts?
- When will the Corridor be Built?

Corridor Preservation Study

| Study potential new highway alignment concepts: |
| - Identify and Evaluate Potential Options |
| - Reduce the Number of Options |

Benefits to Communities, County, & State:

- Integrate Corridor with Development Plans
- Consider Formal Environmental Review
- Consider Financial Commitment

Corridor Preservation Study

A Corridor Preservation Study is:

- First of Many Steps to a New Highway Corridor.
- Not a Plan for Highway Construction.
- A Process to Integrate a New Highway Corridor with Land Uses.
- Necessary due to the Growth of the Area.
- A Collaborative Effort

Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

- Representatives from Study Partners
  - Rice County – Dennis Luebbe, County Engineer
  - Bridgewater Township – Gary Ebling, Supervisor
  - City of Dundas – Tom McMahon, City Engineer
  - City of Northfield – Heidi Hamilton, City Engineer
  - Northfield Township – Mike Growth, Supervisor
  - Mn/DOT – Chris Moates, District Planner
  - MnDNR – Randy Brandt, Hydrologist
  - Consultant – Chris Chromy, Project Manager

CH 1 Study Purpose & Goal

Identify a safe and efficient corridor alignment option for further planning, preservation, and environmental analysis based on an objective evaluation of alternatives.
CH 1 Corridor Objectives

Objective 1.1 – The proposed corridor meets the long-term regional transportation mobility needs as described in the 2025 Rice County Transportation Plan.

Objective 1.2 – The proposed corridor alleviates existing safety concerns and avoids potential future safety issues.

Objective 1.3 – The proposed corridor is fiscally responsible.

Objective 2.1 – The proposed corridor meets the long-term local transportation mobility needs in the Northfield/Dundas area.

Objective 2.2 – The proposed corridor meets the long-term local land use and infrastructure needs in Dundas and Northfield.

Objective 3.1 – The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to farm operations.

Objective 3.2 – The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to wetland, floodplain, river/stream crossings, and other natural features.

Objective 3.3 – The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to hazardous sites.

Objective 3.4 – The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to the natural heritage or threatened and endangered species:

Objective 3.5 – The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to protected groups of people.

Planning Alignment Concepts

Each Concept:
- 45-55 mph Design
- 4% Maximum Grade
- 150 Ft Right of Way Corridor (Typical)
- Perpendicular Crossing of Cannon River
- Railroad Underpass or Overpass
- Intersection Spacing
  (Existing and Planned Local Road Connections)

Each Concept: (continued)
- TH 3 Intersection Spacing
- TH 3/CH 20 Intersection Configuration
- TH 246/CH 1/CH 22/CR 81 Intersection Configuration
- Avoid – Minimize – Mitigate Impacts
Planning Alignment Concept 1A

**Key Features:**
- Intersection Spacing on Corridor and TH 3
- Number of Right-of-Way Relocations
- Impact to Dundas Land Use Planning

**Challenges:**
- Attractiveness for Regional Trips
- Horizontal Curvature
- Farmland Impacts and Severance
- Large amount of new Right-of-Way

Planning Alignment Concept 1B

**Key Features:**
- Intersection Spacing on Corridor and TH 3
- Horizontal Curvature
- Wetland Impacts
- Project Costs and Ability for Growth to Help Pay

**Challenges:**
- Attractiveness for Regional Trips
- Horizontal Curvature (Safety)
- Farmland Impacts and Severance
- Large amount of new Right-of-Way

Planning Alignment Concept 2

**Key Features:**
- Intersection Spacing on Corridor
- Attractiveness for Regional Trips
- Project Costs and Ability for Growth to Help Pay
- Wetland and Farmland Impacts

**Challenges:**
- TH 3 Intersection Spacing
- Curvature between Baldwin and Cabot Avenues
- Quality Wooded Area Impacts at Bluff

Planning Alignment Concept 3A

**Key Features:**
- Attractiveness for Regional Trips
- Wetland, Floodplain, and Farmland Impacts
- Quality Wooded Area Impacts at Bluff

**Challenges:**
- Intersection Spacing within Dundas
- Number of Right-of-Way Relocations
- Project Cost
- Possible Impacts to Historic Sites
- Park Impacts

Planning Alignment Concept 3B

**Key Features:** (Similar to 3A)
- Attractiveness for Regional Trips
- Wetland, Floodplain, and Farmland Impacts
- Quality Wooded Area Impacts at Bluff

**Challenges:** (Similar to 3A)
- Intersection Spacing within Dundas
- Number of Right-of-Way Relocations
- Project Cost
- Possible Impacts to Historic Sites

*Does Not Relocate Dundas Baseball Field*

Planning Alignment Concept 4A

**Key Features:**
- Wetland, Floodplain, and Farmland Impacts
- TH 3 Intersection Spacing

**Challenges:**
- Project Cost (Highest)
- Underpass of Railroad
- Intersection Spacing within Dundas
- Bluff and Quality Wooded Area Impacts
- Possible Impacts to Historic Sites
- Number of Right-of-Way Relocations
- Horizontal Curvature
Planning Alignment Concept 4B

Key Features: (Similar to 4A)
- Wetland, Floodplain, and Farmland Impacts
- TH 3 Intersection Spacing

Challenges: (Similar to 4A)
- Underpass of Railroad
- Intersection Spacing within Dundas
- Possible Impacts to Historic Sites
- Number of Right-of-Way Relocations
- Horizontal Curvature

Less Impact to Bluff, Lower Project Cost, More Attractive for Regional Trips

Planning Alignment Concept 5A

Key Features:
- Intersection Spacing on TH 3
- Bluff and Quality Wooded Area Impacts
- Project Costs and Ability for Growth to Help Pay

Challenges:
- Floodplain Impacts
- Curvature between Baldwin and Cabot Avenues
- Intersection Spacing within Dundas
- Impacts to Future Residential Areas

Planning Alignment Concept 5B/C

Key Features: (Similar to 5A)
- Intersection Spacing on TH 3
- Bluff and Quality Wooded Area Impacts
- Project Costs and Ability for Growth to Help Pay

Challenges: (Similar to 5A)
- Floodplain Impacts
- Intersection Spacing within Dundas

More Attractive for Regional Trips, More Desirable Horizontal Curvature, Farmland Impacts and Severance

Planning Alignment Concept 6A/B

Hybrid of Concepts 1 and 3
- Concept 1 west of TH 3
- Concept 3 east of TH 3

Key Features:
- Shares TH 3 Bridge Over Cannon River

Challenges:
- Attractiveness for Regional Trips

Schedule for Decisions

Selection of Preferred Planning Alignment(s)
- Project Advisory Committee – December 2006
- Public Information Meeting – February 2007
- Elected Officials – February 2007

Agreement on Each Agency’s Responsibilities
- February – March 2007

Comments / Questions

PAC Wants Your Input:
- End of Presentation
- At Individual Stations
- Written Comments Tonight Thru October 30, 2006
- Project Advisory Committee

Study Information Available on Rice County Website, County Highway Department, Dundas City Hall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suzanne Hongre</td>
<td>5624 E. 14th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mike &amp; Mary Green</td>
<td>3015 Millerburg Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Paul Gallard</td>
<td>3638 E. 118th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jerry Adams</td>
<td>107 N 2nd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rich Selles</td>
<td>12476 Cannon City Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ed Panin</td>
<td>116 88th St. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anthony Zurschmidt</td>
<td>3811 Millard Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Anne Messner</td>
<td>1590 330 1/2 E. Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mike Hall</td>
<td>3993 18th St. E. East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mark Smertang</td>
<td>12222 Eaton Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Paul Selby</td>
<td>12104 Cannon City Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grace L. Lileby</td>
<td>12, 09 Cannon City Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dana H. King</td>
<td>1040 Sommersfield Dr., Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nancy Harrington</td>
<td>11371 Dennison Blvd, Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Darin May Narburg</td>
<td>8758 Dundee, Minn. 55017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Moran</td>
<td>5770 115th St E</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Johnson</td>
<td>6233 115th St E</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chock Deveraux</td>
<td></td>
<td>De noisy city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie Kleese</td>
<td>5770 115th St E</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Kleese</td>
<td>5270 115th St E</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Giraffe</td>
<td>6151/2 Washington St, Northfield</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Adams</td>
<td>108 E. Hester St, Priors</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Saurer</td>
<td>3865 Upper 321 St. Nfld.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staci Quanno</td>
<td>11751 Dundas Blvd, Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jones</td>
<td>1st Timberlane</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma Fette</td>
<td>16470 Ames Way</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Hermundson</td>
<td>5915 110th St E</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Anderson</td>
<td>7038 E 125th St E</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Edergren</td>
<td>5780 115th St E</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Malcon</td>
<td>6025 115th St E</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK RYAN</td>
<td>11677 Lakes Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Schrader</td>
<td>1125 Millersburg Blvd E</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Kallested</td>
<td>8947 Eaves Ave &amp; Northfield</td>
<td>Cannon River Watershed Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick DeCarli</td>
<td>12275 Cannon City Blvd</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan &amp; Mary Kolb</td>
<td>11790 Cannon City Blvd NW</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Schrader</td>
<td>1125 Millersburg Blvd E</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Kenley</td>
<td>2808 Oak Lawn</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Jakobson</td>
<td>2808 Oak Lawn Dr</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIP LEMANN</td>
<td>Box 125 Dundas</td>
<td>LANDOWNER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Information Meeting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Thurnheer</td>
<td>2713 Union Lake Tr.</td>
<td>area resident, motorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Demian</td>
<td>12138 Faribault Blvd</td>
<td>Dundas, Minn. 55019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Emerson</td>
<td>1770 George Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Ritter</td>
<td>1720 Cannon Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Ojala</td>
<td>205 East St. Dundas</td>
<td>Dundas Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mervon Mallett</td>
<td>312 West Ave. Dundas</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Doermann</td>
<td>DUNDAS - CITY</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Tenen</td>
<td>Geiser Development - Faribult</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Brenda Bulman</td>
<td>11525 Canyon City Blvd</td>
<td>Home owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Block</td>
<td>10425 1st Street Timberlane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Silkey</td>
<td>5555 165th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseanne Gathier</td>
<td>6974 110th St. E. Nfld</td>
<td>Home owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Haley</td>
<td>6974 110th St. E. Nfld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stummer</td>
<td>812 St. Olaf NF</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Aabuckle</td>
<td>12350 12th Ct E Nfld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony Davis</td>
<td>1660 College St</td>
<td>NFLD City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis McCarthy</td>
<td>P.O. Box 20, Douglas</td>
<td>DUNDAS CITY ADMIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Nelson</td>
<td>But 7 Dundas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Frazier</td>
<td>5647 123rd St. E Nfld</td>
<td>Home owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Perry</td>
<td>7065 110th St. E Nfld</td>
<td>Home owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyn Kuennen</td>
<td>7606 115th St. E East</td>
<td>Landlord/Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese Josephika</td>
<td>11885 Cabel Ave Dundas</td>
<td>Home owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Zelter</td>
<td>2587 Killersweg Blvd</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Brunkelev</td>
<td>5090 123rd St. E. Nfld</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsey Buckheit</td>
<td>616 Union, Nfld</td>
<td>City Commission candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Brunkelev</td>
<td>12015 Comm. City Blvd, N.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Switzer</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Scholtz</td>
<td>10715 Boucher Rd. Dundas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Shott</td>
<td>5720 E. 15th St.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Information Meeting: October 13, 2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike and Edie Piper</td>
<td>5340 124½ Ct. E NORTHFIELD 55057</td>
<td>Bridgewater Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Suttee</td>
<td>2720 Speedman Ct. Northfield 55057</td>
<td>Dundas Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menard Inc. Att: John Rachetti</td>
<td>100 Schillig Dr Snt Dundas 55019</td>
<td>Menards Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Engle</td>
<td>5500 E. 110th St.</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Hollinger</td>
<td>10220 Dundas Blvd</td>
<td>Dundas 55019 (No Maps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Hunsam</td>
<td>10844 Fairview Ave.</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Henrichen</td>
<td>1866 130th St E</td>
<td>Dundas 55019 (2:46 PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Risberg</td>
<td>5365 104th St. E.</td>
<td>Northfield, MN 55057 (Send Maps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Miller</td>
<td>12335 EATON AVE</td>
<td>Northfield 55057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanine Taylor</td>
<td>801 Railway St. S. Dundas 55019</td>
<td>please send all maps to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Mitchell</td>
<td>11811 Dundas Blvd 55019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon Butter</td>
<td>Rice Co. Steam Yach Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Moroney</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry DeMano</td>
<td>Dundas - 401 Railway St. S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wendwood Association  
Kit O'Brien  
5642 Endwood Trail  
Northfield, MN 55057

Dennis Luebbe  
Engineer  
610 NW 20th Street  
Faribault, MN 55021

Dear Mr. Dennis Luebbe,

We are writing to you as concerned homeowners affected by the CSAH proposal 4B. This proposal would change our entire neighborhood, destroying at least 5 homes and changing the surroundings of the remaining homes. We have a unique neighborhood, with a lovely woods, containing the Yellow Lady Slipper Orchid, and a road that is rarely traveled by anyone but the people that live here. Our children play in the park which is located right in our neighborhood. Our entire neighborhood would be eliminated since large tracts of mature woods and wildlife would be replaced with a highway posting speeds of 45 to 55 miles per hour.

We do realize that no one wants a road to come through their front yard but 4B would effect, not only the people you relocate, but the remaining homes. It is our wish that you look seriously into choosing another plan for the proposed road. It is our hope that you focus on a plan using 115th Street and Highway 1. It seems senseless to preserve land surrounding the city, rather than protecting land that is already developed. A route that dissects the downtown area of Dundas will have a significant impact on the existing homes and businesses that are currently in place. The routes to the south or north have less impact on land that is already developed. We realize it is impossible to make future decisions that will make everyone happy. It is our hope, the facts of the situation will make you realize 4B is not the correct choice.

Lastly, I would encourage you to try to protect what we have, which is homes in which we are raising our children, paying our taxes, go to our jobs and planning our futures. Please reconsider your choices and look to a plan that has the least impact on existing homes, businesses, and a beautiful natural setting.

Sincerely,

Kit O'Brien
You may note your comments on the map or on the back of this page.
October 30, 2006

Rice County CSAH1 Study
Project Advisory Committee

Dear Committee Members:

On 10/26 more than 20 residents of 115th St and Rice County 20 met to review the CSAH1 corridor study concepts. Our review lasted more than 2 1/2 hours. All of the attendees of the meeting have signed this letter, plus we have solicited signatures from our neighbors who were unable to attend.

We the undersigned support a CSAH1 corridor plan which emphasizes the following:

1. Provides for the transportation needs of developments on the southeast side of Northfield, in addition to Dundas, Bridgewater and northeastern Rice County
2. Links I 35 directly to MN 246 and Cty 81
3. Provides direct access to north/south corridors between I 35 and MN 246. Specifically Decker Ave and MN 3
4. Minimizes cost
5. Makes the most effective use of existing roadway
6. Promotes safe travel and makes necessary curves as safe as possible
7. Minimizes impact on housing relocations
8. Preserves protected bluff land
9. When it is necessary to cross farmland in Bridgewater township, the concept follows section lines as much as possible to minimize impact
10. Does not disturb endangered species habitat
11. Opens up scenic areas to greater access

We have reviewed the Corridor Preservation Study objectives, evaluation criteria and the six concepts presented by the Project Advisory Committee.

Concept 5 is the only proposal that sufficiently satisfies the areas above which we feel are important to emphasize and meets the stated objectives and criteria of the committee. As a group we strongly preferred concept 5B because it eliminates some of the dangerous curves currently on county road 1.

We strongly recommend concept 5B for selection by the committee to proceed to the next phase of the project: Preliminary Design & Environmental Review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angie McLennan</td>
<td>5270 115th St. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Klehn</td>
<td>5270 115th St. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Machacek</td>
<td>12037 Cannon City Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucille Machacek</td>
<td>12037 Cannon City Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Chester</td>
<td>11495 Cannon City Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Chester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley J. Hauert</td>
<td>5920 E. 115th St. N. U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart R. Hauert</td>
<td>5720 E. 115th St. N. U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard L. Brownung</td>
<td>5565 115th St. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigrid S. Brownung</td>
<td>5565 115th St. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Brownung</td>
<td>5565 115th St. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom J. Ryan</td>
<td>6626 115th St. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Minna</td>
<td>6626 115th St. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Siegel</td>
<td>5555 115th St. E. N. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald S. Buhman</td>
<td>5555 115th St. E. N. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Buhman</td>
<td>11525 Cannon City Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Buhman</td>
<td>11525 Cannon City Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barbour</td>
<td>205 East St., Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Ogden</td>
<td>205 East St., Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Beekmant</td>
<td>12405 Edwards Way, Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Kevin Johnson</td>
<td>6233 115th St. East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Johnson</td>
<td>6233 115th St. East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Seiler</td>
<td>12359 Cannon City Blvd, Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Seiler</td>
<td>17359 Cannon City Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathi</td>
<td>5750 115th St., MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Muenster</td>
<td>5575 115th St., Northfield, MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Omen</td>
<td>18185 Eaton Ave, Dundas, MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Muenster 952-994-2365</td>
<td>6780-115th St. E, Nfld, MN 55057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar K Wagner</td>
<td>6099 Railway St, Dundas, MN 55019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Muenster</td>
<td>6099 Railway St, Dundas, MN 55019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Muenster Sahl</td>
<td>5730 115th St. E Nfld, MN 55057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Muenster Sahl</td>
<td>5730 115th St. E Nfld, MN 55057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Omen</td>
<td>5710 115th St. E, Northfield, MN 55057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Muenster</td>
<td>5710 115th St. E, Northfield, MN 55057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Muenster</td>
<td>5710 115th St. E, Northfield, MN 55057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Lindo</td>
<td>6035 115th St E Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. S. S. M.</td>
<td>6035 115th St E Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Close</td>
<td>5575 115th St E Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Haan</td>
<td>11910 Cannon City Blvd., Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscus Haan</td>
<td>11916 Cannon City Blvd., Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul S. Z. Feeney</td>
<td>12136 Cannon City Blvd., Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zea D. Feeney</td>
<td>12136 Cannon City Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul L. Wegner</td>
<td>5780 115th St E Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Nelson</td>
<td>200 Hester St. Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Edwardsen</td>
<td>200 Hester St. Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juellia Nelson</td>
<td>12543 Eaton Ave Nfld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12543 Eaton Ave. Nfld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald R. Kolb</td>
<td>11900 Cannon City Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garn Moran</td>
<td>5770 115th St E. Nfld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon J. Ellwood</td>
<td>305 N. 2nd St. Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Josephke</td>
<td>11885 Cabot Ave, Dundas MN 55011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Josephke</td>
<td>11885 Cabot Ave, Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric L. Dilley</td>
<td>Box 53 NFLD MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Kue</td>
<td>12049 Canow City, Westfield MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>12049 Cannon City Blvd, NFLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David J.</td>
<td>12303 Cannon City Blvd, NFLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Stadulis</td>
<td>5121 Lida Dr, NFLD MN 55057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad &amp; Diane Minkle</td>
<td>12345 Cannon City Blvd, NFLD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 30, 2006

Rice County CSAH1 Study
Project Advisory Committee

Dear Committee Members:

We the undersigned support a CSAH1 corridor plan which emphasizes the following:

1. Provides for the transportation needs of developments on the southeast side of Northfield, in addition to Dundas, Bridgewater and northeastern Rice County
2. Links I 35 directly to MN 246 and Cty 81
3. Provides direct access to north/south corridors between I 35 and MN 246. Specifically Decker Ave and MN 3
4. Minimizes cost
5. Makes the most effective use of existing roadway
6. Promotes safe travel and makes necessary curves as safe as possible
7. Minimizes impact on housing relocations
8. Preserves protected bluff land
9. When it is necessary to cross farmland in Bridgewater township, the concept follows section lines as much as possible to minimize impact
10. Does not disturb endangered species habitat
11. Opens up scenic areas to greater access

We have reviewed the Corridor Preservation Study objectives, evaluation criteria and the six concepts presented by the Project Advisory Committee.

Concept 5 is the only proposal that sufficiently satisfies the areas above which we feel are important to emphasize and meets the stated objectives and criteria of the committee.

We strongly recommend concept 5 for selection by the committee to proceed to the next phase of the project: Preliminary Design & Environmental Review.

1. Kevin Kent
2. Carole Beemer
3. Stan J. Helmer
4. Douglas Davis
5. Bill T. Sullivan
6. Charlie Black
7. Karen Montgomery
8. TCMR
Concept 4B - on Co. Rd. #1 - Intersection from Hwy 3 - Impossible -
the road from Hwy 3 - goes through protected area for wildlife,
then through housing area (Endwood - Woodwood Trail) -
then through a virgin maple woods - primary intersection
would be at end of woods. There are hills where intersection
is and would be no room for this.
This would not be an option for Co. Rd. #1 east of Hwy 3.

Sandra Giermundson
5915 110th St. E.
Northfield, MN 55057
(507) 645-4701
Dear Mr. Chromy, and members of the Project Advisory Committee, CSAH1:

After looking at the design concepts for the corridor alignment from Interstate 35 to TH 246, I feel that all the options are detrimental to the growth and benefit of the City of Dundas. In addition, I cannot support any concept that uses East 115th Street as a major route for regional traffic.

**Why 115th Street?** Five of the six concepts use 115th Street to get from Dundas to TH 246. Growth may demand that 115th Street be upgraded in its use, but for no more than local residential use. That way there would be no or little need to change the grade or curve of the current hill. If 115th Street is allowed to be a major thoroughfare, then it will promote the placement of businesses in addition to more residences.

**Is that the direction that Dundas wants to take?**

**Why is the proposed route not even further south of Dundas?** For a major route where 55 mph is desired in the non-urban areas, it makes better sense to go from CSAH 1 to a point directly north of and then dropping down to the north-south part CSAH 8 and then over to 125th Street. (See map.) This would give almost an non-interrupted route between I-35 and TH 246. It has been my experience that folks will drive out of their way on a “fast” longer road, rather than work their way through a shorter in-town route. By the time you get to Cannon City Boulevard, you have already climbed to the higher elevation that seems to be the problem on 115th Street and CSAH 1 east of Dundas. This alternate proposal would also feed into CSAH 20 at the top of the hill, allowing for an orderly intersection for roads that connect I-35 and TH 246, going east-west and that connect Northfield and Faribault, going north-south. It would incorporate 125th Street and the old Lockerby Territorial Road. Or, the corridor could go in an almost straight east-west line from I-35 by using the east-west portion of CSAH 8, part of the north-south portion of CSAH 8 and then over to 125th Street clear to TH-246. (See map.)

The following additional comments are in order from least preferred to almost preferred concepts proposed by the The Rice County Transportation Plan.

- **Concept 6** would add more traffic to the nightmare that is otherwise known as Highway 3.
- **Concept 4** is a major roadway that cuts Dundas in half. Such a split divides a town both physically and psychologically.
- **Concept 2** has two local connectors that appear to make a jog onto Hwy. 3. (See Concept 6 above.) Reasons for the rest of the connectors on the east side of Hwy. 3 are unclear.
- **Concept 3** is the most direct route proposed and makes the most of existing roadways. However, it cuts up Dundas, albeit not through the center of the city.
- **Concept 1A** (this one is more personal) clips a corner of a family apple orchard, along with its progenitor hundred-year apple tree; and **Concept 1B** cuts the small family farm acreage in half across a major roadway.
- **Concept 5** makes partial use of CSAH 1 on the west and much of CSAH 1 on the east side of Dundas. The proposed route appears to divide the currently built up areas of Northfield and Dundas. Dividing between two cities would not be as detrimental as dividing up one city. These towns may even welcome it.

In summary, if ever there is a time to “tear it down and start all over again” it is at the beginning of a project and not the end.

Yet, given the unlikelihood that further options will be provided to the public, I recommend **Concept 5**.

I wish you well in the difficult process of sorting out all the options.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Grace Silkey
P.O. Box 53, Northfield, Mn, 55057
Dear Sirs:

After reviewing the proposed rerouting of Rice County #1, I would like to offer an alternative to the proposed rerouting - Move the I-35 exchange from Rice County #1 to Rice County #8 (2 miles south). I believe that this would have the following advantages:

- There would be a straight road from I-35 to Hwy 3.
- Rice County #8 is 3-4 miles north of the Faribault Industrial Park. This new exchange could also serve the northern part of Faribault.
- I would speculate that the cost of rebuilding Rice County #8 to handle heavy trucks would be much less than rebuilding and rerouting Rice County #1, because of the massive amount of fill needed for the heavy wet soil series along Rice County #1.
- If 115th Street were to be rebuilt, as in one of the proposed plans, there would be a good connection from I-35 to Hwy 246.

Sincerely,

Eugene Werner

cc: Jim Brown, Rice County Commissioner
    Rice County Highway Department
Dear Mr. Chris Chromy,

I was unable to attend the town meeting on Thursday 10-12-06 and Friday 10-13-06. I reviewed the Internet draft study information at http://www.co.rice.mn.us/highway/CSAH1.php. I feel it would be kindest and safer for our residents and children to have the road/traffic directed away from town such as in proposal #6.

Thank you,

Nicholas J Wiese, DDS
307 Grindstone Ln
Dundas, MN 55019
nwiese@rconnect.com
Why Wait? Move to EarthLink.
Dear Mr. Chromy, and members of the Project Advisory Committee, CSAH1:

After looking at the design concepts for the corridor alignment from Interstate 35 to TH 246, I feel that all the options are detrimental to the growth and benefit of the City of Dundas. In addition, I cannot support any concept that uses East 115th Street as a major route for regional traffic.

**Why 115th Street?** Five of the six concepts use 115th Street to get from Dundas to TH 246. Growth may demand that 115th Street be upgraded in its use, but for no more than local residential use. That way there would be no or little need to change the grade or curve of the current hill. If 115th Street is allowed to be a major thoroughfare, then it will promote the placement of businesses in addition to more residences.

**Is that the direction that Dundas wants to take?**

**Why is the proposed route not even further south of Dundas?** For a major route where 55 mph is desired in the non-urban areas, it makes better sense to go from CSAH 1 to a point directly north of and then dropping down to the north-south part CSAH 8 and then over to 125th Street. (See map.) This would give almost an non-interrupted route between I-35 and TH 246. It has been my experience that folks will drive out of their way on a “fast” longer road, rather than work their way through a shorter in-town route. By the time you get to Cannon City Boulevard, you have already climbed to the higher elevation that seems to be the problem on 115th Street and CSAH 1 east of Dundas. This alternate proposal would also feed into CSAH 20 at the top of the hill, allowing for an orderly intersection for roads that connect I-35 and TH 246, going east-west and that connect Northfield and Faribault, going north-south. It would incorporate 125th Street and the old Lockerby Territorial Road. Or, the corridor could go in an almost straight east-west line from I-35 by using the east-west portion of CSAH 8, part of the north-south portion of CSAH 8 and then over to 125th Street clear to TH-246. (see map.)

The following additional comments are in order from least preferred to almost preferred concepts proposed by the Rice County Transportation Plan.

- **Concept 6** would add more traffic to the nightmare that is otherwise known as Highway 3.
- **Concept 4** is a major roadway that cuts Dundas in half. Such a split divides a town both physically and psychologically.
- **Concept 2** has two local connectors that appear to make a jog onto Hwy. 3. (See Concept 6 above.) Reasons for the rest of the connectors on the east side of Hwy. 3 are unclear.
- **Concept 3** is the most direct route proposed and makes the most of existing roadways. However, it cuts up Dundas, albeit not through the center of the city.
- **Concept 1A** (this one is more personal) clips a corner of a family apple orchard, along with its progenitor hundred-year apple tree; and **Concept 1B** cuts the small family farm acreage in half across a major roadway.
- **Concept 5** makes partial use of CSAH 1 on the west and much of CSAH 1 on the east side of Dundas. The proposed route appears to divide the currently built up areas of Northfield and Dundas. Dividing between two cities would not be as detrimental as dividing up one city. These towns may even welcome it.

In summary, if ever there is a time to “tear it down and start all over again” it is at the beginning of a project and not the end.

Yet, given the unlikelihood that further options will be provided to the public, I recommend **Concept 5**. I wish you well in the difficult process of sorting out all the options.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Grace Silkey
P.O. Box 53, Northfield, Mn 55057
Suggested alternate CSAH1 route.

The following map is adapted from Map Document: (H:\RICO\T4121499\Arqgis\RICO County Growth County 11x17.mxd) 10/26/2005 -- 1:36:00 PM as provide in the Rice County Transportation Plan, 2025 by Bolton & Menk, Inc.
From: Chip DeMann [cdemann@charter.net]
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2006 11:18 PM
To: Dennis Luebbe; Chris Chromy; Gary Ebling; Heidi Hamilton; Randy Bradt; Chris Moates; Tom McMahon; Mike Groth
Subject: Comments on proposal for alignment of CSAH 1

CSAH 1 Corridor Preservation Study
Project Advisory Committee

To Whom It May Concern:

The existing County Road 1 is preferable to every option presented and being considered for realignment of County Road 1.

The corridor objectives as stated are not met, and in every case of the alternatives, most of the objectives are violated. In January of 2005, I submitted written comments regarding a proposed alignment that is now referred to as “Concept 2.” A copy of my letter, dated January 17, 2005 is attached. That letter states how “Concept 2” will not meet the corridor objectives stated in the study presentation, even though it was written before the objectives were publicly shared. To wit:

The proposed corridor is fiscally irresponsible. The acquisition of right-away through 10 existing property owners west of Highway 3, the requirement of grade differentiation on a new railroad crossing, the grade differentiation to get down to the river, the river bridge, the grade differentiation to use 115th street and cut down the bluff, all make this an impractical and prohibitively expensive alternative.

The proposed corridor fails to meet the long-term local land use and infrastructure needs of Dundas, since it destroys a large portion of the west and south parts of the city, and violates current zoning and agreements made by the city for agriculture preservation.

The proposed corridor makes a major impact to farm operations, as acquisition of additional right of way west of County 8 will disrupt and divide farms, as well as violating an agreement for an agriculture preservation district on the Albers farms in the city of Dundas.

The proposed corridor will have a major impact on wetland, floodplain, river crossing and requires major grade changes that destroy natural features of the land, both west of the Cannon River and on the bluff for existing 115th Street.

The proposed corridor will have a major impact on the natural heritage and to endangered species, including nesting bald eagles on the DeMann farm.

Unfortunately, it appears that each of the proposals is impractical both from a fiscal and environmental perspective. It appears that the study group did not attempt to find the best alternative, rather they chose routes that met a pre-determined goal that was not revealed to the public, since none of the choices meet the goals that were publicly stated.

Currently, the best choice for the route of County Road 1 to meet existing needs is to use the existing road. The best choice for future transportation needs is to use existing right of way rather than attempting to acquire additional right of way through existing farms, wetlands, floodplain or bridging the river. In addition, it is impractical and cost prohibitive to attempt to align with existing 115th Street. The bluff is a natural barrier and an environmental asset to the community. The rush to plan the destruction of the bluff in order to realign County Road 1 is cost prohibitive and environmentally destructive.
Sincerely,
Chip DeMann
311 Railway Street South, Box 125
Dundas, MN  55019

Dennis Luebbe, P.E.  dluebbe@co.rice.mn.us
Chris Chromy, P.E., P.T.O.E.  chrisch@bolton-menk.com
Gary Ebeling, Supervisor  gebling@rconnect.com
Heidi Hamilton, P.E.  heidi.hamilton@ci.northfield.mn.us
Randy Bradt  Randy.Bradt@dnr.state.mn.us
Chris Moates  chris.moates@dot.state.mn.us
Tom McMahon, P.E.  ccst@frontiernet.net
Mike Groth, Supervisor  rmg612@11net

Letter sent previously to Rice County Board:

January 17, 2005

To Whom It May Concern:

I am unable to attend the January 19th open house at the Bridgewater Town Hall regarding transportation planning for Rice County. Following are some comments regarding the proposed realignment of County Road 1.

1. The proposed rerouting heads southeast from the existing route at about the western Dundas city limits, bisecting ten properties before connecting with 115th Street on the southeast side of Dundas, with no direct benefit to the any of these properties.

2. The first property bisected by this reroute belongs to the Albers family. The City of Dundas recently entered into an agreement with the Albers not to develop their property and to protect the agricultural use of this land. This agreement was entered into in good faith by the parties involved. Condemning a road across this land is in violation of that agreement.

3. The proposed re-route would require a new railroad crossing, requiring grade separation which entails the expense of the additional land needed for the approaches in order to bridge over the rail.

4. The elevation drops steeply east of CSAH 8, causing expensive grading and approach, again requiring more right-of-way than would be needed for less drastic elevation changes.

5. There is a wetland some distance west of the river, requiring mitigation and bridging.

6. The bridging of the Cannon River, designated a wild and scenic river, is expensive and unnecessary as there are a number of alternative locations for the re-routing.

7. East of the river there are additional floodplain and wetlands up to Hwy 3.

10/30/2006
8. The intersection of the re-routed County Road 1 would be congested with Hwy 3, CSAH 20, Eaton Ave and 115th Street.

9. The proposed rerouting would then follow up 115th Street, resulting in major engineering issues due to the steep grade change on Larkin's Hill.

10. The proposed rerouting causes major issues with the realignment of CSAH 22 (Falk Trail), County Road 82, County Road 81, and Hwy 246. The realignment of these roads with the existing County Road 1 is a current issue and unfunded.

These issues result in a project that would be cost prohibitive and a waste of taxpayer money since practical, less costly alternatives are available. It would also take additional property from the tax roles when there are current right-of-ways that can be used for the rerouting and result in a more practical project.

One alternative is south on Cabot Avenue to 118th Street, then east to CSAH 8 and then follow the abandoned township road to Highway 3. This uses existing right-of-way and an existing railroad crossing and eliminates wetland, floodplain and Wild & Scenic River crossings. It also moves the traffic away from Dundas, making substantive changes to the traffic load. It also reduces the congestion at the Hwy 3 intersection by moving the County Road 1 intersection south.

This alternative does not address the grade issues with 115th Street and the issues with the Hwy 246 intersections. However, additional study should result in practical alternatives to the current proposal.

Sincerely,

Chip DeMann
311 Railway Street South, Box 125
Dundas, MN 55019

10/30/2006
Dear Mr. Chromy,

I am writing to voice my concern and opposition to the proposed highway that would destroy my home.

The proposed 4A and 4B routing would destroy approximately 20 to 25 existing homes. Also the proposals would destroy the aesthetic values of the bluffs to the east of highway 3. Proposals 4A and 4B seem to be the least desirable of all the proposals put forward. The proposals would also destroy some of the last wooded areas in close vicinity to Northfield and Dundas as well as the natural home of the Yellow Lady Slipper, an endangered species.

Any new construction of an east-west corridor should have the least impact possible on an existing development. This point alone should prohibit consideration of proposal 4A and 4B and favor the other proposals to the north or south of proposal 4A or 4B. Existing right of ways are already established for 4 lane highway along 110th street and 115th street. Also attempting to use the existing bridge in Dundas which is obviously not suitable for a 4 lane highway and would have to be replaced at a cost equal to or exceeding the cost of a new bridge needed for other proposals. It is also clear that with the growth in the area under consideration for the east-west corridor, a new bridge would be needed by the time the new corridor would become a reality.

Finally, it seems unnecessary to split the town of Dundas into 2 areas. Again this is easily avoided by routes to the north or south of Dundas. This fact alone should eliminate proposal 4A and 4B. I and my neighbors are very concerned about the corridor along proposal 4A and 4B.

We have a personal interest and need to be informed immediately of any future considerations by anyone or any planning commission or any government agencies considering the future east-west corridor. Please add me to any phone list, e-mail list or mail list that would notify me of any meetings or comment period concerning the east-west corridor.

I am looking forward to closely following the planning of the east-west corridor.

Thank You

Susan K. Johnson
Arlo J. Johnson

Phone: 507-663-0292

10/30/2006
E-Mail stombeall@aol.com

Address: 5630 Endwood Trail
Northfield, MN. 55057
RE: Re-Routing Highway 1

"The road will get used." This seems to be one of the primary requirements for the new Hwy 1. The majority of the traffic from and through the Dundas/Northfield area is headed in a northbound direction. As Northfield grows further to the east and south people will seek out a route to I35. Currently, most people are heading west on 19 to get to I35. If we lived in the southern part of Northfield, such as the Spring Creek development, we would not be inclined to drive south in order to go North, i.e. to the current 115th street (as many of the concepts call for) Hwy 19 would be much more desirable from that aspect. Therefore, we believe that Planning Alignment Concept 5 makes the most sense based on the primary requirement that "the road will get used". We also believe it makes sense as a quicker route to the Northfield Hospital for people or ambulances coming from Southern or Southeastern Northfield.

Greg and Kristin Nesseth
5710 115th St E
Northfield, MN 55057
October 29, 2006

Dear Corridor Study Committee Members:

I am writing to provide my comments on the CSAH1 corridor study. As a current resident of Northfield, and a former resident on Timberlane Dr., I strongly urge you to select concept 5 for the next phase of the project.

Traffic in Northfield has become congested due to limited river crossings and access along highway 19 to Interstate 35. Northfield has struggled for a number of years with the development of a Jefferson Rd. crossing site. Concept 5, with a river crossing roughly along the city boundaries, seems like an excellent solution and would best serve the needs of the citizens of Northfield, Dundas and Rice County.

It is readily apparent when visiting K-Mart and Menard's, that traffic on CSAH1 has steadily increased over the past several years, compared with when I lived on Timberlane Dr. about ten years ago. Conversations with friends indicate that a significant amount of this additional traffic comes from new developments on the south side of Northfield and is starting to include residents from the new Bridgewater Heights development. Many of these residents require easy access to interstate 35 to facilitate their commute to the twin cities.

Other plans that route CSAH1 through Dundas or to the south of Dundas do not really make sense. The routes through Dundas unnecessarily displace too many homes. The routes south of Dundas may be necessary years in the future, but are located too far to the south to serve current and near-term developments.

Concept 5 with the direct access it provides from Interstate 35 all the way through to highway 246 and Rice county road 81 best serves the quickly growing developments on the SE side of Northfield.

Thank you for considering my input.

Sincerely,

Edward A. Weck

Edward A. Weck
Dear Mr. Luebbe and Mr. Chromy,

We are Rice County residents living at 804 St. Olaf Ave in Northfield. We have become aware of the six proposals being considered for an east-west corridor in northeast Rice County and have studied the details on your website. We have concluded that the county's taxpayers and environment would be best served by your supporting Concept 5.

We feel strongly that Concept 5 is the most safe and the most efficient option available, affording the best traffic flow. Concept 5 is also the least expensive, the least invasive, and the most environmentally sound.

Through adoption of Concept 5, unsafe roads that the public already use to go east/west could be made safer. Expensive grade shifts in roads could be avoided. Congestion on Highway 3 could also be avoided, and a surviving remnant of the Big Woods and bluffland, which is a large wildlife habitat, would not be disrupted.

We think that Concept 5 is the most cost effective and environmentally sound way of providing our county with the new east/west road it needs. We hope you both will give your support to Concept 5.

Thank you, Pamela Percy and Roger Jackson
Dear Mr. Chromy,

As a homeowner for 23 years in Wendwood, I agree 100% with the thoughts and suggestions expressed by the current President of our Association's letter to you in regard to the CSAH Proposal 4B. We would appreciate your serious consideration and thoughts to help us preserve our existing neighborhood. Thank you very much for your time!

Bebe Diehl
5540 Endwood Trail
Northfield, MN 55057
The purpose of this letter is to convince you to eliminate concept 4B from further consideration.

Concept 4B, if approved, would destroy a fragile system of fresh water springs, streams and ravines which serves as a wildlife corridor for turkey, deer, and fox. Many ephemerals and native orchids thrive in this setting as well. As we look at long range plans for future development, we need to consider the inherent value of open spaces, which provide habitat for such wild animals and plants. It would be a huge loss to all to destroy this wildlife corridor in order to build a highway.

Concept 4B, if approved, would destroy Wendwood. The Wendwood residential community preserves large open spaces, maintains its own park and well. Its residents contribute significantly to our local society. To break up this neighborhood in order to build a highway just does not make sense.

Please eliminate concept 4B from further consideration!

Thank you,

Tim and Carolyn Hogan
5680 Endwood Trl
Dear CSAH1 Corridor Study Committee:

We are writing to provide our opinions on the concepts you have presented for Rice County Road 1. We do appreciate the public meetings you have held, as well as the posting of the plan details on your website. After reviewing those plans on the internet, we would like to add our support to concept 5 for inclusion in the next phase of the study.

Of all the plans, only concept 5 serves Bridgewater, Dundas and Northfield with a safe east-west corridor that connects highway 246 to interstate 35. It is also the only plan that avoids impacting the Big Woods bluffs on the east edge of Dundas.

Please strongly consider our support for concept 5.

Sincerely,
Susan and Gary Singer
14910 Dixon Trail
Northfield, MN 55057
Dear Corridor PAC members:

We are writing to comment on the CSAH1 corridor study concepts. We strongly support concept 5B or 5C.

Our home is on the west side of I 35 and we use county road 1 as our main access to Northfield. Concepts 5B and 5C eliminate the two sets of dangerous curves closest to Dundas.

Concepts 5B and 5C provide easy access to shopping along hwy 3 and the Northfield schools for us and our neighbors in Forest Township. It also gives better access to Decker Avenue and the new Northfield hospital.

The routes (3 and 4) which go through Dundas will displace more homes than necessary. The more southerly routes (1 and 2) disturb too much farmland in Bridgewater township and route us away from hwy 3 shopping and the schools.

Please consider concepts 5B and/or 5C for selection for the next phase of your project.

Sincerely,

Diane and Chuck Von Ruden
9975 Bagley Ave
Northfield, MN 55057

Chuck and Diane Von Ruden
cdvrr@rconnect.com
You may note your comments on the map or on the back of this page.
After reviewing the maps for the proposed east-west corridor, we felt compelled to send in our comments. If one of the "main objectives" of creating a corridor is to achieve a direct, continuous route between I-35 and TH216 that is an "attractive" alternative to TH19 between Northfield and I-35, then the concept that people will take a more southerly route will certainly not meet this objective. It makes no sense to undertake an expensive project of this magnitude if it will not properly serve its intended purpose.

Thank you for considering our opinion.

(Gary & Maureen Ubjejiak)
Dundas
(507) 645-4152
11885 Cabot Ave
Dundas, MN 55019
You may note your comments on the map or on the back of this page.

Public Information Meeting
I was at one of your presentations at Bridgewater Town Hall and would favor a route that would utilize the existing roads. My first choice would be county road No. 7 from 24th west to highway 3. From there around the north side of Dundas and then link up with No. 1 on the west side of town.

My second choice would be to use 115th street and not loop around south of town. From the west No. 1 would go straight across the river and link up with 115th by John Chester.

Larry Rock
10425 First Timberlane Dr
Northfield, MN 55057
My name is Tom Trout and I reside at 5515 Endwood Trail. We built our house about 15 years ago and have watched the area develop around us. I am concerned about the possible widening of cty rd 1 for several reasons. First and foremost is safety. We have 4 children that enjoy playing in our backyard and over the course of time have had several vehicles come off cty rd 1 into our property. One was a large truck that went halfway through our yard. Fortunately no one was outside when it happened but it went through right where our playset is. Lowering the speed limit has helped to certain degree but most vehicles do not pay attention to the posted limit. Increasing the volume of traffic would not only increase the likelihood of more accidents but also move that traffic much closer to our house due to the widening of the road. Everyone who I have talked to that lives along this road agrees that the road is much too hilly and curvy to safely accommodate a high volume of traffic, especially large trucks that have little or no regard for speed limits.

Moving the road closer to the house would not only devalue the property (which would not ever be reflected in lowering taxes) but it would make selling and moving a very difficult and expensive proposition.

We love our neighborhood and expect change to occur but know that safety has to first and foremost when it comes to progress.

Tom Trout ccc@ll.net
To:  Dennis Luebbe, Rice County Engineer  
     Chris Chromy Project Manager  
     Gary Ebling Bridgewater Supervisor  
     Heidi Hamilton, Northfield City Engineer  
     Randy Bradt, MN Dept of Natural Resources  
     Chris Moates, MN Dept of Transportation  
     Tom McMahon Dundas City Engineer  
     Mike Groth, Northfield Supervisor

From:  William Bruihler & Ruth Anne Rasmusson  
       5090 123rd Street East  
       Northfield, MN  55057

Date:  October 27, 2006

Re:  Landowner Comments on CSAH1 Corridor Preservation Study

We attended the recent public information meeting about the CSAH1 Corridor Preservation Study. We are writing now to express our opinions about the proposed options.

We have been residents and owners of our home in Bridgewater Township since October 2003. We purchased this property due to our appreciation of open spaces, woodlands, and nature. Since moving here we have observed wild turkeys, fox, coyotes, deer, hawks, a wide variety of songbirds, owls, and bald eagles all within a mile radius of our home. We have even seen two female eagles feeding in the fields along Eaton Avenue. We are concerned about the environmental impact that a new highway may have upon this area.

From our understanding of the issues and our perception as property owners, we believe that options 4 and 5 are most desirable. We believe that options 1, 2, 3, and 6 are least desirable.

We certainly understand that the final decision about the corridor placement must balance safety, construction costs, environmental impacts, and many other concerns. We thank your for your efforts to balance these concerns as you plan ahead for the anticipated population growth. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like further clarification about our opinions on this matter.
TO.

DENNIS LUEBBE. RICE COUNTY ENGINEER.
CHRIS CHROMY. BOLTON & MENK PROJ. ENGINEER.
GARY EBLING. BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR.
HEIDI HAMILTON. NORTHFIELD CITY ENGINEER.
RANDY BRADT. MN. DEPT. NATURAL RESOURCES.
CHRIS MOATES. MN. DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION.
TOM MCMAHON. DUNDAH CITY ENGINEER.
MIKE GROTH. NORTHFIELD TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR.

THIS NOTE'S PURPOSE IS TO INFORM ALL INVOLVED PARTIES THAT CSAH 1 CORRIDOR CONCEPT 5C WOULD DISSECT AND DEVIDE A 15 YEAR OLD 66 ACRE REINVEST IN MINNESOTA PERPETUAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT AND CONNECTED 11 ACRE CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM EASEMENT. THESE 77 ACRES CONTAIN 6 CREATED WATER IMPOUNDMENTS, NATIVE PRAIRIE GRASS AND WILDFLOWER SPECIES, AND SEVERAL THOUSANDS OF PLANTED AND NATURALLY PRODUCED CONIFERS AND HARDWOODS. THESE CONSERVATION EASEMENTS CONNECT AND COMPLETE A HABITAT CORRIDOR THAT EXTENDS APROX 3.5 MILES WHICH INCLUDES OLD GROWTH HARDWOODS AND THE DNR DESIGNATED BROOK/TROUT STREAM, FORMERLY KNOWN AS RICE CREEK OR DITCH #22 OR MOST RECENTLY CALLED SPRING BROOK. THIS TROUT STREAM EMPTIES INTO THE CANNON RIVER NEXT TO THE BONITA RAY FARM. THE EASEMENT AREAS MENTIONED ARE LOCATED IN SECTION #9. IF CONSTRUCTED AS CONCEIVED, CONCEPT #5C WOULD PRODUCE THE MOST NON REVERSABLE ECOLOGICAL AND HABITAT DAMAGE OF ALL CONCEPTS COMBINED.

MICHAEL J. DAILY 507-650-6936
BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP RESIDENT.
October 25, 2006

Chris Chromy
Project Manager - Bolton & Menk, Inc.
12224 Nicollet Ave.
Burnsville, MN 55337

Dear Mr. Chromy,

I have been reviewing the materials relating to the "County Highway 1 Corridor Preservation Study for Northfield/Dundas Area", and I support the concept that the right of way for any major traffic artery needs to be set in place so future development planning can be incorporated properly. However, I was rudely surprised about how some proposals conform with the stated goals of the study.

My specific concern is with plan 4A/B which proposes to build a roadway through my neighborhood on Endwood Trail. By your own study matrix, this plan seems to have several fatal drawbacks: grade, traffic safety, number of curves, integration into existing road system, and has the highest number of relocation's. Aside from these factors, there are other issues with this and other plans that are not reflected in the matrix:

- The existing bridge(s) that are to be incorporated into these plans will not be sufficient to support high traffic, bridge widening or rebuild would be required in the future, which negates any budgetary advantage of using existing bridges.
- This route also uses existing railroad crossings, and would require expensive rework to be adequate to future traffic, again negating the potential budget savings.
- This route goes straight through the city of Dundas, where a busy highway would have a severe negative impact on existing homes and businesses.
- The cost of the destruction of existing homes and businesses, the loss of property value to those residents who are just beyond the right of way, and the cost of the "relocations" themselves do not seem to be accounted for in the total budget analysis. If you multiply the number of re-locations (25) by an average cost of $400K per. in today's dollars (and I'm probably being very conservative), I get at least $10M for the re-locations alone. This would add 40% to the projected roadway cost, making this plan also fiscally irresponsible.
- The inevitable further conversion of surrounding farmland into commercial and residential development, would funnel all future traffic into this already narrow traffic corridor.
- The proposed route is in direct conflict with the local planning commission's desire to preserve the forest and bluff in that location.
- There is no existing right of way on the part of the route that would pass through my neighborhood, or any expectation that a road would be needed here.
No one wants a highway through their property. However, I believe that the highway right of way should be planned around existing development, so that future expansion of the city would allow traffic to be able to use existing road systems along with the new roadway. While no plan will satisfy everyone, I feel that any highway expansion plans that destroy existing homes and businesses, in favor of development that does not yet exist, or to spare farmland that is destined to be developed eventually anyway, is short-sighted and counterproductive.

Having lived in big cities in other states most of my life, I may appreciate more than lifelong local residents the advantages and ambiance of the "small town" and rural setting, which seems to be eroding here at a high rate. The neighborhood I live in was established years ago, well planned with specific attention to home lot spacing and setting, and as such commands a higher than average home value now. As such, we pay a disproportionate share of property taxes, considering the services we use, and I don't understand why we should have to pay the price in loss of our homes, ambiance, and value, to benefit the plans of wealthy developers, who are chiefly responsible for accelerating these road requirements, and have yet to pay for alleviating this problem.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Douglas Baker
Kiyoko Morris
You may note your comments on the map or on the back of this page.
Written Comments:

Note: Shaded area on map is Silkey Gardens.
Note: “A” marks location of existing 100+ year old apple tree.

Corridor options 1A and 1B would effectively put us out of business. Running a small fruit farm divided by a major thoroughfare would be too cumbersome and too dangerous. For this reason we would hope the county could find another route to use for this highway.

Of the other options, any that include coming up the hill on the west end of 115th Street at a significantly shallower grade than present would also require some kind of frontage road to get to existing houses on the west end of 115th at the top of the hill.

I suggest an alignment that does not use 115th Street as part of the corridor and allows it to be upgraded but not with the constraint of a significant grade change. To this end I would suggest any of the Concept 5 options as they, at least on the east side of the river, utilize the existing County Road 1 alignment. And would take the fewest number of homes.

Finally I feel it should be up to the cities to bear the brunt of any disruptions or dislocations that the future construction of this highway would bring as it is primarily the cities and their residents that benefit from it’s use.

Thank You for reading my comments.

12109 Canon City Blvd

RECEIVED
OCT 24 2006
BOLTON & MENK, INC
BURNNSVILLE, MN
October 30, 2006

Dear Corridor Committee Members

As residents of Northfield, we are writing to express our thoughts on the proposed Highway 1 corridor. We have discussed the proposed plans with other members of the community and feel that plan 5 is the best option. We believe that it is in the best interest of everyone to use existing roads as much as possible.

First, by using existing roads, the project will not only cost less for tax payers, but will also be more valuable to us as citizens of Northfield. Plan 5 is the only one that we feel would sufficiently reduce the traffic in Northfield. It has steadily been increasing for years and is now a problem. In addition, by using existing roads, we can help to preserve the valuable nature that surrounds Northfield and Dundas. Using the plan, which not only saves us money and is the most beneficial to our current traffic problem, but also protects the wildlife of the area, seems like the clear choice.

In addition, as farmers of the area, we would like to see the effect on farmland reduced as much as possible. Plan 5 uses both existing roads and section lines. Both of these help to ease the burden on our farming community by interrupting fields as little as possible. Taking into account the farms of the area is vital to the future of Rice County.

Thank you for your time.

David and Susan Hagan
1221 Woodland Trail
Northfield, MN
Dear Committee,

I wanted to give my opinion on the issue of the Highway 1 corridor. I live in the city of Northfield, but I feel that the decision will have an impact on me. I have looked over the plans and talked to family members in the area and I think that plan 5a b or c would be the best option.

I lived in Nerstrand and I know how important the Big Woods are to this area. I think it would be sad to see more of them cut down when they can be saved by using existing roads. It would be a great thing for Northfield and Dundas to have Big Woods in the area and it seems like a terrible idea to harm them when we can use roads that are already there. This makes plan 5 the best choice in my mind. Also I think that our safety is important. I would like to see the Highway 1 corridor reduce the traffic in Northfield. The traffic in Northfield is more than it can handle and Highway 1 could help with that, if it is not built too far south. I want Northfield to be a safe place to walk or ride a bike and I don’t think it will be soon, if the traffic issue is not addressed. Thank you for listening to my opinions.

Sincerely

[Signature]

David Johnson

811 College St.

Northfield MN, 55057
You may note your comments on the map or on the back of this page.
If the choice of Hwy 1 runs along 115th St, (Concepts 1 through 4) the road will be lowered to a level that would be consistent with the level of 115th St. by the new development. If this were to occur the access drives, which each handle the traffic from a number of residences, would access the highway by coming downhill through embankments like those presently on the South side of the reconstructed 115th St. by the new development. I believe that this will pose a major safety hazard for those people traveling along this stretch of road and the people who have to enter and exit the drives. As more residences are constructed, this hazard will be aggravated. People who enter or exit the drives will be blinded by both the embankments and the curves.

A minor irritant that would be caused by lowering the road would be that the road would fill with snow. There would be more funds needed to plow the snow. This snow will aggravate the hazards of the access points and curves on the road.

Dick Greuning
5565 115th St. E.
To: CSAH I Corridor Project Advisory Committee

From: Michael and Mary Graff- Land owners –Corner of Co. 1 & Cabot

We have reviewed all of the options for the east/west corridor proposed. We feel the best corridor plan is 5C. See the following reasons

A. Less Project Cost
B. More travel effective for city of Dundas & Northfield. Other routes take it too far south and most people would continue to use the existing Co. 1.
C. This plan would eliminate the dangerous curves west of Dundas by Cabot Ave.
D. Less Acres of farmland impacted. We need to preserve our better farmland for food for our future generations.
E. Least acres of right of way to take.
F. Uses more flood plains than rich farmland.
G. No new bridges or railroad crossing.

Also note: Plans 1 B & 6 A

The Graff Family Partnership acres are tiled. If the road would sever the farm, the whole farm would have to be retiled. Adding more cost to these plans.
Dear Project Committee,
As a resident of Northfield, I am writing to express my concern about the Highway 1 corridor. I have looked over the maps and have strong feeling about the plans.

First of all, I would like to see the congestion on Highway 19 impacted. I feel this safety issue can only be resolved with a placement of Highway 1, as far north as possible. I simply do not see the Northfield residents choosing a route farther south. They will continue to use 19, therefore, plan 5 (a, b, or c) is the best choice.

I also feel the plans that impact the bluff lands in the area of Highway 20 are a mistake. The beauty and value of that piece of the Big Woods can not be replaced. Using this land for parkland and open space makes much more sense. I could easily see the existing bike path linking up to the paths that would run through the woods. Please consider a corridor from the 5(a, b, or c) concept.

Thank you,

Mary Weck
620 Woodley St. E.
Northfield, MN
October 30, 2006

Dear Corridor PAC Members:

We are writing to give you feedback on the county road 1 corridor study. We feel that plan 5 makes the most sense.

As residents of Dundas we have seen traffic on county road 1 increase steadily over the past several years. By talking with friends we know that a significant amount of this traffic comes from new developments on the south side of Northfield and is starting to include residents from the new Bridgewater Heights development. Many of these residents need to get to interstate 35 for their commute to the twin cities.

Other plans that either go through Dundas or to the south of Dundas don’t make sense to us. The routes through Dundas unnecessarily displace too many homes. The routes south of Dundas are too far south to serve current and near future developments.

Please give strong consideration to concept 5 for the next phase of your project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ann and Bob Gregory-Bjorklund
205 Railway St S
Dundas, MN 55019
October 30, 2006

Dennis Luebbe  
Rice County Engineer  
610 20th Street Northwest  
Faribault, Minnesota 55021

Commissioner Jim Brown  
Rice County Government Center  
320 Third Street Northwest  
Faribault, Minnesota 55021

Commissioner Milt Plaisance  
Rice County Government Center  
320 Third Street Northwest  
Faribault, Minnesota 55021

RE: CSAH No. 1 Highway Study

Gentlemen:

My neighbors and I living on Endwood Trail have studied the County State Aid Highway No. 1 designs and understand proposal 4B would relocate a main corridor through Endwood Trail and into the City of Dundas. I am writing to ask that you consider the negative consequences of that choice.

From a human standpoint installing a highway through a very quiet residential neighborhood, which has existed for many years, is unfair to the people living there. Depending on the exact location of this alternative potentially it would require removal of half of the houses in that neighborhood. I also understand this same proposal would then travel through the City of Dundas and would require elimination of a very large number of houses in that City. Given the open space available to some of the alternatives we request that you consider those other options.

From an ecological standpoint this choices appears to be the poorest alternative. It would require the elimination of a large part of the one of the few mature wooded areas around Dundas or Northfield. The County has attempted to preserve and expand wooded corridor areas and this
proposal would eliminate that corridor and the wildlife that use it. The woods is home to owls, deer, and many other forms of wildlife, all of which would be displaced by implementation of the route described as 4B. The terrain would necessitate a great deal of filling through the Endwood neighborhood and would then cut through the bluff in approaching Highway 3. That hillside is an attractive area. This route will not be aesthetically pleasing to anyone using Highway 3.

Less environmentally damaging and less expensive alternatives exist. We urge the County to consider preserving neighborhoods that people take pride in and in preserving the limited amount of woodland that exists in the County.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

GARY M. PETERSON

GMP/kk
Personal acknowledgment to the enclosed letter that was written by Alan Huneven, Jr., attorney at law, on October 29, 2006.

Re: CSP 1 corridor preservation study
   (Budweir Avenue to TH 244 in Henn County)

   Comments

Dear Mr. Chromy and members of the project advisory committee:

We love our home and its setting of incomparable beauty. We have
ourselves on our home, our trees composed of our ability to protect our home, our
unique qualities that are centuries old and many varieties of flora and fauna, and our
unique stuff that adds a great and special beauty to both our property and to all of the properties around us.

With the assistance of legal counsel, we shall fight any plan that threatens our home, our stuff, our tree that we have nurtured and cultivated for more than three
decades.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

Alice Guber

5555 E. 115th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55417

October 30, 2006

RECEIVED
OCT 30 2006
BOLTON & MENK, INC
BURNSVILLE, MN
October 29, 2006

Chris Chromy, P.E.
Bolton & Menk, Inc.
12224 Nicollet Avenue
Burnsville, Minnesota  55337

Re:  CSAH 1 Corridor Preservation Study (Baldwin Avenue to TH 246 in Rice County) – Comments

FOR THE COMMITTEE:

Summary:  These comments will demonstrate (1) that, based on staff analysis of the published Corridor Objectives and Evaluation Criteria, Alignment Concept 2 is not suitable for further consideration and is inferior to the alternative Alignment Concepts, and (2) that the Committee must consider at least one other Alignment Concept.

I. Comparative Deficiencies of Alignment Concept 2

Objective 1.1 - The proposed corridor meets the long-term regional transportation mobility needs as described in the 2025 Rice County Transportation Plan:

Concepts 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B and 5C are at least as favorable in terms of continuity as compared with Concept 2. Every other Concept alternative allows drivers to maintain appropriate speeds based on urban/rural setting. Concepts 1A, 1B, 6A and 6B clearly provide minimum intersection and controlled access spacing, and Concepts 3A and 3B are at least as favorable. Every other Concept alternative allows for a right-of-way width of at least 150 feet. **Concepts 1B, 5A, 5B and 5C already accommodate a grade separated crossing of the Union Pacific railroad, while Concept 2 would require significant grading.** Concepts 3A and 3B are less lengthy, and concept 4B is at least as favorable. (Note that Concepts 6A and 6B are pending analysis regarding their length.) Concepts 1A and 1B are at least as favorable in regard to connectivity, and that Concepts 4A, 4B, 6A and 6B will “likely” satisfy this objective, as well.
Concepts 1A, 1B, 4A, 4B, 6A and 6B are at least as favorable for access and controlled intersection spacing along TH3. **Staff has determined that Alignment Concept 2 will not enhance either future rail or transit station opportunities.**

Objective 1.2 - The proposed corridor alleviates existing safety concerns and avoids potential future safety issues:

Every other Concept alternative meets driver expectations and MnDOT access spacing. **Concepts 1A and 1B include a perpendicular intersection of TH3 with CSAH 20, where these routes do not intersect in Concept 2 requiring construction or upgrading of local roads to achieve the connection.** Concepts 1B, 3A and 3B have fewer curves, while Concepts 5B and 5C are at least as favorable. (Note that Concepts 6A and 6B are pending analysis regarding both the number of horizontal curves and whether they achieve desired superelevated transitions.) Concept 1B clearly achieves desired superelevated transitions, while Concepts 3A and 3b are at least as favorable. Concepts 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B and 6 are at least as favorable in meeting driver expectations in regard to horizontal curves. Concepts 3A, 3b, 4A and 4B clearly meet sight distance standards at proposed intersections. (Note that Concepts 6A and 6B are pending analysis regarding whether they are adequate for sight distances at proposed intersections.) Concepts 5A, 5B and 5C clearly can be constructed with roadway profile grades of 4% or less, while Concepts 1A, 1B, 3A, 3B, 6A and 6B are at least as favorable as to the impact of the bluff east of TH 3. Concepts 1A, 1B, 3A, 3B, 6A and 6B are at least as favorable for roadway grades at horizontal curves.

Objective 1.3 - The proposed corridor is fiscally responsible:

**Concepts 4B, 5A, 5B and 5C are clearly lower that Concept 2 in estimated construction cost (negating the presumed recoupment of costs from private developers).** (Note that Concepts 6a and 6B are pending analysis for project costs, costs that can be shared with private developers, potential relocations and roadway length.) Concepts 3A, 3b, 5C, 6A and 6B will clearly require less new right-of-way, and all other Concepts are at least as unsuitable in regard to soils for roadway construction.

Objective 2.1 - The proposed corridor meets the long-term local transportation mobility needs in the Northfield/Dundas area:

Concepts 1A, 1B, 6A and 6B are at least as favorable regarding integration of local collectors as compared with Concept 2. Concepts 1A and 1B will clearly provide sufficient access to existing and future land uses while meeting state and county access spacing guidelines. (Note that all Concepts are pending analysis in regard to whether they will hinder a potential Cannon River crossing.) All concepts are at least as favorable in providing compatibility with present and future trails.

Objective 2.2 - The proposed corridor meets the long-term local land use and infrastructure needs in Dundas and Northfield:
(Note that all Concepts are pending analysis in regard to whether they will be compatible with existing and future land use planning and development, as well as orderly extension of sewer and water.) Concepts 1A, 1B, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A and 6B are at least as favorable in regard to section 4(f) parkland impacts as compared with Concept 2. Concepts 3A, 3B, 4A and 4B clearly have less impact on highly desirable future residential areas, and Concepts 3A, 3b, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B, and 5C will clearly allow for a railroad spur for future industrial activities.

Objective 3.1 - The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to farm operations:

Concepts 3A, 3B, 4A, 4C, 5A and 5C will clearly have less impact on prime farmland as compared with Concept 2. (Note that Concepts 6A and 6B are pending analysis regarding impact on prime farmland.) Concepts 3a, 3B, 4A, 4B and 5A are at least as favorable in regard to the number of farmland severances.

Objective 3.2 - The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to wetland, floodplain, river/stream crossings, and other natural features:

Concepts 1B and 3A are clearly preferable for minimizing impact on wetlands as compared with Concept 2. (Note that Concepts 6A and 6B are pending analysis regarding impact on wetland.) All concepts as at least as favorable regarding impacts to DNR protected waters. Concepts 6A and 6B require no crossing of areas designated Wild and Scenic, while other Concepts as at least as favorable when compared with Concept 2. Concept 2 will require a more extensive cut than all others, except Concept 4A. Concepts 3A, 3B, 4A and 4B will clearly minimize impacts for floodplains, and all of them are at least as favorable in providing opportunities for mitigation. (Note that Concepts 6A and 6B are pending analysis in regard to floodplains.) Concepts 6A and 6B are clearly preferable in requiring not watercourse crossings, and all other Concepts are at least as favorable compared with Concept 2. Except for Concept 4A, every other Concept will clearly have less impact on quality wooded areas as compared to Concept 2. (Woodlands impacted in Concept 2 consist predominately of 100+ years old maple, oak and basswood trees all within the Cannon River viewshed.)

Objective 3.3 - The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to hazardous sites:

Concepts 1B, 3B, 3B, 6a and 6B are at least as favorable in minimizing impacts on known hazardous waste sites as compared to Concept 2.

Objective 3.4 - The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to the natural heritage or threatened and endangered species:

While Concepts 6A and 6B are clearly as favorable in impacting natural heritage sites, as compared with Concept 2, all other Concepts are not deemed likely to physically impact nearby sites.
(Concept 2, along with Concepts 1A, 1B, 3A, 3b, 6A and 6B, requires additional investigation regarding impacts on threatened or endangered species.) Staff found not impact for Concepts 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B and 5C.

Objective 3.5 - The proposed corridor minimizes impacts to protected groups of people or low-income people:

Concepts 1A, 1B, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A and 6B clearly have no likelihood of impacting disadvantaged persons.

II. Consideration of additional Alignment Concepts

Objectives where analysis is pending or additional investigation is deemed required are so numerous that, taking into account when lands for the proposed connection could be acquired and the improvement could be constructed (based on available funds); there is no reason to rule out consideration of reasonable alternatives. We believe that the following route merits consideration:

Starting at the intersection of County 1 with Cabot Avenue; then South along Cabot Avenue to County 8; then East along County 8 to a new bridge and new road to connect with 125th Street, East; then continuing East to connect with Highway 246. (A possible variation that we think would meet long-term regional transportation mobility needs and alleviate existing safety concerns and avoid potential safety issues involves intersection of Interstate 35 and County 8; then County 8 would connect to a new bridge and new road to connect with 125th Street, East; then continuing East to connect with Highway 246.)

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your courtesy.

Very respectfully,

RUVELSON & KAUTZER, CHARTERED

Alan K. Ruvelson, Jr.

cc: Ronald Silkey and Alice Silkey

We love our home and its setting of incomparable beauty. Please know that we shall fight to the full extent of the law any plan that threatens the bluff or the forest and the species that inhabit the forest or our home. Please see the enclosed personal addendum. Thank you.

Alice Silkey

Ron Silkey
I attended the informational meeting at Bridgewater Twp. Hall on 9/26/06 concerning Rice County 1 planning. My residence is on the south border of concerned area on Hwy 20 and Rice Co. 1 is my principle route to I35 which I travel almost daily. My input follows...

My most favored option offered is Concept 2, followed by Concept 1B and, lastly 1A. My reasons are none of those listed in the "Property Owner Invitation" Attachment "B" and that is commercial traffic. College City Beverage's new facility when operational will increase truck traffic in Dundas by 75 trucks per day and this is planned to commence in April 2007, way before any of the concepts for CSAH 1 even gets off paper and into reality, and that is just the start. I find this heavy truck traffic within a city of 600 people as unacceptable. At the meeting Mr. Luebbe asked if we thought Northfield residents will be willing to drive south to a new CSAH 1 to access I35. I believe those living on the south side of Northfield already do but in the 10 years it takes to build the road, I am sure residential development will push farther south so a 1 mile swing to the south to avoid a 30 mph area with 3 stop lights through Northfield will make a 45 to 55 mph CSAH 1 look more attractive. Plus the same factor in College City Beverage's move to Dundas will put pressure to develop Dundas's Industrial park on the southside since Northfield has not planned ahead for ample industrial space in their commercial areas. One only has to drive Armstrong Rd, a.K.a. as hwy 78 (and another route to get to Cedar Ave. while avoiding Northfield) where you often find semi's waiting on the shoulder of Armstrong Road for loading dock space to vacate. Obviously the industrial facilities are reaching capacity and business will be looking for alternatives. Concepts 1 and 2 provide the environment for those alternatives which will benefit Rice County with a better tax base to pay for the required bridge. I am sure if one of these concepts is built residential as well as industrial development will result along the south Dundas corridor and on either side of Hwy 3.

I considered concepts 3A & B, as well as 4A & B, but they will route commercial traffic into town but would probably be more appealing to residential drivers. However, the impact on residential neighborhoods would be greater meaning the speed limits would be lower and commercial traffic will be forced into town rather than out of town. This will reduce the
efficiency of the new CSAH 1 to through traffic

Concepts 6A & B avoids the need for a bridge but will impact Hwy 3 which today is very difficult to enter at times, especially with a left turn when commuters are enroute to the Twin Cities in the early AM or late PM hours. I believe if these were implemented, which appear to be of lower cost, we would still have to build the bridge anyway but at a later date when we have to replan these same concepts once again. This means these concepts wouldn't be as thrifty as they appear.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Dick DeCramer
diesel@rconnect.com
12275 Cannon City Blvd.
Northfield, MN

This email message, including any attachments, is confidential and is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you have received this by mistake, please notify the sender by email reply and delete this email from your system.
October 31, 2006

Mr. Chris Chormy  
Bolton & Menk, Inc.  
12224 Nicollet Avenue  
Burnsville, MN  55337

Mr. Chormy,

I am a resident of Bridgewater Township, residing at 11811 Dundas Blvd. I have reviewed the different concepts that have been drafted as part of the County Highway 1 Corridor Preservation Study and have the following comments.

Overall, the concept plans presented show an effort to explore as many options as possible. However, from a reviewer's point of view, a thoughtful evaluation of each concept is hindered by the lack of documentation on the evaluation criteria for each concept. Hopefully, this information will be made available in the future and additional comment periods will be initiated.

As far as the alignments presented, several of the concept alternatives seem unlikely and/or undesirable. Concepts 4A and 4B, although the most direct, are unlikely scenarios in view of the level of existing urbanization in that area.

When taken in context of the city centers of Dundas and Northfield, Concepts 1A and 1B would take commuters too far south to be a practical corridor. Steps would have to be taken to discourage commuter traffic from taking the shorter, more direct route through downtown Dundas. This is also true for Concepts 6A and 6B, which are further degraded by the awkward jog along Highway 3.

Concepts 5A, 5B, and 5C are the most desirably placed of all route alternatives when the city centers are taken into consideration. However, constructing a new transportation corridor through the wide floodplain that exists at this point of the Cannon River is problematic, both from an engineering and river preservation point of view.

Concepts 3A, 3B and 2 are the most desirable when considering the location of city centers and creating a direct flow of traffic through the area. In addition, they would be poised to serve the portion of Dundas that is zoned for industrial expansion. This is exactly the type of traffic that should be the first priority to serve with a bypass corridor since they are the most disruptive to highly urbanized areas.

Therefore, my recommendation as a citizen of Bridgewater Township is to look more closely at concepts 3A, 3B or 2 for future bypass corridor improvements.

Thank you for the chance to participate in the drafting of this transportation corridor plan.

Sincerely,

Mary Mitchell  
1811 Dundas Blvd.  
Dundas, MN  55019
27 October 2006

Mr. Chris Chromy P.E., P.O.T.E.
Project Manager - Bolton & Menk
12224 Nicollet Avenue
Burnsville, MN 55337

Re: Rice County Road Study CSAH1

Dear Mr. Chromy,

We would like to let you know of our concerns regarding the proposed East-West corridor options.

We expect that the route would have the least environmental impact possible. The chosen route should preserve existing bluffs, woodlands and wetlands. We would also expect that the route would impact the least number of established residents. It makes sense to utilize existing roadways and right-of-ways (such as 115th street and Highway 1) as much as possible. Dundas has been working on preserving ROW at 115th Street and to the North there is already ROW along Highway1. Proposed routes 4A and 4B seen to have the maximum grade changes, least straight alignment and duplicate the existing ROWs.

Routes that bisect the City of Dundas or go through other existing single family home neighborhoods do not make sense. Transversing the established Wendwood subdivision destroys an existing desirable residential area.

We are firmly opposed to the proposed 4A and 4B routes in the study.

Thank you for considering our thoughts.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Ehresmann

John Ehresmann
You may note your comments on the map or on the back of this page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it makes a lot more sense for the new #1 to follow #8. Trying to drop it down in a residential area will cause too many problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Nesseth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5710 15th St. E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You may note your comments on the map or on the back of this page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>please use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dundas should not develop beyond its means, as stated by John Cruz at candidate forum for Dundas City Council.

We in the township are suffering from lack of transportation planning by the City of Dundas.

Stephanie Henricksen
1766 730 St. E.
Dundas, MN 55027
507-645-7086

This corridor study is much appreciated, especially as the cost estimates which were missing in evaluation charts created by Dundas Planning Commission when they made their choice of corridors.
Press Release

Public Information Meeting for CSAH 1 Corridor Preservation Study in Northfield/Dundas Area

February 6, 2007

A public information meeting regarding a planning study for a potential new east-west highway corridor has been scheduled. The purpose of the meeting is to present the preferred planning alignment concept under consideration, and to receive public input in the process. The public, landowners within the study area, and other interested parties are encouraged to attend.

A copy of draft study information can be viewed on the Rice County website at:

http://www.co.rice.mn.us/highway/CSAH1.php

The meeting will be held on Thursday, February 22, 2007, at the Northfield Community Center, 1651 Jefferson Parkway, Northfield (rooms SS 103–Community Room and SS 105–Dining Room), from 5:30 – 8:00 PM, with a presentation at 6:30 PM.

CONTACTS

DENNIS LUEBBE, HIGHWAY ENGINEER, (507) 332-6110

GARY WEIERS, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR, (507) 332-6121
Corridor Preservation Study

CSAH 1: Baldwin Avenue to TH 246

Need for the Study:
- Rice County 2025 Transportation Plan
- Local Efforts on Ring Road Concept

Corridor Preservation Study

CSAH 1: Baldwin Avenue to TH 246

Purpose of the Study:
- Identify and Evaluate Potential Alignment Options
- Reduce the Number of Options

Corridor Preservation Study

CSAH 1: Baldwin Avenue to TH 246

Benefits to Communities, County, & State:
- Integrate Corridor with Community and Development Plans
- Preserve Corridor and Minimize Future Impacts and Cost
- Address Existing Issues Consistent with Long-Term Transportation Vision

Corridor Preservation Study

A Corridor Preservation Study is:
- First of Many Steps to a New Highway Corridor.
- Not a Plan for Highway Construction.
- A Process to Integrate a New Highway Corridor with Land Uses.
- Necessary due to the Growth of the Area.
- A Collaborative Effort

Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

- Representatives from Study Partners
  - Rice County – Dennis Luebbe, County Engineer
  - Bridgewater Township – Gary Ebling, Supervisor
  - City of Dundas – Tom McMahon, City Engineer
  - City of Northfield – Joel Wallinski, Public Works
  - Northfield Township – Mike Growch, Supervisor
  - Mn/DOT – Chris Moates, District Planner
  - MnDNR – Randy Brandt, Hydrologist
  - Consultant – Chris Chromy, Project Manager
CSAH 1 Study Purpose & Goal

Identify a safe and efficient corridor alignment option for further planning, preservation, and environmental analysis based on an objective evaluation of alternatives.

CSAH 1 Planning Alignment Concepts

12 Corridor Options/6 Bridge Locations

Each Concept:
- 45-55 mph Design
- 150 Ft Right of Way Corridor (Typical)
- Perpendicular Crossing of Cannon River
- Railroad Underpass or Overpass
- Intersection Spacing
  (Existing and Planned Local Road Connections)

CSAH 1 Planning Alignment Concepts

Each Concept: (continued)
- TH 3 Intersection Spacing
- TH 3/CSAH 20 Intersection Configuration
- TH 246/CSAH 1/CSAH 22/CR 81 Intersection Configuration
- Environmental and Cultural Resource Overview
  - Avoid - Minimize - Mitigate Impacts

Preferred Planning Alignment Selection Process

1. Comprehensive Evaluation Matrix
2. Public and Property Owner Input
3. PAC Ranking Process:
   - Each Member Given Equal Input
   - Asked to Identify:
     - Three Most Supported Concepts
     - Three Least Supported Concepts
     - Other Three That Could Be Supported

Preferred Planning Alignment Selection Process

PAC Recommendation:
- Remove 10 of 12 Concepts from Further Study
- Preferred Planning Alignments
  - Hybrid of Concepts SB and SC
  - Concept 2 (Secondary Recommendation)

Planning Concepts Fatal Flaws

Planning Alignment Concept 1A/1B
- Unattractive for Regional Trips
- Lack of PAC Support

Planning Alignment Concept 3A/3B
- Impacts to Developed Properties, Community Cohesion, & Historic Site
- Impact to Bluff and Quality Wooded Areas
- Number of Right-of-Way Relocations
Planning Concepts
Fatal Flaws

Planning Alignment Concept 4A/4B
- Impacts to Developed Properties, Downtown Dundas & Historic Sites
- Impact to Bluff and Quality Wooded Areas
- Project Costs and Public Resistance

Planning Alignment Concept 5A
- Curvature of Existing Alignment West of Cates Ave

Planning Alignment Concept 6A/6B
- Not a Regional Connection

Preferred Planning Alignment Concept 5B/5C

Key Features:
- Attractive Route for Regional Trips
- Low Impact to Bluff and Quality Wooded Area
- Project Costs and Ability for Growth to Help Pay
- Public Acceptance
- Beneficial to Each Community

Challenges:
- Impacts to Cannon River Wild and Scenic Corridor

Secondary Planning Alignment Concept 2

Key Features:
- Attractive Route for Regional Trips
- Project Costs and Ability for Growth to Help Pay
- Low Farmland and Wetland Impacts

Challenges:
- Impacts to Cannon River Wild and Scenic Corridor
- Bluff and Quality Wooded Area Impacts
- Does not address City of Northfield River Crossing Needs

Next Steps

- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
  - Each Agencies Roles and Responsibilities
- Formal Environmental Review
- Right-of-Way Preservation
- Developing Area

Community Opportunities

- Integrate Corridor with Community Plans
  - Planning Land Use and Corridor Concurrently
  - Allowing Growth while Preserving & Developing Corridor
  - Enhance Natural Features along Corridor
  - Allow Growth to Contribute to Cost of Corridor

- Other Community Decisions
  - Vision for TH 3 Access
  - Solution for TH 246/CSAH 1/CSAH 22
  - Local Roadway Connections (Ring Road)
  - Refinement of Land Use Plans
Community Opportunities

- Quality of Life
  - Corridor Designed to Accommodate Traffic
  - Safety of Motorists, Pedestrians, Residents
  - Efficient Movement of People, Goods, & Services
  - Environmentally Responsible
  - Improves Emergency Response Times
  - Communities' Regional Accessibility
## County Highway 1 Corridor Improvements
### Project History and Possible Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rice County 2025 Transportation Plan</strong></td>
<td>County Wide Vision</td>
<td>Confirm Need for New CH 1 Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH 1 Corridor Preservation Study</strong></td>
<td>Baldwin Ave to TH 246</td>
<td>Identify and Evaluate Potential Alignments</td>
<td>Reduce Number of Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH 1 Preliminary Design &amp; Environmental Review</strong></td>
<td>Baldwin Ave to TH 246</td>
<td>Illustrate WHAT Will Be Built and Cost</td>
<td>Formal Environmental Review</td>
<td>Timeline may vary 2-5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH 1 Detailed Design</strong></td>
<td>Baldwin Ave to TH 246</td>
<td>Determine HOW It Will Be Built and Cost</td>
<td>Finalize Design Details</td>
<td>Identify RAV Needs</td>
<td>Prepare Construction Bid Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH 1 Right-of-Way</strong></td>
<td>Baldwin Ave to TH 246</td>
<td>Purchase Necessary RAV and Easements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH 1 Construction</strong></td>
<td>Baldwin Ave to TH 246</td>
<td>Construction of Recommended Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyn Kuenner</td>
<td>7606 115th St. East.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene E. Jasnoch</td>
<td>2600 Oakwood Dr.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GROTH</td>
<td>10763 James Trail</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Westerman</td>
<td>100 Bridge St. Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill &amp; Mary Jones</td>
<td>221 Morris &amp; Dundas</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Rock</td>
<td>10425 13th Timbalong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Forsgren</td>
<td>7375 115th St. E., Nfld.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Broot</td>
<td></td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Vanlo</td>
<td>414 Waterwheel Rd. Dundas 1</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Huffman</td>
<td>362 Waterwheel Rd. Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Summers</td>
<td>3811 Milesburg Blvd. Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Colburn</td>
<td>107 N 2nd St. Dundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike &amp; Mary Song</td>
<td>3075 Milesburg Blvd. Dundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Rasmussen</td>
<td>10507 Carbon Ave, Nfld.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (PLEASE PRINT)</td>
<td>Address (PLEASE PRINT)</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel Emery</td>
<td>NW 10th Ave</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinh Dassum</td>
<td>10301 E. 106th St</td>
<td>Enfield Property Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Marks</td>
<td>301 West Ave, Dundas M</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART WHITE</td>
<td>408 N Spring #204</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Reiners</td>
<td>1534 E 120 Dundas</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Kelley</td>
<td>PO Box 275, Dundas</td>
<td>Dundas Homeowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur C. Campbell</td>
<td>10334 Farrell Ave</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don King</td>
<td>1040 Summerfield Dr.</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Albers</td>
<td>1310 90th St E NHLRO</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dubas</td>
<td>5525 Enclwood Trl</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Rasmussen</td>
<td>10507 Cates Ave</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Trout</td>
<td>5515 Enclwood Trl</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>2657 E 130</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Yehs</td>
<td>760 Meadow View Dr, Northfield</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl David Buck</td>
<td>10678 First Timberlane Drive, Northfield</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Brown</td>
<td>11821 Old US 55, Bloomington, IL 55010</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Patriku</td>
<td>10525 Farrell Ct, 55057</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Jordan</td>
<td>6570 Edwood Tr,</td>
<td>Woodworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Pavlek</td>
<td></td>
<td>College City, Honey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Morgueuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Brown</td>
<td>County Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Radner</td>
<td>5787 Edwing Way</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janis Spohn</td>
<td>1330 110th St E</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Myron</td>
<td>10404 Farrell Ct</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Fraser</td>
<td>5047 123rd St E</td>
<td>Nonowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Helgeson</td>
<td>9881 Decker Ave N</td>
<td>Landowner, Motorist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kragi Premme</td>
<td>11751 Dundas Blvd, Dundas, MN</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pedretti</td>
<td>100 Schilling Dr S, Dundas MN 55019</td>
<td>Menards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Sutela</td>
<td>1 W Cannon St, Dundas MN 55019</td>
<td>Award Center/Menards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Robert Becker</td>
<td>2687 Millersburg Blvd, Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Becker</td>
<td>111 10th St. #4, Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Baker</td>
<td>116 3rd St. #4, Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Whiteman</td>
<td>155 West Ave, Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Adams</td>
<td>108 E Hester St</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Demann</td>
<td>Box 125, Dundas</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Behrens</td>
<td>3147 Industrial Dr, Flio</td>
<td>Metro Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Gerathie</td>
<td>4450 100th St East, Westwood</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa M. Graff</td>
<td>605 1/2 Washington, Southfield</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Klems</td>
<td>600 Railway St, Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Randolph Cox</td>
<td>10331 Decker Avenue (R.O. Box)</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry F. Albies</td>
<td>316 West Ave, Dundas 55019</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evi &amp; Diane Lohn</td>
<td>125 Melendez, Dundas</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice &amp; Arni Sulay</td>
<td>5555 E. 115th St, NFld</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe &amp; Sue Hollinger</td>
<td>13237 Firribault Blvd, Dundas</td>
<td>Land Renter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Brenda Burkman</td>
<td>11535 Cannon City Blvd</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul &amp; Susan Wagner</td>
<td>5780 115th St. E</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick &amp; Sara DeCmane</td>
<td>12275 Cannon City Blvd, NFld</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis McCarthy</td>
<td>PO Box 183, Dundas MN</td>
<td>Local Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Sibley</td>
<td>3885 100th Street East, NFld</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNMM Eames</td>
<td>2240 90th Street East, NFld</td>
<td>LNMM Owner / Eames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Boles</td>
<td>8997 Eales Ave, NFld</td>
<td>Advocate for natural resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie Hawkins</td>
<td>3865 Upper 321 W, NFld</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ehresmann</td>
<td>5747 Ennismord TRL</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Schmidt</td>
<td>1217 Sunac Ln, NFld</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Shaff</td>
<td>5720 E. 115th St, NFld</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Harrington</td>
<td>11371 Dennison Blvd, NFld</td>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Donna Freeman</td>
<td>448 S. 2nd Street, 700 53019</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Kit O'Brien</td>
<td>5642 Endwood Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Pat O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Nora C. Silkey</td>
<td>12109 Cannon City Blvd</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Ron Silkey</td>
<td>5555 115th St E</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Paul Silkey</td>
<td>12109 Cannon City Blvd</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Gene Werner</td>
<td>3104 Millersburg Blvd</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Daly</td>
<td>10163 Cates Ave.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Amey</td>
<td>461 2nd St. S. Dundas</td>
<td>City of Dundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nistor</td>
<td>2772 Brookman Court</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Terry</td>
<td>1450 Cliff Rd. E. Inner Grove</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph A. Kuszala</td>
<td>708 County Rd. One Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danette Demann</td>
<td>601 Railway St. S. Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Demann</td>
<td>601 Railway St. S. Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maud &amp; Josephia</td>
<td>11885 Cabot Ave. Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Josephia</td>
<td>11885 Cabot Ave. Dundas</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Campbell</td>
<td>108 34 Farewell Ave. Nfld.</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda Lovell</td>
<td>3993 115 St. E. East Dundas</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Knob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary &amp; Don Kelly</td>
<td>11790 Cannon City Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>2753 120 St. E. East Dundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Rockman</td>
<td>3138 Millersburg Blvd. Dundas</td>
<td>Land home owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (PLEASE PRINT)</td>
<td>Address (PLEASE PRINT)</td>
<td>Interest in Corridor (landowner, motorist, developer, elected official, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Malecha</td>
<td>1607 Pheasantwood Trl</td>
<td>Rice Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Piper &amp; Edie Piper</td>
<td>5340 124th E</td>
<td>Blen, Blwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Oshiro, Matt Ported</td>
<td>2009 Michigan Dr. Nfield</td>
<td>Property owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Grensteiner</td>
<td>2229 Greenfield Dr</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Grensteiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Little</td>
<td>11811 Candy Ave Fairview</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Silkey</td>
<td>13x53, 7161, MN, 55257</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Duda</td>
<td>5525 Endwood Trail 55057</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Reeder</td>
<td>5787 Erwin Way</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>