



NORTHERN
ROCHESTER
TRANSPORTATION STUDY

PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING
RECORD OF MEETING NO. 11

DATE: Thursday, December 10, 2009

LOCATION: Conference Call (due to weather)

START: 9:30 a.m. DRAFT DATE: January 12, 2010

ADJOURN: 1:00 p.m. APPROVAL DATE: March 3, 2010

ATTENDEES: See Attendance List (end of document)

Meeting Discussion

I. Approval of Previous Minutes

- PMT confirmed that minutes from the September 24th conference call and October 8th PMT were approved on November 17th prior to the Open House.
- November 12th, 2009 (PMT 10) minutes were approved as revised.
- October 22nd conference call minutes are still pending.

II. Tasks

- **Task No. 1 – Project Management and Coordination**
 - FTP site has been experiencing some access problems and space issues when loading materials to the site. The City will look into expanding the space allotted to the site, and SRF will implement a process by which materials will be removed and archived in order to keep FTP site from being overloaded and contain the most recent materials.
 - Action item list continues to be updated and will be distributed after the New Year.
 - Reallocation of Costs – The City and Mn/DOT agreed that the shift in costs was acceptable. The City will sign the letter and return to SRF. [SUBSEQUENT NOTE – due to joint powers agreement between the City and Mn/DOT, Mn/DOT is requiring a contract amendment for these costs in order for their auditing process to be consistent with state protocols.]

- **Task No. 3 – Data Collection**

- Review of 55th Street Bridge conversion to SPUI – the as-built drawing show additional vertical clearance created during the ROC52 project. This will be advantageous and allow the conversion to be more easily accomplished. The PMT reviewed sketches of two options developed by SRF. The first is a splayed configuration (\$3.9M) of the bridge beams, and the second is a more traditional rectangular girder placement (\$5.2M); however, due to the ramp angles associated with a SPUI, the bridge is actually longer parallel to TH 52. In either scenario, the existing girders would not be reusable in the new bridge but could be salvaged for use elsewhere. The existing abutments and center piers appear to be reusable with the reconfigured bridge:
 - The City wanted to know if the “patio” area on the second option would need to be decked. [Follow-up note: full decking would be needed to provide structural support].
 - Mn/DOT asked about sight distance concerns at the ramp termini. PMT discussed the 19th Street SPUI has the retaining wall run parallel to TH 52 rather than the ramps in order to improve the sight distance at the intersection.
 - SRF to send PDFs of sketches to PMT via FTP site.

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

- Technical Memorandum No. 3: approved November 17, 2009, prior to the Public Open House.

- **Task No. 5 – Initial Concepts**

- Technical Memorandum No. 4: approved November 17, 2009, prior to the Public Open House.
- Screening Criteria/Evaluation Matrix:
 - The PMT discussed the use of the evaluation matrix developed to date. Since the focus of the study to date has been on individual areas of the overall study, and not on an overall system solution, it was discussed that the evaluation matrices should be tailored to each interchange location (55th Street and 65th Street); then the matrices can be used to identify the best solution at each location. The PMT felt it would be good to identify the appropriate Interchange configurations before determining/selecting frontage roads:
 - Add column to identify the basis (data) for each decision.
 - Review operational items.
 - VMT/VHT and crash items need to be added.
 - R/W and construction costs will need to be developed in a comparable fashion.

- Impacts and influence of interchanges on frontage roads needs to be considered.
- Impacts and influences of interchanges on auxiliary lanes need to be considered.
- [Subsequent note: Mn/DOT requested additional measurable criteria be used for impact to travel speed on TH 52 in project area (related to performance target of 60 mph on high priority IRC corridors).]
- Safety: can it be evaluated as to what interchange type might be safer (e.g., SPUI versus a Parclo)?

• **Task No. 6 – Concept Evaluation**

- LOS Exhibits 7, 7a, 7b, 8, 8a, and 8b – LOS content has not changed but some editorial changes have been made based upon comments received. Additional comments include:
 - Define offset frontage road versus realigned frontage road, east and west.
 - Review tables for intersection LOS that may be missing.
 - At 65th Street, the West Frontage Road does not appear to have an operational affect on the interchange LOS.
 - At 65th Street, traffic operations are not likely to be a key factor in differentiating the options.
- Right-in/right-out (RIRO) at 55th Street and Bandel – The PMT reviewed the opportunities to provide this access at the existing intersection. With the Parclo interchange configuration, this RIRO access would not be allowed due to the ramp intersection locations. With the SPUI configuration, the right-out (RO) is not recommended due to its proximity to the ramp, but the right-in (RI) could be allowed if designed appropriately.
- Preliminary Weaving Analysis – Regarding the City’s previous question about the need to analyze a new alternative (H3) to help identify the operational merit of a west frontage road, it was discussed that there would be no significant difference in the forecast volumes from Alt. G (with a WFR) to a new Alt. H (without a WFR) to identify specific impact changes:
 - TH 52 is to maintain a LOS C or better.
 - Preliminary weaving analysis uses Highway Capacity Manual methodology.
 - Since TH 52 is not nearing capacity thresholds with HCS, it is not expected that the CORSIM analysis results will differ much.
 - Auxiliary lanes are not a replacement for a West Frontage Road. Their function is related to the merge/diverge operations on TH 52:

- Alternatives that include a 65th Street interchange without a WFR add approximately 4,000 vehicles per day to TH 52 when compared with 65th Street interchange alternatives that do include a west frontage road.
 - Ramp spacing will have a larger affect on the need for auxiliary lanes.
- VMT/VHT – Exhibit 10 presents a comparison of the preliminary VMT/VHT results of the No-Build (Alternative B), Alternative F, and Alternative G. It should be noted that the VMT/VHT results shown in Exhibit 10 are on a daily basis. The preliminary results show that VMT increase under Alternatives F and G, but the VHT decreases for each (when compared to the No-Build). Alternative F shows the greatest VMT increase, while Alternative G shows the greatest VHT decrease.
- SRF to determine whether these VMT/VHT differences are significant.
- Technical Memorandum 5 was distributed for review. This memorandum will have multiple reviews as it will contain a substantial amount of technical data regarding the traffic operations, as well as document the design criteria being applied and identify the preferred alternative:
- Need to identify which generation of data is being used in the TM.
 - Previous TM addressed the existing and No Build conditions.
- CORSIM – Mn/DOT has now approved both the existing and No Build models so we are positioned to test the Build condition once we select a preferred alternative:
- SRF to review the differences in the Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) of the actual and simulated numbers and explain to PMT.
- **Task No. 7 – Environmental Documentation**
 - Early coordination is complete.
 - Draft Phase I ESA is being reviewed and this includes the amendment to include additional area on the east side of 55th Street.
 - SRF will be doing Noise Modeling for project:
 - The City expressed concerns about 55th Street and TH 52 area and how these studies results might compare to the TH 52 EA/EAW results.
 - SRF to review and identify differences and reasons for them.
 - Wetland verification – SRF has done verification (not delineation) of the area wetlands for use in the EA/EAW:

- The City thought that the Menard's site and/or Nelson properties might have delineation information from their previous permitting process.

– Task No. 14 – Public Involvement:

- Comments have been received and compiled. SRF to look for substantive comments that should be addressed. Also, summarize the attendees by location.
- The PMT thought another open house should be held to present the recommended alternative prior to identifying a specific preferred alternative.
- A few comments on the drawings that were presented at the public meeting were discussed:
 - The insurance company east of McDonalds would be impacted by the realignment of the east frontage road and would likely be a total take.
 - The Clearwater intersection should be shown as a modified – T when the frontage road is located at Chateau.
 - The first house in the NW quadrant of the Clearwater intersection would likely be impacted by alternatives that include the west frontage road through Clearwater. If this alternative moves forward, this property would likely be a total take.
 - The PMT discussed that additional correspondence is needed with these property owners if it appears that these alternatives will move forward to the preferred alternative.

III. Next Meetings

- Mn/DOT is meeting with FHWA on December 15, 2009.
- 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
- PMT meetings to be held the 2nd Thursday of the month – 2/11, 3/11, 4/8 and 5/27
- Conference calls to be held the 4th Thursdays of the month – The PMT identified some conflicts with these dates and will look to identify better options prior to the new year.

NORTHERN ROCHESTER TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Project Management Team Meeting No. 11

December 10, 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
	Fausto Cabral, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7552	Fausto.Cabral@state.mn.us
	Mark Trogstad-Isaacson, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7607	Mark.Trogstad-Isaacson@state.mn.us
	John Paulson, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7614	John.J.Paulson@state.mn.us
	Kristin Calliguri, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7684	kristin.calliguri@state.mn.us
	Kristine Hernandez, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-285-7364	kristine.hernandez@state.mn.us
	Gary Reihl, Mn/DOT D6 (partial)	507-286-7608	gary.reihl@state.mn.us
X	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
	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