

Table 1
Preliminary Summary of Potential Impacts

Environment	Alternatives			
	3 South Alignment	4 North Alignment	5 Mixed Alignment	5A Mixed Alignment + Frontage Road
Total Acres of Wetland Impacts	16.5 ac.	16.4 ac.	17.1 ac.	17.3 ac.
Acres of Wetland Impacts by Quality Ranking¹				
<i>Low - includes roadside ditches and drainage ditches</i>	1.9 ac.	2.1 ac.	2.1 ac.	2.1 ac.
<i>Medium-Low - includes wet meadow reed canary grass and farmed wetlands</i>	6.9 ac.	6.2 ac.	7.7 ac.	7.8 ac.
<i>Medium – includes shallow marsh and jewelweed</i>	2.5 ac.	3.4 ac.	2.5 ac.	2.6 ac.
<i>Higher - includes forested wetlands</i>	0.3 ac.	0.3 ac.	0.3 ac.	0.4 ac.
<i>Highest – includes lakes and lakeshore</i>	4.9 ac.	4.5 ac.	4.5 ac.	4.5 ac.
Floodplains	2.2 ac.	2.2 ac.	2.2 ac.	2.2 ac.
Noise				
<i>Number of Residential Structures²</i>	111	104	111	101
<i>Number of Places of Common Use²</i>	2	2	2	2
<i>Number of Commercial Structures³</i>	11	11	11	11
Cultural and Historic Resources				
<i>Architecture/History – eligible properties</i>	None	None	None	None
<i>Archaeological – eligible properties⁴</i>	None	None	None	None
Right of Way (ROW) (TH 8 + frontage)				
<i>Total ROW Needed</i>	222.4 ac.	225.8 ac.	227.5 ac.	241.0 ac.
<i>Net New ROW Needed</i>	64.6 ac.	67.9 ac.	84.6 ac.	99.7 ac.
<i>Partial Takes - Number of Parcels Affected</i>	118	113	103	92
<i>Full Takes - Number of Parcels Affected</i>	12	15	9	13
<i>Total Combined Parcels Affected</i>	130	128	112	105
Residential Displacements	10	12	7	10
Community Facilities Displaced	None	1	None	None
Parklands / Section 4(f)/6(f)	None	None	None	None
Public Input⁵	●	○	●	●
Estimated Cost (in millions)				
<i>Estimated ROW Cost</i>	\$8.45M	\$12.80M	\$4.83M	\$5.57M
<i>Estimated Project Cost (excluding ROW)</i>	\$18.81M	\$18.81M	\$18.81M	\$18.81M
Total	\$27.26M	\$31.61M	\$23.64M	\$24.38M

Source: URS Team, June 6, 2012

● = Higher public preference for alternative / ● = Some public preference for alternative / ○ = Lower public preference for alternative.

¹The defined quality ranking from “low” to “highest” is a unique classification system specific to the site and is intended for planning purposes only.

²Number of locations where noise sensitive land uses (residential and places of common use) are assessed a noise impact when project noise levels exceed the Minnesota State Noise Standard of 65 dBA (measured as L₁₀ [h]).

³Number of locations where noise sensitive land uses (commercial) are assessed a noise impact when project noise levels exceed the Minnesota State Noise Standard of 70 dBA (measured as L₁₀ [h]).

⁴After selection of preferred alternative, Phase 1 Archaeological survey recommended for one site where land owner permission was denied.

⁵Fifteen persons filled out comment cards at the first public open house in June 2009. Alternative 3 was supported by six persons. Alternative 4 was supported by 2 persons. One of these individuals expressed concern about Alternative 3’s impact on Little Comfort Lake by Concept 3, which has since been changed to have a similar alignment through the isthmus between Big and Little Comfort Lakes. Alternative 5 was supported by three persons. Alternative 5A was supported by three persons. One person expressed equal preference between Alternatives 3 and 5.