

## *Meeting Summary*

**To:** *All Meeting Participants*

**From:** *Ronald B. Bray, P.E.*  
*Project Manager, WSB*

**Date:** *August 20, 2002*

**Re:** *Meeting Minutes*  
*CSAH 50 Project Management Team Meeting*  
*Cass County, Minnesota*  
*Wednesday, August 14, 2002, 2:30 PM*  
*WSB Project No. 1326-01*

---

An agenda package was passed around to all persons in attendance.

### **I. Introductions**

The following project management team members were in attendance at the meeting:

David Enblom	Cass County Engineer
Jim Dowson	Cass County Commissioner
James Tande	US Forest Service
Dave Johnson	Anderson Bros. Construction Company
Don Willis	Ten Mile Lake Association President
John Alden	Ten Mile Lake Assoc., Water Resources
Harlan Fierstine	Mn/DNR Fisheries
Jerry Mills	Resident
Ed Mergens	Portage Lake Assoc.
Ron Bray	WSB & Assocs.
Becky Haydon (Hauschild)	WSB & Assocs.

The following public persons were in attendance:

Dorothy Mills  
Michael Jensen  
Marie Marsh  
Kelly Hogue  
Shirley Miller  
Bruce Miller

The following project management team members were not in attendance:

Kelvin Howieson	Mn/DOT State Aid
John Sumption	Cass County Environmental Services
Dan Steward	Board of Water and Soil Resources
Robert L. Crom	Ten Mile Lake Assoc. Delegate (req'd Don Willis to attend)
John Freetley	Chippewa Nat'l Forest
Steve Frick	Forest Service Cass Lake
Mitch Bouchonville	Forest Service Walker
Michele Hanson	United States Army Corps of Engineers
Vicki Converse	Resident
Tom Somrak	US Forest Service
Kirk English	Mn/DNR Waters
Harris Hostager	Portage Lake Assoc.

## **II. Public Comments**

### **A. General**

- There were no additional comments received from the members present.

### **B. Neighborhood Meeting (7-11-02)**

- Handout included in agenda package.
- Access Alternatives A, B and C, as presented to the PMT in June, were presented at the neighborhood meeting.
- General consensus from the residents present at the neighborhood meeting was to leave the existing road in place (Alternative A), realizing that the additional cost and time associated with trying to remove the existing roadway could end up delaying the project indefinitely.
- Jerry Mills noted that there was significant disappointment that the existing roadway would not be removed.
  - Ron noted that the adjoining property owners can vacate the existing roadway by petition.
- Jerry Mills also questioned the level of snow removal maintenance by the township.
  - David noted that the county has to turn the existing road back to the township meeting County standards. Cass County does not have the required right-of-way in this area; therefore, Cass County may end up keeping jurisdiction over both the new and existing CSAH 50.

- Marie Marsh would like to look at the proposed connections from the existing road to the new CSAH 50.
  - **WSB will sketch two (2) alternative connections with acreage remaining and mail these to Marie Marsh.**
- Mr. Jensen noted that he would prefer that the existing road be removed and then questioned if the homeowner can fill the wetland between the new CSAH 50 and their garages?
  - Ron noted that no they could not without a permit, the county will be required to mitigate for the wetland areas between the new and roadway; however, it is anticipated that these areas will be utilized for ponding areas.
- Mr. Jensen asked whether they would be compensated for any right-of-way acquisition.
  - Ron noted that they would be compensated for any right-of-way acquisition. It would be a one-time payment, based on an appraisal.
- Mrs. Miller stated that since we are spending a lot of money, why don't we do it right the first time and remove the existing roadway.
  - Ron noted that this is a good comment; however, the main goal of the improvement was to remove the 'majority' of the traffic from the roadway between the cabins and garages and this would be accomplished with the proposed plan.
  - Cass County would love nothing more than to remove the existing roadway, but at whose expense. Cass County estimated the expense of constructing driveways to access the new CSAH 50 in excess of \$250,000;
  - The door is still open for the residents to get a petition and get all of the adjoining property owners to agree to vacate the existing roadway. Cass County would then incorporate this into their construction plans.
- Kelly Hogue questioned how the residents could keep the through traffic off of the existing roadway?
  - Ron noted that there was a project similar to this constructed in the Alexandria area and the majority of the through traffic was eliminated.

**C. Ten Mile Lake Association Meeting (August 3, 2002)**

- Ron thanked both lake associations for bringing the materials on CSAH 50 and CSAH 71 to their annual meetings.

- There were no comments raised at the Ten Mile Lake Association meeting.

**D. Portage Lake Association Meeting (July 13, 2002)**

- Ed reported that there were questions pertaining to the proposed alternatives at the CSAH 50/CSAH 71 intersection.
  - How far would the intersection be relocated, if constructed on a new alignment? Ron Bray noted approximately 200-feet; however, additional property owners in the area had requested a meeting, so there concerns will be considered.
  - There were also questions about where the water would drain? Ron Bray noted that the proposed drainage would be directed to the south and east into a pond.

**E. Marie Marsh (August 2, 2002)**

- Ron Bray met with Marie Marsh and her daughter, Kelly Hogue, at the Marsh residence on August 2, 2002.
- Marie Marsh is concerned with how the connection from the existing CSAH 50 is constructed to the new CSAH 50 and how much land is remaining.
- Two scenarios will be drawn up with the remaining parcel acreage labeled and sent to Marie Marsh and Kelly Hogue for discussion.

**III. Alternative Alignments**

**A. Access Scenarios**

- Ron Bray explained the three (3) access alternatives that were developed for the relocation of CSAH 50.
  1. Alternative A: Existing Road Left Inplace
    - Alternative 1 leaves the existing road inplace;
    - The existing roadway would intersect (stop sign) with the new CSAH 50 east of the Mills residence and west of the Marsh residence;
    - Access to the majority of the property owners would remain as is.
  2. Alternative B: Removal of Existing Roadway
    - Alternative 2 removes the existing CSAH 50 in its entirety;
    - Access to all parcels would be constructed from the new CSAH 50;

- This alternative leaves ten (10) parcels land-locked. These parcels would have to be granted easements from adjoining property owners to receive access.

3. Alternative C: Segments of Existing Road Left Inplace

- Alternative 3 leaves a segment of the existing CSAH 50 inplace;
- The existing roadway would intersect (stop sign) with the new CSAH 50 west of the Mills residence and west of the Marsh residence;
- This alternative leaves five (5) parcels land-locked. These parcels would have to be granted easements from adjoining property owners to receive access.

**B. CSAH 50 at TH 371 (Forest Service Update)**

- The Forest Service has an approved Environmental Assessment (EA) for the realignment of Woodtick Trail – construction in 2003.
- Therefore, a separate EA would need to be approved for the realignment of CSAH 50 to intersect at the new alignment of Woodtick Trail.
  - **WSB will check the location of the Lothrop site, it would take more than one year for the Forest Service to perform a biological survey, etc. for inclusion in the EA.**

**C. CSAH 50 at CSAH 71**

- Two alternatives have been proposed for the intersection of CSAH 50 with CSAH 71.
  - Alternative 1: Tee CSAH 71 into CSAH 50 at its existing location with mountable curb and gutter to better define the intersection;
  - Alternative 2: Tee CSAH 71 into CSAH 50 along a new alignment approximately 100-ft westerly of its present location.
    - Consensus of the PMT as the preferred alternative;
    - The homeowner located across from the new CSAH 71 was concerned with headlights – the alignment will be modified to eliminate this concern.

**IV. Public Involvement**

- Public and/or property owner meetings will occur prior to construction if right-of-way is to be acquired.

**V. Hydraulic Design Committee**

**A. Ten Mile Lake Hydraulic Study Update**

- John Alden noted that they are working on the study. The general guidelines would be to not do anything that would have a negative impact on wither Portage or Ten Mile Lake.

## **VI. Other**

### Schedule

- The construction schedule was discussed.
- David noted that Cass County has this project in their Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the year 2003. This denotes that the county would like to have a contract awarded in that year; however, construction may not begin until 2004.
- Once final construction plans are complete and right-of-way is acquired, the county has to 'get in line' with the permitting agencies.

## **VII. Next Meeting**

The next meeting for CSAH 50 was not scheduled. Project Management Team members will be notified of the next meeting, most likely in the Winter of 2003.

**NOTE: The above constitutes WSB's understanding of the items discussed at this meeting. If there are any questions, comments or changes, please notify me immediately at (763) 541-4800 or (888)-541-4800.**

c: Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe  
Morgan Dawley, WSB & Associates, Inc.  
Jeff Stewart, WSB & Associates, Inc.