

AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS – CENTRAL MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARTNERSHIP
JUNE 11, 2026

Sherburne County Government Center
13880 Business Ctr Dr NW
Elk River, MN 55330

1. Call to Order – *Chair*

2. Routine Business

- a. Roll Call – *Emma Nelson*
- b. Approval of Meeting Agenda – *Chair*
- c. Approval of Minutes from March 12, 2026 Meeting – *Chair*
- d. Approval of Financial Statements – *Nelson, Chair*

3. Action Items

- a. Discussion and approval of 2027 membership dues schedule – *Chair*
- b. Discussion and approval of work plan for 2027 – *Chair*
- c. Discussion and approval of preliminary 2027 operating budget – *Chair*

4. Discussion/Information Items

- a. River Crossing project updates – *Andrew Witter, Staff*

5. Update on Other Area Projects

- a. State Highway 25 Buffalo to Monticello – *Wright County*
- b. State Highway 24, Clearwater – *Wright County*
- c. Wright County CSAH 39 – *Wright County*
- d. TH 10/CSAH 11 Interchange – *Sherburne County*
- e. TH 25 between Mississippi River and Big Lake – *Sherburne County*

6. Other Business

7. Adjournment – *Chair*

Attachments:

1. Minutes from March 12, 2026
2. Financial Statements & Budget Report for May 2026
3. Memo re Proposed 2027 Membership Dues Schedule
4. Memo re Proposed 2027 Nonprofit Workplan
5. Proposed Operating Budget for 2027
6. Pre Scoping Methodology Table DRAFT 5.18.26

MINUTES

Central Mississippi River Partnership

Board of Directors Meeting

7:30am Thursday, March 12, 2026

Sherburne County Government Center/Virtual via Microsoft Teams

Board attendance:

Raeanne Danielowski*	Commissioner	Sherburne County	Present
Darek Vetsch	Commissioner	Wright County	Present
Lloyd Hilgart	Mayor	City of Monticello	Present
Dean Brenteson	Supervisor	Big Lake Township	Present
Ken Geroux	Councilmember	City of Big Lake	Absent
Brian Kolbinger	Supervisor	Becker Township	Present
Mark Kolbinger	Mayor	City of Becker	Present

*Presiding officer(s)

Quorum:

A quorum was present.

Other attendees present:

Greg Lerud	City Administrator	City of Becker
Jacob Sanders	Community Development Director	City of Becker
Hanna Klimmek	City Administrator	City of Big Lake
Rachel Leonard	City Administrator	City of Monticello
Dan Weber	Assistant County Administrator	Sherburne County
Marc Schneider	Assistant Zoning Administrator	Sherburne County
Andrew Witter	Public Works Director	Sherburne County
Gregg Felber	Commissioner	Sherburne County
Marc Mattice	Assistant County Administrator	Wright County
Greg Kryzer	County Administrator	Wright County
Chad Hausmann	Highway Engineer	Wright County
Emma Nelson	Director of Association Management and Client Services	Flaherty & Hood, P.A.
Angie Bersaw	Consultant	Bolton & Menk

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Raeanne Danielowski called this meeting of the Central Mississippi River Partnership (CMRP) Board of Directors to order at 7:30am on Thursday, March 12, 2026.

2. Routine Business

a. Roll Call

A roll call was taken, and a quorum of the Board was present. See list of attendees on page 1 of these minutes.

b. Approval of Meeting Agenda

Motion: Approve the meeting agenda for this meeting of the CMRP Board of Directors. Moved by Lloyd Hilgart. Second by Darek Vetsch. The motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

c. Approval of Minutes from 1/22/2026 Board Meeting

Motion: Approve the meeting minutes from the 1/22/2026 meeting of the CMRP Board of Directors. Moved by Darek Vetsch. Second by Lloyd Hilgart. The motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

d. Approval of Financial Statements

Motion: Approve the January 2026 financial statements as presented. Moved by Lloyd Hilgart. Second by Darek Vetsch. No discussion. The motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

3. Discussion/Information Items

a. Roles and responsibilities of CMRP and LGU

This agenda item was originally item D. Emma Nelson shared that there had been a request to move it to the first discussion/information item that she had forgotten to mention when the agenda was brought up for approval. Board members agreed that the item could be moved earlier in the discussion.

Emma Nelson presented a slide with the roles and responsibilities of the CMRP nonprofit versus the Local Government Unit consisting of Wright and Sherburne counties. The slide was developed by the counties based on feedback from the group that additional clarity was needed to establish the roles and responsibilities of each entity. County staff clarified that the decision-makers for the LGU are the respective county boards.

b. River Crossing and Highway 10/CSAH 11 update

Angie Bersaw from Bolton & Menk presented on the status of the river crossing project and the Highway 10/CSAH 11 update. She explained how and why the river crossing project will need to proceed through federal processes and what work needs to be done to prepare the project for the Tier 1 EIS study. Angie also explained that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is the lead agency for the Tier 1 EIS and has said that

they will not support two federal actions within overlapping study areas. Bolton & Menk working with the LGU has tried to propose different approaches to address this issue, which have not received support from FHWA. Ultimately the staggered approach of pushing the TH10/CSAH categorical exclusion forward and then beginning the Tier 1 EIS when that process wraps up. FHWA won't even review the Purpose and Need updates for the river crossing project until the CATEX for the TH10/CSAH11 is complete. However, there is other preparation and environmental work that can be done as the group waits for the Tier 1 EIS to be able to move forward.

Angie also shared what was next after the Tier 1 EIS. The implementation and funding plans will be critical to give options to continuously work towards construction.

The group discussed the involvement of MnDOT in securing funding and support for the river crossing project. The consensus was that the project is a priority for the local governments but not a priority for MnDOT, and that one of the main purposes of CMRP will be to lobby for funding and for MnDOT support.

Lloyd asked about the impact of potential future interchange projects in Monticello on the project processes. Regardless of the crossing, they'll need an interchange. The consensus among Angie Bersaw and the county engineering staff was that the conversation will take place during the Tier 1. Part of the conversation during the Tier 1 is talking to the cities and the counties about future local projects and other plans. Argument that an interchange on 94 is a different situation since that's an area where there isn't a signal and it's already graded. During and after the Tier 1 EIS, they will be able to start looking at those projects.

c. BUILD Grant Background & Update

Andrew Witter shared that Sherburne County submitted an application for BUILD grant funding for design and construction on the TH10/CSAH11 project to move the project forward as quickly as possible. Chad Hausmann shared that Wright County submitted an application for the BUILD grant for \$2 million for the design and planning process for the river crossing project. They're expecting an answer by the end of June. Both counties have requested a letter of support from the CMRP nonprofit entity. There was group consensus that there should be a formal motion to approve the letters of support.

Motion: Approve the Letters of Support from CMRP for both the Sherburne and Wright County BUILD Grant applications. Motion by Lloyd Hilgart. Second by Darek Vetsch. The motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

d. Update on Tier 1 RFP Process and Timeline

Andrew Witter shared that with the Tier 1 EIS expected to begin in 2027, they anticipate beginning work on the RFP in Q3 of 2026 to allow for the RFP to go through the necessary approval processes. They could work on it earlier but would be asking the consultants to take on additional risk and liability by selecting a consultant before the Tier 1 has been fully approved to move forward. Wright and Sherburne County will

develop the RFP draft and circulate it to the county boards, MnDOT, and the CMRP group, and then send the final RFP to consultants in Q4.

e. Monticello Chamber Luncheon

Marc Mattice shared an update on the Chamber luncheon that will be taking place next week on March 17. Angie Bersaw, county staff, and MnDOT will be giving project updates. Darek Vetsch will give a CMRP organizational update.

4. Update on Other Area Projects

a. State Highway 25 Buffalo to Monticello

Wright County shared that they will have a pre-construction meeting with the contractor for this project next week, where they will confirm the expected construction schedule and will share any updates with CMRP.

b. State Highway 24, Clearwater

Wright County shared that this is two projects: an interchange project led by MnDOT which is opening bids in April, and another section led by the county with a bid date staggered behind the interchange.

Darek Vetsch shared that he had received several questions about whether there would be road closures for the project. Wright County staff anticipate that there will be intermittent bridge closures and will check on other potential road closures.

c. Wright County CSAH 39

Wright County shared that this is an ongoing project and is being completed in small chunks every few years, with a 1-2 mile section planned for construction in 2029. The total stretch is between 7 and 8 miles.

d. TH10/CSAH 11 Interchange

Sherburne County shared that they are meeting frequently to discuss the project and keep it moving forward. They have been working with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) who has been highly involved and interested in the project. Most of the anticipated improvements will be east of where the current alignment is to avoid impacting the businesses and industrial park on the west side.

e. TH 25 between Mississippi River and Big Lake

Sherburne County is working with MnDOT to focus on preservation and maintenance. Working on driving improvements on alignment. MnDOT has completed their study on Highway 25 between Monticello and Big Lake and have recommendations and improvements. They have the project slated for 2031, but it isn't clear exactly what the improvements will be yet.

5. Other Business

Lloyd Hilgart added an update on improvements to I-94 in Monticello. There is planned redecking next year, and then in 2031 further planned improvements, including a roundabout at 4th street and removing the signal at River Street.

6. Adjournment

Motion: Adjourn this meeting of the Central Mississippi River Partnership Board of Directors. Moved by Darek Vetsch. Seconded by Lloyd Hilgart. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 8:45am on Thursday, March 12, 2026.

Minutes recorded by:

Emma Nelson, Director of Association Management, Flaherty & Hood, P.A.

Approved by:

Pending approval by the CMRP Board of Directors.

Lloyd Hilgart,
CMRP Secretary

Dated: _____

Darek Vetsch,
CMRP Chair

Dated: _____

Emma Nelson,
Staff

Dated: _____

Management Report

Central Mississippi River Partnership
For the period ended May 31, 2026



Prepared by
Carpenter Evert & Associates

Prepared on
June 4, 2026

Table of Contents

Statement of Activity 3

Statement of Financial Position 4

A/P Aging Summary 5

A/R Aging Summary Report 6

Statement of Activity

May 2026

	Total
REVENUE	
4100 Income	
4200 Other Income	
4210 Interest Paid	5.45
Total 4200 Other Income	5.45
Total 4100 Income	5.45
Total Revenue	5.45
GROSS PROFIT	5.45
EXPENDITURES	
Total Expenditures	
NET OPERATING REVENUE	5.45
NET REVENUE	\$5.45

Statement of Financial Position

As of May 31, 2026

	Total
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Bank Accounts	
1000 MidWestOne Checking (0119)	68,557.46
Total Bank Accounts	68,557.46
Total Current Assets	68,557.46
TOTAL ASSETS	\$68,557.46
LIABILITIES AND EQUITY	
Liabilities	
Total Liabilities	
Equity	
3000 Opening Balance Equity	100.00
Retained Earnings	25,781.32
Net Revenue	42,676.14
Total Equity	68,557.46
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND EQUITY	\$68,557.46

A/P Aging Summary

As of May 31, 2026

This report contains no data for your specified date range.

A/R Aging Summary Report

This report contains no data for your specified date range.

CMRP Operating Budget (1/1/2026-12/31/2026)

As of 5/31/2026

Budget reserve	Opening	Dedication	Total
	\$ 100.00	\$ 25,781.32	\$ 25,881.32

Operating Income	Budgeted	Actual to Date	Difference	% Budget Realized
Government Partner Memberships	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ -	100%
City of Becker	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ -	100%
Becker Township	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ -	100%
City of Big Lake	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ -	100%
Big Lake Township	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ -	100%
City of Monticello	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ -	100%
Sherburne County	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$ -	100%
Wright County	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$ -	100%
Affiliate Memberships	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Total Operating Income	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ -	100%

Other Income	Budgeted	Actual to Date	Difference	% Budget Realized
Grants	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Interest Paid	\$ 50.00	\$ 22.72	\$ (27.28)	45%
Other Income	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Total Other Income	\$ 50.00	\$ 22.72	\$ (27.28)	45%

Expenditures	Budgeted	Actual to Date	Difference	% Budget Realized
Consultant/Professional Fees	\$ 38,500.00	\$ 9,230.72	\$ 29,269.28	24%
Operations & Administration	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 8,750.00	\$ 26,250.00	25%
Project Support	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Accounting & Tax Preparation	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 480.72	\$ 3,019.28	14%
Other Expenses	\$ 3,305.00	\$ 615.86	\$ 2,689.14	19%
Outreach/Marketing	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -	\$ 2,000.00	0%
Mileage & Travel	\$ 300.00	\$ 121.08	\$ 178.92	40%
Printing & Postage	\$ 250.00	\$ 45.30	\$ 204.70	18%
Accounting Software	\$ 420.00	\$ 410.48	\$ 9.52	98%
Email/Marketing Software	\$ 240.00	\$ 39.00	\$ 201.00	16%
Website & Hosting Fees	\$ 60.00	\$ -	\$ 60.00	0%
Online Payment Processing Fees	\$ 35.00	\$ -	\$ 35.00	0%
Expenditures Total	\$ 41,805.00	\$ 9,846.58	\$ 31,958.42	24%

	2026 Budgeted	2026 Actual	\$ Difference	% Budget Realized
Operating Income	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ -	100%
Other Income	\$ 50.00	\$ 22.72	\$ (27.28)	45%
Total Income	\$ 52,550.00	\$ 52,522.72	\$ (27.28)	100%
Total Expenditures	\$ 41,805.00	\$ 9,846.58	\$ 31,958.42	24%
Balance	\$ 10,745.00	\$ 42,676.14		



JUNE 11, 2026

TO: CMRP BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: CMRP STAFF

SUBJECT: PROPOSED CMRP 2027 MEMBERSHIP DUES SCHEDULE

Summary

The CMRP Board of Directors is responsible for determining the annual membership fee for Government Partners. CMRP staff recommend that the Board set the 2027 dues schedule to allow Government Partners to plan for their CMRP dues in their upcoming budgets.

Proposed Dues Schedule

CMRP staff recommend that the Board set the 2027 membership dues for Government Partners at the following amounts, which reflect no changes from the 2026 membership dues schedule:

County – \$25,000

City – \$500

Township – \$500

Following the approval of the 2027 CMRP membership dues schedule, staff will send a notice to Government Partners with their dues amount. Invoices will be sent in late 2026 to be paid before January 1, 2027.

Recommended Action

Approve the 2026 CMRP membership dues schedule for Government Partners.



JUNE 11, 2026

TO: CMRP BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: CMRP STAFF

SUBJECT: PROPOSED CMRP 2027 WORK PLAN

Summary

Per the bylaws of the Central Mississippi River Partnership (CMRP), the Board of Directors must approve a work plan for the following year by July 31 of each year. The following proposed work plan is based on the work already completed, the current project status, and projected future needs.

Proposed Work Plan for 2027

- Work with Bolton & Menk to support final project pre-scoping efforts, including additional stakeholder coordination, purpose and need updates, additional work related to the state Wild & Scenic River designation, and traffic/safety sensitivity analysis.
- Support the initial stages of the Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the river crossing project.
- Create an advocacy plan to map out increased state and federal legislative activities.
- Engage in lobbying and advocacy efforts at both the state and federal levels to secure additional funding for project planning and construction.
- Utilize member resources to better inform and engage with the public about the status of the river crossing project and the role of CMRP.
- Build and strengthen the CMRP affiliate membership program.
- Continue to support other regional transportation projects and ensure regional unification and support.

Recommended Action

Approve the proposed 2027 CMRP work plan.

CMRP Proposed Operating Budget (1/1/2027-12/31/2027)

Budget reserve	Opening	Dedication	Total
	\$ 25,881.32	\$ 10,745.00	\$ 36,626.32

Operating Income	2026 Budgeted	2026 Actual To Date	2027 Budgeted
Government Partner Memberships	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00
City of Becker	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00
Becker Township	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00
City of Big Lake	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00
Big Lake Township	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00
City of Monticello	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00
Sherburne County	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
Wright County	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
Affiliate Memberships	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Operating Income	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00

Other Income	2026 Budgeted	2026 Actual To Date	2027 Budgeted
Grants	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Interest Paid	\$ 50.00	\$ 22.72	\$ 50.00
Other Income	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Other Income	\$ 50.00	\$ 22.72	\$ 50.00

Expenditures	2026 Budgeted	2026 Actual To Date	2027 Budgeted
Consultant/Professional Fees	\$ 38,500.00	\$ 9,230.72	\$ 37,800.00
Operations & Administration	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 8,750.00	\$ 35,000.00
Project Support	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Advocacy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Accounting & Tax Preparation	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 480.72	\$ 2,800.00
Other Expenses	\$ 3,305.00	\$ 615.86	\$ 2,671.00
Outreach/Marketing	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,500.00
Mileage & Travel	\$ 300.00	\$ 121.08	\$ 300.00
Printing & Postage	\$ 250.00	\$ 45.30	\$ 200.00
Accounting Software	\$ 420.00	\$ 410.48	\$ 420.00
Email/Marketing Software	\$ 240.00	\$ 39.00	\$ 156.00
Website & Hosting Fees	\$ 60.00	\$ -	\$ 60.00
Online Payment Processing Fees	\$ 35.00	\$ -	\$ 35.00
Expenditures Total	\$ 41,805.00	\$ 9,846.58	\$ 40,471.00

	2026 Budgeted	2026 Actual	2027 Budgeted
Operating Income	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 52,500.00
Other Income	\$ 50.00	\$ 22.72	\$ 50.00
Total Income	\$ 52,550.00	\$ 52,522.72	\$ 52,550.00
Total Expenditures	\$ 41,805.00	\$ 9,846.58	\$ 40,471.00
Balance	\$ 10,745.00	\$ 42,676.14	\$ 12,079.00

Tier 1 EIS Pre-Scoping Methodology
I-94 to Hwy 10 Mississippi River Crossing

Topic	PEL Recommendations for Tier I EIS Analysis <i>What does the PEL Final Report say should be investigated further in the Tier 1 EIS?</i>	Proposed Tier 1 Analysis Approach <i>What are the topics that need further investigation to identify a single preferred corridor alternative? Assume 15-20% design. What are the required steps to conducting that analysis?</i>	Pre-Scoping Agency Coordination <i>Who do we propose to coordinate with at this pre-scoping stage to get buy-in on the proposed Tier 1 analysis approach?</i>	Agency Discussion Topics <i>What questions do we need answered from the agencies to continue to define the proposed Tier 1 analysis approach and scope of work?</i>
Wild and Scenic River	July 24, 2025, DNR Letter: Limit new crossings of Wild & Scenic River, consistent with the Wild and Scenic Management Plan <i>Note: Other sections of DNR letter are covered in Water Resources, T&E, and Natural Resources rows below.</i>	Confirm & document no filling in wetlands per 6105.0160 (4) Confirm & document whether each alternative meets requirements per 6105.0200, and associated future permits needed. This may require some alignment adjustments to comply with these requirements. Confirm & document compliance or opportunities related to interagency coordination recommendations under 6105.0880, specifically supb C & D.	MnDNR, SHPO, USACE, MNDOT, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, MPCA (possibly)	Draining or filling of wetlands within wild, scenic, or recreational river land use districts is prohibited (MN Rule 6105.0160. Subp. 4). Will we need total wetland avoidance?
Water Resources	Future studies will need to re-evaluate impacts to wetlands, floodplains, and water resources based on refined project design information. Wetland delineations will be necessary to accurately determine impacts to wetlands. July 24, 2025, DNR Letter: - Determine ability to meet no-rise requirements. - Consider river velocities and rate of river migration and sediment deposition. - No approach fill is allowed for new crossings in the floodway.	Level 1 wetland delineations Prepare preliminary Hydraulic Impact Assessments using available FEMA Models as the basis to confirm the following for each alternative: - Alternatives can achieve No Rise, or document they meet regulatory requirements for a CLOMR/LOMR. - Confirm abutment locations and bridge length meets State Statutes for public waters. 6115.0231 (Subp.2)(B)(1-2) - Assess potential impacts to velocity or channel stability within the public water limits, and any stabilization measures needed for each alternative. - Identify freeboard recommendations for bridge/roadway profile, related to recreational use.	MnDNR, MPCA, USACE	Can the project achieve no degradation of waters? Does a Stream Quantification Tool (SQT) need to be completed in the Tier 1 EIS? What are the work in waters exclusion dates? What existing floodplain modeling or channel bathymetry is available through this study area? If limited data is available, or it is outdated, will bathymetric surveys be required to complete current modeling? Concerns have been posed by the DNR regarding impacts to stream sediment transport impacts. Is sediment transport modeling needed at the Tier I EIS stage, or is assessing hydraulic characteristics like shear forces and velocity adequate? Sediment transport modeling could be available in the Tier II EIS for the preferred alternative when bridge design detail is known for in-river piers (e.g., number location, size, spacing, etc.).

Tier 1 EIS Pre-Scoping Methodology
I-94 to Hwy 10 Mississippi River Crossing

Topic	PEL Recommendations for Tier I EIS Analysis <i>What does the PEL Final Report say should be investigated further in the Tier 1 EIS?</i>	Proposed Tier 1 Analysis Approach <i>What are the topics that need further investigation to identify a single preferred corridor alternative? Assume 15-20% design. What are the required steps to conducting that analysis?</i>	Pre-Scoping Agency Coordination <i>Who do we propose to coordinate with at this pre-scoping stage to get buy-in on the proposed Tier 1 analysis approach?</i>	Agency Discussion Topics <i>What questions do we need answered from the agencies to continue to define the proposed Tier 1 analysis approach and scope of work?</i>
Threatened and Endangered Species	Future environmental processes should include a MnDNR Natural Heritage Information System review, Federal USFW IPAC tool review, and the project must comply with floodplain regulations. July 24, 2025 DNR Letter: - Determine potential impacts to river islands managed by DNR fisheries requiring DNR PWW permit - Consider impact to known State-protected species.	Federal and state-listed threatened and endangered species survey needs, bald eagle nest locations, tree clearing amounts, habitat assessments Consider species that may be listed soon Work restriction dates for tree clearing, etc.	MnDNR, USFWS	What are federal and state-listed threatened and endangered species habitat assessment and survey needs? Determine timing of NHIS request, IPAC tool review, survey, etc. since NHIS letters are initially only valid for 1 year.
Natural Resources (NPCs and MBS sites)	Minimize impacts on natural resources by considering alignment modifications to avoid and/or minimize impacts to MBS Sites and river stability. July 24, 2025 DNR Letter: -Analyze ability to avoid or minimize impacts to rare resources.	Habitat mapping to identify Native Plant Communities (NPC) and confirm Minnesota Biological Survey (MBS) sites	MnDNR	Can we determine actual native plant community boundaries rather than use shapefiles? What are MBS site restrictions?
Section 6(f)	Additional analysis of potential Section 6(f) impacts	Determine limits of Wild and Scenic River designated lands purchased with Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) and all other Section 6(f) resources listed in the LAWCON database (e.g., Montissippi County Park).	MnDNR	Calculate potential Section 6(f) impacts and outline potential avoidance or minimization and mitigation analysis needed in Tier 1 EIS.
US Coast Guard	The reach of the waterway is not actually navigated other than by logs, log rafts, rowboats, canoes, and small motorboats, therefore it will not require a Coast Guard permit.	Coordinate to ensure the lowest portion of the superstructure of the bridge across the waterway clears the high water pursuant to 33 CFR 115.70.	US Coast Guard	Determine design coordination timing for plan review to secure Coast Guard Advanced Approval letter (in lieu of permit)

Tier 1 EIS Pre-Scoping Methodology
I-94 to Hwy 10 Mississippi River Crossing

Topic	PEL Recommendations for Tier I EIS Analysis <i>What does the PEL Final Report say should be investigated further in the Tier 1 EIS?</i>	Proposed Tier 1 Analysis Approach <i>What are the topics that need further investigation to identify a single preferred corridor alternative? Assume 15-20% design. What are the required steps to conducting that analysis?</i>	Pre-Scoping Agency Coordination <i>Who do we propose to coordinate with at this pre-scoping stage to get buy-in on the proposed Tier 1 analysis approach?</i>	Agency Discussion Topics <i>What questions do we need answered from the agencies to continue to define the proposed Tier 1 analysis approach and scope of work?</i>
Cultural Resources	Cultural resources will need to follow Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as regulated by 36 CFR part 800 and Minnesota Statute 138.	A Phase IA (Desktop) cultural resources review can be completed to identify previously recorded archaeological sites and inventoried or National Register properties and previously completed surveys. This desktop review can be used to determine probability for additional cultural resources. Once a preferred alternative is chosen, field studies and evaluations can take place.	State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA), MN Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs); Will MnDOT Cultural Resources Unit (CRU) be involved?	Are there any initial concerns from a Tribal perspective regarding the river's cultural history?