

## **65<sup>th</sup> Street Interchange Reconstruction Project Project Management Team Meeting**

### **Record of Meeting No. 2**

Date: August 10, 2011  
Location: City of Rochester office  
Start: 9:00 a.m. Draft Date: August 16, 2011  
Adjourn: 10:30 a.m. Approval Date: September 14, 2011  
Attendees: Richard Freese, Gary Shannon, Doug Nelson, Jeff Bunch, Heather Lukes,  
Mike Schweyen, Ken Holte and Aaron Vacek

#### **Meeting Discussion**

##### **1. Introductions**

- No comments were made and PMT No.1 Minutes were approved.

##### **2. Geometric Layout**

- Status – Comments are being worked through at the district and final comments will be sent to SRF by the end of the week.
- The largest outstanding issue is the weave on NB 52 from 65<sup>th</sup> Street to 75<sup>th</sup> Street. This scenario was modeled and reviewed during the NRTS. At that time, it was agreed that an auxiliary lane was not warranted between 65<sup>th</sup> Street and 75<sup>th</sup> Street. However, MnDOT has indicated the revised ramp alignment alleviates the need for an auxiliary lane. MnDOT needs additional time to finalize their layout comments and address ramp revision specifically.
- Mn/DOT has provided SRF with a sketch of a revised NB TH 52 on-ramp alignment which increases the weaving distance by approximately 200 feet.
- SRF has provided traffic volumes and a revised Ramp alignment which adds 200 feet of weaving distance between the ramps. The final comments will be incorporated into the layout once received and returned to the district for signatures and then forwarded to the Central Office for review. The layout history will be updated to reflect the changes made by the districts comments.
- Central Office Review – comments are expected to be made by Central Office Geometric Design Support Unit, but the hope is they will be limited.

- Design Memo – the memo has been set up to incorporate both State Aid and Trunk Highway Design Tables. MnDOT District 6 will review the document. The City had two additional comments:
  - Page 13, Shoulder width required should be 12 feet left and 10 feet right – not 8 feet.
  - Comments made to the EAW should also be reflected in the Design Memo.
- EAW – The City provided comments to the EAW; SRF will incorporate the City's comments and then forward to MnDOT District 6 for review:
  - The City provided SRF with a copy of the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act Notice of Application.
  - Following the meeting, an email was sent from Jennie Ross at MnDOT that the RGU for the project will be MnDOT, and it will need to be reviewed by Jennie Ross and approved by Frank Pafko.
- Menards Coordination – SRF has received the contact information for the developer and has begun coordinating on the project.
- Sink Holes – the City has retained McGhie & Betts for their knowledge of the area. A Coordination Meeting was scheduled with the City, SRF, AET and McGhie & Betts but due to a conflict, the meeting will need to be rescheduled.
- City Welcome Sign – Visually the sign can be seen after the loop is placed. MnDOT to verify the sign does not need to be relocated (i.e., can remain in place via permit).
- Ramp Pavement – MnDOT will check with staff to determine if there is a District preference. If it is concrete, the returns on the east ramps may need to be rebuilt.
- SAP number – The City is working to acquire a SAP number for the project.

### **3. Noise Wall**

- The Traffic Noise Analysis Report is currently being developed. The City requested that MnDOT clarify termini of the noise analysis – is it at the project termini or does it extend past the end of construction limits?

### **4. Right of Way**

- SRF presented the right of way layout for informational purposes to MnDOT District 6.
- SRF has submitted a proposal to the City to do the right of way acquisitions for the project. The City will review this proposal.

### **5. Signing and Striping**

- TH 52 and Ramp and Loops will follow MnDOT signing and striping standards.
- MnDOT requested that SRF provided signing, striping and lighting plans for an initial review.

- 65<sup>th</sup> Street striping will be ground-in epoxy.
- Opening day configurations for areas of future dual lefts:
  - Ramp A: future condition is dual lefts with a right. Opening day this will be a left, a thru and a right.
  - Loop C: future condition is dual lefts with a right. Opening day will strip out the middle left turn lane, and this striping will be epoxy but not ground in.
  - EB 65<sup>th</sup> Street to Loop B: future condition has dual lefts, opening day will strip out the inner left turn lane, and this striping will be epoxy but not ground in.

## **6. Lighting**

- Gore lighting plan has been developed and will be forwarded to the City and MnDOT for initial review.
- The City requested intersection lighting be added to the ramp termini at 65<sup>th</sup> Street and at the new west frontage road intersection. Lighting would consist of two (2) lights in opposite corners on each intersection.
- The City requested that the conduits and hand holes be installed for the future signals at the ramp terminus and at the west frontage road. It was also requested that the interconnection conduits be installed from the signals at the West Frontage Road to Bandel Road.

## **7. Schedule Review**

- The schedule had been revised to reflect a 2013 construction schedule. At the time of the meeting the RGU was unknown and the schedule reflected the City as the RGU; after the meeting it had been determined that MnDOT is the RGU. With MnDOT as the RGU, the EAW schedule will need to be pushed back approximately one month and a half so that CO can review the document. The letting date will also be pushed back since the City cannot hold a referendum on transportation sales tax until November 6, 2012.

## **8. Design Submittals**

- 50% plan scheduled for submittal Nov 18, 2011.
- 100% plan scheduled for submittal February 10, 2011.

## **9. Other**

- The next meeting is scheduled for September 14th at 9:00 a.m. at the Rochester City offices.
- MnDOT stated that new quality control procedures will need to be followed for the P,S&E plan set.
- SRF to coordinate soil borings with American Engineering Testing. Borings should be included at OH sign locations.

## 10. Action Items

• Geometric layout comments to SRF	MnDOT
• Sinkhole meeting	SRF/City
• Noise Wall analysis termini	MnDOT
• SAP number	City
• Send snapshot of Signing Striping and Lighting Plans to the City and MnDOT	SRF
• Rochester welcomes you sign, remain by permit?	MnDOT
• Review right of way scope of services	City
• Incorporate additional intersection lighting into plan set	SRF
• Verify ramp pavement type	MnDOT
• Incorporate Design Memo comments	SRF
• Incorporate the City's EAW comments and send the document to MnDOT for review	SRF
• Revise schedule to push back EAW and letting date	SRF

These meeting minutes were prepared by SRF Consulting Group, Inc. If there are any questions or comments, please contact Aaron Vacek at 763.475.0010 or [avacek@srfconsulting.com](mailto:avacek@srfconsulting.com).

AMV/bls