
Subject	Webinar: BNSF Bismarck Bridge 196.6 Replacement Design Concepts Considered
Prepared by	Aimee Angel, Lori Price
Location	Webinar through JoinMe.com
Date/Time	Wednesday November 13, 2019 - 2:00 P.M. (Eastern)
Participants	Rob McCaskey, Sally Sugarman, and Brian Dunn/USCG; Emily Sakariassen and Susan Dingle/Preservation North Dakota; Erik Sakariassen/Fort Abraham Lincoln; Mark Zimmerman and Susan Wefald/FORB; Amy Sakariassen/NTHP; Lorna Meidinger/North Dakota SHPO; Kitty Henderson/Historic Bridge Foundation; Matt Robertson; Chris Wilson/ACHP; Jim Neubauer/City of Mandan; City of Bismarck; David Mayer/Bismarck Parks; Aimee Angel and Lori Price/Jacobs; Mike Herzog, Dava Kaitala, and Amy McBeth/BNSF

Notes

Rob McCaskey (USCG) opened the meeting.

- Asked everyone on the line to post their names in the chat room as a virtual sign in sheet. (Although there were 32 participants shown on the call, only 21 participants signed in.)
- There will be breaks in the presentation to ask questions.

Mike Herzog (BNSF) began presentation.

- Introduced the project and 4 design concepts
- Explained that the bridge was a condition-based replacement
- Provided the purpose and need for the project
- The Project:
 - Needs piers that can accept a future second track
 - Must have minimal impacts on environment and public
 - Must meet optimal cost, schedule and efficiency.
- Concept variables are length of span and how far north the new span would be located
 - Q & A:
 - Susan Wefald – You held a public meeting in 2017 and announced that the new bridges would be at 80 feet and 30 feet. Now that has changed to 92.5 feet. Why the change?

Mike Herzog – (Fast forwarded presentation to slide “West End – Missouri River Natural Area”). Clarified that distance has not changed – 92.5 feet is the average distance between the proposed and existing track/bridge.
- Mike Herzog presented Concept 1 – 200-foot spans, piers 92.5 feet upstream; bridges are very close, piers 10 feet apart

- Discussed issues with right-of-way (ROW) on the east end and with the Missouri River Natural Area on the west end
- Would require massive 30-foot tall retaining walls and property from the Missouri River Natural Area (which has an easement restricting development.)
- Q & A:
 - Emily Sakariassen – (regarding the Missouri River Natural Area) When did you get information from DOT and can we get a copy?
 - Amy McBeth – That information is in the project binder - Consulting Party Meeting 5 tab
- Mike Herzog presented Concept 2 – 400-foot spans, piers 92.5 feet upstream
 - The longer spans will require falsework; cannot guarantee that the falsework would be down before winter. Having the falsework up through the winter would increase the risk of flooding from ice jams.
 - There are two ways to plan for a future double track – can construct larger trusses or larger piers. Larger trusses are very expensive.
 - Concept 2 is less efficient – discussed the differences between various pier designs
 - Q & A:
 - Chris Wilson – When you look at single vs. double track, what does your analysis show for rail traffic?
 - Mike Herzog – We know rail traffic will eventually increase. Where we know that, it's our policy to build a bridge that can handle the eventual second track to save on expense and environmental impacts.
 - Mark Zimmerman – Are you talking about double tracking all the way through Bismarck?
 - Mike Herzog – We don't have plans in development for the double track, but we are planning for the future. Getting across a river is a major undertaking and there is an opportunity to prepare for a future double track now.
 - Mark Zimmerman – We should be addressing the issue of the bridge over I-194 now.
 - Mike Herzog – I would ask that you hold that question until we get through Concept 4.
- Difference between Bismarck and Sibley was discussed.
 - Truss erection – falsework is needed because the bridge has two spans over land. It's not entirely over water like the Sibley bridge. Because of that, BNSF cannot float in a complete span (as they could in Sibley). Falsework would be required and could block the river flow.
 - Q & A:
 - None
- Mike Herzog presented Concept 3 - 200-foot spans, piers 42.5 feet upstream
 - This concept encroaches on the water supply reservoir; requires a smaller retaining wall at Missouri River Natural Area.
 - May have to change the bridge over I-194; financial assumption does not include the replacement of the I-194 bridge.
 - Q & A:

- David Mayer – Have you looked at the hydraulic flow of the river’s edge with the piers being so close to the shoreline? I am concerned with the potential erosion of the bank and possibly compromising the trail up-slope on the Bismarck side.
 - Mike Herzog – We do not anticipate any scour issues.
 - Susan Wefald – How big are the piers shown in brown?
 - Mike Herzog – Referred to slide “Concept 2 – Efficiency Reduction” (slide 22).
 - Mark Zimmerman – Is there any documentation of the conversation between BNSF and the City of Bismarck about the impacts to the water reservoirs or the Missouri River Natural Area?
 - Mike Herzog – We have had conversations with North Dakota Department of Transportation (NDOT) and we have reviewed the easement documents. The Missouri River Natural Area is a protected area. On the east end, grading line and slope stability has been a constant problem since 1880.
 - Mark Zimmerman – Do you have documentation of the costs and a response from the City? I disagree with the opinion that you can’t use the Missouri River Natural Area. Efforts can be made to mitigate your impact to the area.
 - Amy McBeth – Referred back to project binder and to the response from NDOT (Consulting Parties Meeting 5).
 - Mark Zimmerman – Does not feel like the effort to use part of the Missouri River Natural Area has been fully explored.
 - Amy McBeth referenced the Statement of Management for the Missouri River Natural Area.
 - Mark Zimmerman – Requested additional consultation and work be done with NDOT to more fully evaluate the option of using land at the Missouri River Natural Area.
- Mike Herzog presented Concept 4 - 200-foot spans, piers 20 feet upstream
 - Q & A:
 - None
 - Mike Herzog presented a side-by-side comparison of the four concepts
 - Emily Sakariassen – Complimented Mike Herzog on the presentation and asked if there is any avenue to address additional impacts on the public.
 - Rob McCaskey – Stated that those impacts could be discussed. Asked what specifically she wanted to talk about.
 - Emily Sakariassen – Stated she will review the presentation and whittle down her ideas and questions to suggest future agenda items.
 - Mike Herzog – Cost and schedule for BNSF has to continue to be a factor.
 - Chris Wilson - This meeting was to bring everyone up to speed from the BNSF perspective and is not considered a consultation meeting.
 - Shelly Sugarman – Wanted to get everyone up to speed. The next step is to put all of this and the feedback received earlier into a draft PA, send the draft out for buy-in, then get back together to discuss.

Webinar ended.