



NORTHERN
ROCHESTER
TRANSPORTATION STUDY

SRF No. 0096730 0270

PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING

RECORD OF MEETING NO. 10

DATE: Thursday, November 12, 2009

LOCATION: Mn/DOT District 6 Offices

START: 9:30 a.m. DRAFT DATE: November 17, 2009

ADJOURN: 4:00 p.m. APPROVAL DATE: March 3, 2010

ATTENDEES: See Attendance List (end of document)

Meeting Discussion

I. Approval of Previous Minutes

- September 24, 2009 conference call #4 minutes were tabled until next meeting. The City did not receive minutes. SRF to re-send.
- PMT 9 (October 8th) minutes were tabled. Agencies requested additional time to review last minute edits/entries. Agencies to provide comments to SRF by noon on Monday, November 16th.
- October 22, 2009 conference call #5 minutes have not yet been distributed.

II. Tasks

- **Task No. 1 – Project Management and Coordination**
 - Action item list is being updated and will be distributed for review.
 - Reallocation of Costs - SRF presented a letter and documentation for budget revisions due to cultural resources change in scope and Mn/DOT coordination.
 - Schedule and Budget: The PMT is currently behind the original schedule, but this is due to approach and effort being put into finding appropriate solutions. The budget for Phase I appears okay, but there is much to be done. Whereas the current approach, effort and timeline is causing some task overruns, SRF is hopeful the approach will lead to lesser effort needed in the Benefit/Cost and CORSIM tasks.

- The following should be added to the Distribution List for PMT materials: Gary Shannon (City), Charlie Reiter (ROCOG), Kaye Bieniek (County), and Kevin Kleithermes (FHWA).

- **Task No. 3 – Data Collection**

- Review of 55th Street and 65th Street Bridges indicates they both have about one foot of excess clearance. This is the amount needed to convert the bridges to single point interchanges.
- SRF to verify cost components of a conversion to a SPUI. Does the deck need to be fully replaced? Identify what items can be salvaged (e.g., piers, abutments, girders, etc.).
- SRF to review previous conversions to determine how staging and maintenance of traffic was handled.
- The PMT wants to get a better handle on costs and try to determine if conversion to SPUI is more/less cost effective than widening and/or replacing the existing bridges.
- SRF to refine SPUI geometric drawings and cost estimates for the next meeting.

- **Task No. 4 – Confirm Issues and Need**

- Technical Memorandum No. 3:
 - Purpose & Need test was removed from the body of the memorandum and placed into a discussion memorandum and used as an appendix.
 - Appendix A, page 2 – verify that the second paragraph under *Mobility and Capacity* is consistent with the body of the technical memorandum.
 - The PMT to provide additional comments by noon on Monday, November 16th.
 - Page numbers are to be added.
 - Revise date to identify the latest version.

- **Task No. 5 – Initial Concepts**

- Technical Memorandum No. 4:
 - For consistency, the memorandum has been edited to update the naming conventions within the exhibits.
 - Appendix A was added (ADT figures).
 - Figures 2 and 3 had alternative names and cumulative notes added.
 - Revise date to identify new version.

- Figure 2, starting at Alternative E₂, verify where initial improvements are included.
- The PMT discussed Table 1 (First-level Screening of Initial Concept). The thresholds used for the screening are not consistent. Generally, a range of volumes is used, as this is a planning level evaluation; whereas, the finite numbers currently being used are either on the high or low ends of the general ranges. The PMT discussed going back to ranges, since this is a planning level effort. The PMT discussed and agreed to the following:

Freeway Ramps	12,000 – 15,000 ADT
4-lane divided roadway	28,000 – 32,000 ADT
6-lane divided roadway	48,000 – 56,000 ADT
6-lane freeway	90,000 – 120,000 ADT

[Subsequent to the PMT meeting it was recommended that the 6-lane divided roadway capacity be revised to 48,000 to 55,000 ADT]

- The PMT also discussed adding language to the technical memorandum to identify that additional criteria related to social and economic factors will also be used in the evaluation process.

– Screening Criteria/Evaluation Matrix:

- The PMT discussed the use of the evaluation matrix developed to date.
- Based upon traffic operations, it would appear that Alternatives E₃, F₃ and G₃ provide the most improvement. However, Alternative E₃ does not create a lot of improvement on 55th Street.
- The PMT also felt it was important to determine the overall importance of the west frontage road, as well as how the WFR system improvements compare to the cost and right of way impacts.
- The PMT discussed how the project might be phased, but that subject was tabled as it is not relevant to choosing a preferred alternative.
- The PMT will continue to discuss evaluation opportunities and look to pare-down alternatives and sub-options.

- **Task No. 6 – Concept Evaluation**

– LOS Exhibits:

- Exhibits 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b and 4 have not changed.
- Exhibits 2, 2.1, 3, 3.1 and 5 have not changed.
- Exhibits 7, 7a, 8 and 8a have had minor edits but no major changes based upon the last round of comments. Some additional

comments pertaining to format, labels, clarifications, and LOS thresholds will be added for the next meeting.

- For Alternatives A through D, the WFR is assumed to be located at 34th Street. For Alternatives E through G, the WFR is assumed to be located at the westerly location.
- In response to Mn/DOT's earlier question regarding the differences between LOS and delay results between Exhibit 7a, Alternative D, scenarios 3 and 4 compared to Exhibit 3b, Alternative D; SRF noted that the differences was a result of the traffic signal cycle length used in each alternative. The analysis for the single-point interchange (under Exhibit 7a, Alternative D, scenarios 3 and 4) assumed a longer cycle length than what was used for the existing interchange configuration (under Exhibit 3b, Alternative D). The longer cycle length results in longer delays and lower levels of service.
- The PMT asked why the ramps start failing with SPUI versus PARCLO in Alternative D, Exhibit 7? SRF will review the traffic models and report back to the PMT.

– Preliminary Weaving Analysis:

- Worst case scenario (closest ramp nose spacing) was identified as a SPUI at both 55th Street and 65th Street, and used in this analysis.
- In general, analysis shows that freeway sections do not provide LOS C without an auxiliary lane, and the addition of auxiliary lanes does provide LOS C for all segments.
- Therefore, use of auxiliary lanes should provide a LOS C. As interchange configurations are selected at 55th and 65th, the weave analysis will be recomputed to verify need.
- SRF to post HCS pdf's on FTP site for review.
- Add Alternative G₃ to the analysis.
- SRF to review PM peak densities.

– Task No. 7 – Environmental Documentation:

- SRF to send copies of Draft Contaminated Sites Report to the City and District.

– Task No. 14 – Public Involvement:

- PMT discussed the message they wanted to convey to the public. Part of this message is to educate the public on the process to be followed and how that relates to the potential improvements.
- A pdf of the newsletter to be posted on the web site.
- SRF to look into the web site to see if it can be set up so viewers can send in comments through it.

- 270 direct mailings went out to area residents and business owners. Press releases have been sent to the newspaper and radio.
- The PMT discussed using various stations to illustrate the various parts of the project.
- Quick Facts sheet was reviewed. This document is to be greatly modified. More succinct definition of the project, safety issues, area map, volume increases, etc. SRF to re-craft and get a new version to the PMT as soon as possible.
- Comment form was reviewed. A number of edits were identified to aid in clarity and readability. Looking to offer Attendees the opportunity to offer opinions.
- Presentation was reviewed. The purpose is to describe to Attendees how the meeting/comment process works, as well as how the Project Development Process works.
- SRF staff to man the various stations. City staff will man the welcome table. Mn/DOT staff to attend and be available to answer questions.

III. Next Meetings

- November 19, 2009 Public Information Meeting; no conference call
- December 10, 2009 PMT #11, 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., Mn/DOT D6 offices
- December 17, 2009 Conference call #6, 1:00 to 3:00 p.m.
- January 14, 2010 PMT #12, 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., Mn/DOT D6 offices

KH/bls

NORTHERN ROCHESTER TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Project Management Team Meeting No. 10

November 12, 2009

ATTENDEES

PMT Members		Phone	Email
X	Rhonda Prestegard, Mn/DOT D6	507-286-7511	rhonda.prestegard@state.mn.us
X	Richard Freese, City of Rochester	507-328-2426	rfreese@rochestermn.gov
X	Ken Holte, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-249-6732	kholte@srfconsulting.com
PMT Member's Staff:			
X	Greg Paulson, Mn/DOT D6	507-286-7502	greg.paulson@state.mn.us
X	Michael Schweyen, Mn/DOT D6	507-286-7636	michael.schweyen@state.mn.us
	Craig Lenz, Mn/DOT D6	507-286-7542	craig.lenz@state.mn.us
X	Jeff Bunch, Mn/DOT D6	507-286-7557	jeffrey.bunch@state.mn.us
X	Fausto Cabral, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7552	Fausto.Cabral@state.mn.us
X	Mark Trogstad-Isaacson, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7607	Mark.Trogstad-Isaacson@state.mn.us
X	John Paulson, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7614	John.J.Paulson@state.mn.us
X	Kristin Calliguri, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7684	kristin.calliguri@state.mn.us
X	Kristine Hernandez, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-285-7364	kristine.hernandez@state.mn.us
X	Gary Reihl, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7608	gary.reihl@state.mn.us
	Gary Shannon, City of Rochester (partial)	507-328-2430	gshannon@rochestermn.gov
	Mike Nigbur, City of Rochester (partial)	507-328-2410	mnigbur@rochestermn.gov
X	John Hagen, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-249-6726	jhagen@srfconsulting.com
	Marie Cote, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-249-6716	mcote@srfconsulting.com
	Angela Bersaw, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-475-0010	abersaw@srfconsulting.com
X	Kevin Jullie, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-249-6711	kjullie@srfconsulting.com
Project Partners:			
	Mike Sheehan, Olmsted County	507-328-7070	sheehan.michael@co.olmsted.mn.us
X	Kaye Bieniek, Olmsted County	507-328-7070	bieniek.kaye@co.olmsted.mn.us
	Charlie Reiter, ROCOG	507-328-7136	reiter.charlie@co.olmsted.mn.us
	Kevin Kleithermes, FHWA	651-291-6123	kevin.kliethermes@fhwa.dot.gov.us

