

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING**  
**RECORD OF MEETING NO. 12**

DATE: Thursday, January 14, 2010

LOCATION: Mn/DOT District 6 Offices

START: 9:30 a.m. DRAFT DATE: January 20, 2010

ADJOURN: 1:30 p.m. APPROVAL DATE: March 25, 2010

ATTENDEES: See Attendance List (end of document)

**Meeting Discussion**

**I. Approval of Previous Minutes**

- October 22<sup>nd</sup> conference call minutes were discussed. Mn/DOT has provided some comments, but may have additional feedback as staff reviews the document. The City requested that item 2.f be revised to clarify statement or removed entirely. [Subsequent note: item 3.f. on page 2 will be struck from the Oct. 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting minutes].
- December 10, 2009 (PMT No. 11) minutes have been distributed. Mn/DOT has provided some comments, but may have additional feedback as staff reviews the document. The City has not offered any comments to date.
- The PMT agreed to allow more time for review of each of these documents.
- December 17, 2009 conference call minutes are yet to be distributed.

**II. Tasks**

- **Task No. 1 – Project Management and Coordination**
  - The action item list has been updated and posted to the FTP site.
  - Schedule: the current project status is well behind the original schedule. The PMT discussed the need to determine an overall system solution in order for the second phase of the project to get underway.
  - Reallocation of sub-consultant costs: SRF had previously submitted a letter requesting a reallocation of costs due to the changes in use of the sub-consultant's for the environmental process. Although this method was approved by the PMT, Mn/DOT's Contracting Department has determined that a contract amendment is needed to accomplish the reallocation of funds because of the format and form of the contract between the DOT and the City.

- Mn/DOT also indicated that an amendment might be needed to add a task for value engineering (VE) of the project. The VE study would be conducted independent of the SRF study, but there may need to be an SRF person involved to help answer questions.
  - SRF identified the need to review our current budget in light of the project status/schedule as well as the number of studies and iterations that have been undertaken, in hopes of providing the proper information for the agencies to make an informed decision.
  - Key PMT members will meet after today's PMT meeting to discuss budget and schedule as they may relate to a needed contract amendment.
- **Task No. 3 – Data Collection**
    - 55<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge widening for three lanes in each direction plus dual lefts (for PARCLO alternatives) – Mn/DOT expressed a concern that SRF's cost estimate of 1.1 million is half of the cost estimate (2.2 million) developed by Mn/DOT's Bridge office in 2006. SRF will review Mn/DOT's previous correspondence and determine the reason for the differences.
    - SRF to develop a PMT discussion memorandum addressing the costs and salvageable items as they relate to Mn/DOT's costs.
- **Task No. 5 – Initial Concepts**
    - 55<sup>th</sup> Street Interchange Configuration – Mn/DOT, as per discussions with FHWA, asked about placing a loop in the NE quadrant of the interchange, as that would seem to handle the heavy NB to WB turn moves in that area.
      - SRF identified that a loop in the NE quadrant was considered and ruled out back in 2003. In order to provide the greatest benefit to the heavy NB to WB move it would be a free right-turn condition. This would necessitate a wider bridge to accommodate the required acceleration lane. Going to something less than a free right would not provide more capacity than the proposed PARCLO A 4-quadrant option currently being considered.
      - SRF to develop a concept with the NE Loop and Ramp per Mn/DOT's request, and send to the PMT to see if this option warrants additional analysis. Mn/DOT also discussed that the NE loop, coupled with a relocated east frontage road, could provide congestion relief along 55th Street for quite a while and could be an early stage for the ultimate PARCLO option. The ability to stage capacity and LOS improvements at the 55th Street interchange is important due to funding limitations.
      - SRF added an option (Option 6: folded diamond) to the critical lane analysis Exhibits 5 and 6, and the results show that Option 2 (PARCLO 4 quadrant) still provides the best operational improvements.

- Removing the left turns from the bridge with a PARCLO is a benefit to the current congestion problems.
  - The PMT discussed the function of a free right condition as it compares to a controlled intersection scenario—the key being that a controlled intersection would require storage space along the ramp.
  - This conversation generated a desire to know the interim interchange strategies in order to evaluate the alternatives. Specifically, the PMT discussed the use of a Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) as an interim solution to 55th Street and how that would facilitate the conversion to a permanent interchange configuration.
  - SRF to provide the PMT with additional information on the DDI. SRF will also perform a critical lane analysis on the DDI to see if it is a viable alternative from a planning-level traffic operations standpoint.
- Evaluation Matrix:
- For 55th Street, the discussion regarding a DDI as an interim solution to 55<sup>th</sup> Street continued. Mn/DOT and the City are interested in seeing if this presents an opportunity to continue to utilize the existing bridge as long as possible.
  - SRF will provide the PMT with a centerline sketch of the DDI to see if it can work with the existing frontage road and ramp spacing.
  - Mn/DOT also expressed a desire to have an interchange configuration that allows for flexibility to accommodate potential changes in the traffic patterns.
  - For 65<sup>th</sup> Street, Mn/DOT would like the folded diamond interchange to be evaluated further geometrically to address the concerns that were expressed in the previous study.
  - SRF reiterated that it is important that the PMT continue to focus on defining the overall solution for the transportation issues; whereas, we do not want to neglect concerns about cost responsibilities, interim implementation options (phasing), and prioritizing the construction pieces, those elements are best determined after a solution is identified.
  - Alternative Evaluation Matrices have been modified to show the interchange configurations still being considered for both Alternative F and G. Also, many of the transportation components have been filled in as well.
  - Line 4 (reserve capacity of TH 52) may want to be broken down by roadway segments.
  - Line 6 (minimize local trips on TH 52); the source for this information is a selected links analysis from the ROCOG model.
  - Under the economics section, add line items to address phasing opportunities and flexibility in handling changes in traffic patterns.
  - Mn/DOT requested that the “impact to travel speed on TH 52 in the project area” be added to the transportation measures within the matrix.

- A question arose regarding future impacts to the speed limit along TH 52 resulting from a new interchange at 65th Street. The City stated they will likely request that the 60 MPH speed limit be moved to the north of the new interchange.
  - The PMT discussed early draft cost estimate numbers. In general, there does not seem to be a large difference in costs. However, the right-of-way costs and risk assessment component need to be further reviewed.
    - A noise wall in the NW quadrant of 55th Street, if required, would be a difference in costs between alternatives.
    - Cost estimates sheets are to be sent out to the PMT with an explanation of their usage (e.g., how the planning level cost estimates were developed and how the differences in alternatives are accounted).
    - Costs should reflect potential staging impacts. For example, would the conversion to an SPUI need to have a temporary bridge?
    - It is anticipated that the east frontage road at 55th Street will likely be the same for all alternatives.
    - Risk assessment should consider costs, controversy, and public acceptance.
  - Matrices are to be filled out by SRF for upcoming conference call. PMT members will each look to identify and qualify each line as good, fair, or poor, and will be discussed as a group.
- **Task No. 6 – Concept Evaluation**
  - RIRO at Clearwater:
    - SRF has reviewed the Continuous Green T-intersection (CGT) that was recommended in the previous *Circle Drive Traffic and Access Management Plan*. SRF is concerned with the required acceleration and deceleration lanes as they relate to the distance between the Clearwater Road and Chateau Road intersections. SRF is also concerned with the potential merging/weaving issues created by the proposed CGT. This concern is also shared by the Florida Department of Transportation (the authors of the CGT Design Guidelines provided to SRF by Charlie Reiter).
    - Based on these concerns, SRF does not recommend the use of the CGT at the 55th Street/Clearwater Road intersection, but rather a modified T-intersection that eliminated left-in and left-out movements for the southbound Clearwater Road approach to the intersection.
    - The City stated that there are two CGTs in town that work fine and have few issues. These intersections are located on TH 63 near TH 52.
    - SRF said they would review these and provide comments to the PMT for their consideration.

- Weave analysis from 55<sup>th</sup> Street to 75<sup>th</sup> Street:
  - The City asked for clarification between the freeway weaving sections and the merge/diverge areas. SRF noted that by definition in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM), freeway weaving sections are formed by on-ramps (merge areas) and off-ramps (diverge areas) that are closely spaced, or within 2,500 feet of each other. When merge/diverge areas are within 2,500 feet of each other, they are analyzed using the HCM's weaving section methodology. Once the distance is greater than 2,500 feet, the merge/diverge areas are analyzed separately using the HCM's merge/diverge analysis procedures.
  - SRF provided a summary of the 55th to 75th Street weaving analysis. The purpose of this analysis was to determine if there was a “fatal flaw” in any given interchange configuration/alternative combination. The results of the preliminary weave analysis of TH 52 between 55th and 75th Streets do not show a fatal flaw in any interchange configuration/alternative combination that is currently under consideration; however, other factors such as geometrics must still be evaluated. It is further noted that the preliminary weaving analysis shows that auxiliary lanes may provide a justified need and operational and cost benefit on TH 52 between 55th and 75th Streets if access is provided at 65th Street regardless of the interchange configuration/alternative selected. This operational need/benefit will be confirmed with the future CORSIM analysis that will be performed on the preferred alternative. However, other factors must still be considered such as cost benefit.
- Exhibits 7, 7a, and 7b:
  - Revise WFR nomenclature to differentiate between the existing WFR south of 55th street and the new proposed WFR north of 55th Street.
  - 7b to have additional language added to incorporate alternatives E and F.
- Technical Memorandum 5:
  - Mn/DOT had previously presented a revised outline to combine various categories within the memorandum. SRF will incorporate these changes into the document.
    - Mn/DOT also requested a summary of the differences between this study and the previous study. This document may already exist from an earlier request. In either case, the summary should become an attachment to Technical Memorandum 5.
    - CORSIM – the City requested a copy of the CORSIM outputs and Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs). SRF will forward the No-Build CORSIM results to the City.
- Identification of overall System Solution: The PMT discussed the need to identify the overall system solution so that the study may continue to move forward. Much of the last several months have been dedicated to answering specific questions and editing/revising the various analyses completed to date.

- 55th Street Interchange – the PMT has some concerns about whether or not the evaluation matrix will provide enough information to differentiate the options.
  - 65th Street Interchange – Mn/DOT would like to see the geometrics defined better for the folded diamond Interchange.
    - Mn/DOT requested a copy of previous layout and profiles developed for the MOU. SRF will look for previous correspondence with Central Office geometrics.
    - Mn/DOT requested that the City share a copy of the development agreement for the land around the 65<sup>th</sup> Street folded diamond interchange.
  - 55th Street west of the interchange – the PMT has not yet addressed this area, but the analysis to date shows that several intersections to the west will not operate at acceptable levels.
  - Auxiliary lanes – analysis to date indicates that auxiliary lanes may be needed. However, this will be verified with a CORSIM analysis once the interchanges are selected.
  - West Frontage Road – this is the most controversial and sensitive aspect of the entire project. Public opinion from the meeting was not in favor of a new frontage road. The PMT will want to look at parcel impacts and costs to evaluate. The analysis to date does indicate an operational benefit to the system, but the PMT will need to evaluate whether it is enough to justify the impacts and costs.
  - East Frontage Road – the realignment to the east appears to be a major benefit to the current conditions and seems to work with all the options being considered at 55th Street. This component will likely be in the final solution.
  - 65th Street west of the interchange – some preliminary development of this corridor has already occurred and will need to be coordinated with the interchange selection at 65<sup>th</sup> Street, but there does not appear to be much concern over this segment of the project.
  - SRF will prepare a recommendation for each of the segments and provide rational for their selection.
- **Task No. 7 – Environmental Documentation.**
    - Wetland verification – SRF to contact John Hartford at the Rochester Planning Department (507.328.7100), to determine if there are any available wetland delineations from the area developments.
    - Noise – SRF to contact John Crawford at URS to determine the availability of the MnNOISE model created for the ROC 52 project.

- **Task No. 14 – Public Involvement**

- Most comments that required some form of response have been sent. However, there are a few outstanding comments that Mn/DOT would like SRF to provide technical specifics for the response.

### **III. Next Meetings**

- PMT meetings have been moved to the 4th Thursday of the month (February 25th, March 25th, April 22nd, May 27th, and June 24th).
- The next conference call will be on February 4, 2010 from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. (SUBSEQUENT NOTE: additional conference calls have been scheduled for:
  - Friday, March 5, 8:30-11:30 a.m.
  - Monday, April 5, 9-12:00 noon
  - Tuesday, May 11, 9-12:00 noon
  - Wednesday, June 9, 9-12:00 noon

KAH/bls

# NORTHERN ROCHESTER TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Project Management Team Meeting No. 12

January 14, 2010

## 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	<a href="mailto:rfreese@rochestermn.gov">rfreese@rochestermn.gov</a>
X	Ken Holte, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-249-6732	<a href="mailto:kholte@srfconsulting.com">kholte@srfconsulting.com</a>
<b>PMT Member's Staff:</b>			
X	Greg Paulson, Mn/DOT D6	507-286-7502	<a href="mailto:greg.paulson@state.mn.us">greg.paulson@state.mn.us</a>
X	Michael Schweyen, Mn/DOT D6	507-286-7636	<a href="mailto:michael.schweyen@state.mn.us">michael.schweyen@state.mn.us</a>
X	Jeff Bunch, Mn/DOT D6	507-286-7557	<a href="mailto:jeffrey.bunch@state.mn.us">jeffrey.bunch@state.mn.us</a>
X	Gary Shannon, City of Rochester (partial)	507-328-2430	gshannon@rochestermn.gov
X	John Hagen, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-249-6726	<a href="mailto:jhagen@srfconsulting.com">jhagen@srfconsulting.com</a>
	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
<b>Project Partners:</b>			
	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