



Project Management Team Meeting

RECORD OF MEETING NO. 3

DATE: Thursday, April 9, 2009

LOCATION: Rochester Public Works

START: 9:30 a.m.

Draft Date: April 16, 2009

ADJOURN: 12:30 p.m.

Approval Date: May 14, 2009

ATTENDEES: See Attendance List at end of document.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introductions

- The PMT welcomed member staff and project partners. Ken Holte provided the member staff and project partners with a brief background of the project goals, framework, decision making process, and schedule.

I. Approval of Previous Minutes

- February 10, 2009 Meeting Minutes (PMT 1)
 - Hearing no further comments, the meeting minutes for the February 10, 2009 PMT were approved.
- March 17, 2009 Meeting Minutes (PMT 2)
 - Comments received via e-mail from District 6 were incorporated in the PMT 2 meeting minutes.
 - The City requested that the meeting minutes differentiate items discussed at the meeting and those items of discussions subsequent to the meetings. Follow-up items and/or clarification of items after the meeting should be set apart from the items discussed at the meeting either by text formatting such as bold or italics, and/or with brackets.
 - City requested that Gary Shannon be added to the attendees list as he will likely be attending future meetings. The attendees list will be expanded to include

additional PMT member staff and project partners at the time that they attend a meeting.

- With the changes discussed at the meeting, the meeting minutes for the March 17, 2009 PMT were approved.

II. Tasks

▪ 1 – Project Management & Coordination

○ Project Log

- The project log needs to be a standing agenda item at all future PMT meetings.
- Project logo, title, and date need to be added to the project log.
- Mn/DOT requested that the project log be expanded to include upcoming tasks and possibly a “to do” list in order to identify who is responsible for various items.
- *SRF to make these changes to the project log and send out to the PMT for review and comment.*

○ FTP Site

- There were printing issues with several meeting-related attachments such as graphics and tables. *SRF will investigate ways to minimize issues related to the printing of larger sized attachments (i.e. – set up graphics so that they can be printed/plotted without much reformatting required).*
- The PMT requested that the project scope be posted on the FTP site (*Mn/DOT responsibility*).
- The PMT asked that a one-page document be created that summarizes the directions to gain access to the project FTP site. *SRF to create this one page summary and send out to all PMT members, PMT member staff, and project partners.*

▪ 2 – Project Framework

○ Technical Memorandum #1

- Mn/DOT noted that some of the colors in the project phase columns do not match the colors in the timeline portion of the schedule (*SRF to revise*).
- The public process was discussed. Two public meetings are planned for this project; one early in the project (before the alternatives are developed), and the other after the preferred alternative has been identified.

- The City asked that SRF make a recommendation to the PMT regarding the timing of the first public meeting, the items to present, and the graphics to include as exhibits (*SRF to complete prior to next PMT meeting*).
- The remainder of Technical Memorandum #1 is currently under review by the PMT, with the goal to have it ready for approval at the May 14th meeting.
- Decision Making Flowchart
 - SRF recommended that the flowchart be revised to focus on just the items in the first phase of the study (i.e. – remove everything after the environmental documentation. The City agreed, but further recommended that a second flowchart be created for Phases II and III of the study.
 - Project logo and task numbers should be added to the flowchart.
 - A more simplified flowchart should also be created for the use in upcoming public meetings and the project website.
 - The flowchart(s) should be added to Technical Memorandum #1.
 - *SRF to revise the flowchart and distribute to the PMT prior to the May PMT meeting.*
 - Regarding the decision making process, a discussion ensued about how the PMT will go about evaluating concepts and alternatives and coming to a consensus on which concepts/alternatives should move forward. The City identified a software package that ROCOG has used in the past that used a “paired comparisons” methodology to compare alternatives individually on a head to head basis rather than the range of alternatives as whole. Each reviewing member then gets to prioritize their preference in each pairing. The software tallies the results and ranks the alternatives. *City will investigate as to the availability of this tool and report back to the PMT.*
- [SUBSEQUENT NOTE: SRF staff discussions indicate a need to make sure that this type of “vote” system would still meet the NEPA requirements for alternative selections. Alternatives need to be selected as part of an evaluation process based on identifiable criteria. Perceptions of “popularity” should be avoided.]
- Schedule
 - Comments on the schedule are included in the earlier Technical Memorandum #1 discussion.

▪ **3 – Data Collection**

- Signal Timing
 - SRF provided a brief update that the updated signal timings along the 55th Street corridor have been provided by City staff. The updated signal timing will be used in the existing conditions analysis.
- Traffic Counts / Key Intersections
 - Mn/DOT and the City have completed the traffic counts at the key intersections where 2006 counts were not available. Additional verification counts were also gathered at selected intersections. These verification counts will be compared to the counts collected in 2006.
 - Mn/DOT expressed some concern on how potential future congestion along Bandel Road will be reflected in the route choices in the forecasting model. They further asked if it would be appropriate to include some intersections along Bandel Road (between 55th and 65th Streets) in the list of key intersections. These issues were discussed by the PMT and it was decided that the Bandel Road intersections with 55th and 65th Street (due to their volumes and traffic operations) will be the key intersections in determining whether a vehicle uses Bandel Road to gain access to 55th and/or 65th Streets. Therefore, there is not a significant need to include additional intersections along Bandel Road as part of our analysis. *SRF will verify the speeds that ROCOG used in the modeling of 2035 volumes for the roadways in the project area, including Bandel Road.*
- CORSIM Limits
 - SRF provided a brief description of the CORSIM model limits, and asked Mn/DOT for direction on the name of the Mn/DOT staff member that would like to review the CORSIM model prior to the model runs. Rhonda will check internally and provide SRF direction on where to submit the CORSIM models for review (*Mn/DOT's responsibility*).
 - [SUBSEQUENT NOTE: Rhonda requested that SRF submit the CORSIM models to Kevin Sommers at Mn/DOT Metro District for review, and copy Rhonda and Mike Schweyen on the submittal]
- Technical Memorandum #2
 - SRF commented the purpose of Technical Memorandum #2 is to document project background, inputs, and the relevant data collected for the project.
 - SRF suggested it would be more appropriate to remove the results of the existing operations analysis (p.6) performed as part of the earlier

NRTS work from this memo, and include the updated existing analysis in the upcoming Technical Memorandum #3.

- Mn/DOT requested that the FHWA roadway functional classifications be added to the memo (p.4).
 - Add the Elk Run traffic analysis from the EA update to the list of previous studies/plans relevant to the NRTS (p.2).
 - Revise traffic data needs section to remove Table 3 Data Collection Needs, as these intersection counts have been collected, and include a discussion of the verification counts that were collected (p.8-9).
 - The Social, Economic & Environmental Concerns (SEE) section needs to be revised to include references/relevant findings from the previous 75th Street interchange EA, the ROC 52 EIS, and other recent environmental documents in the study area (p.9).
 - Add final paragraph to identify approval date(s) of this document. It was discussed that as this document will continue as a work in progress there will be several points along the schedule where the PMT will look to “approve” this document in order to keep it up to date and current.
 - *SRF to revise Technical Memorandum #2 and distribute to the PMT prior to the May PMT meeting.*
- **4 – Confirm Issues & Needs**
- Elk Run Impacts
 - SRF provided a brief summary of the findings of the on-going traffic analysis being performed as part of the Elk Run EA update. Four development thresholds were identified as part of the Elk Run EA Update Traffic Analysis – 1) 15 percent of full build-out represents development level used in the 2012 AUAR; 2) 30 percent of full build-out represents the level of development that can be supported by a “robust” standard diamond interchange at CSAH 12 and TH 52; 3) 40 percent of full build-out represents the development level than can be supported by the “robust” standard diamond interchange at CSAH 12 and TH 52 with the addition of a northbound off loop; and 4) 55 percent of full build-out is the development level that can be supported by the existing four-lane TH 52 through Pine Island.
 - SRF recommended that the NRTS use the 40 percent level as a realistic assumption of the level of the Elk Run development that would likely occur by the year 2035. This 40 percent level is also the development level assumed in the updated Elk Run EA.

- Mn/DOT noted that the hazardous materials review will likely remain the responsibility of SRF's subconsultant. (*Mn/DOT to confirm that the hazardous material review will be completed within the scope of NRTS using SRF's subconsultant*).

- **14 – Public Involvement**

- Website

- SRF distributed sample screenshots of the proposed project website for review/comments.
- The City requested that whenever a new posting is added to the website, the posting date be noted so that the public can determine when items were updated.
- Mn/DOT requested that more graphics be included in the website (study area, key intersections, project timeline/schedule, decision making flowchart, etc.)
- The City asked that a link to the FTP site be added to the project website.
- *SRF to refine the website and prepare it to go on-line once the PMT has had a chance to review the contents.*

III. Value Engineering

- Since the previous NRTS work identified that potential improvements might approach the \$20 to 25 million range, a value engineering review may be required.
- Need to determine if the current level of analysis and the project approach will satisfy the requirements of a value engineering review (*SRF to follow-up and report to the PMT*).

IV. Upcoming Activities

- Existing & No-Build Traffic Models
- Field Observations of TH 52 for CORSIM analysis
- Technical Memorandum #3
- Screening Criteria
- Public Information Meeting

V. Next Meetings

- Future PMT meetings are scheduled for:
 - May 14th – July 9th
 - June 11th – August 13th
- All future PMT meetings will be held at the Mn/DOT District 6 offices in Rochester.

VI. Other Items

- Invoicing items were discussed. MnDOT has a bookkeeping issue regarding the format of the City billing submitted for reimbursement. SRF requested to supply a digital copy of SRF billing to City for modification by MnDOT in order for the City to match the billing format requirements.

[SUBSEQUENT NOTE: prior to SRF submitting digital copy to MnDOT, MnDOT prepared a version and provided to City for future use.].

- The City requested changes to the project logo to add NRTS to the four arrows in the logo.
- SRF received digital information from Mn/DOT regarding right of way, fiber optic lines, and geotechnical information.
- SRF will compile a list of roadway and drainage design criteria prior to development of concepts.

VII. Action List

TASK	ASSIGNED	DUE DATE
▪ Prepare PMT meeting #3 minutes	SRF	4-16-09
▪ Provide comments on PMT 3 meeting minutes	PMT	4-23-09
▪ Revise project log	SRF	4-25-09
▪ Place project scope on FTP site	Mn/DOT.....	4-27-09
▪ Create one-page summary to access FTP site and forward to PMT, PMT member staff, and project partners	SRF	5-6-09
▪ Revise & resubmit TM No. 1 for final review	SRF	4-27-09
▪ Approve TM No. 1	PMT	5-14-09
▪ Provide recommendations on Public Meeting #1 to PMT	SRF	5-6-09
▪ Revise decision making flowchart	SRF	5-6-09
▪ Create simplified decision making flowchart for Public Meetings	SRF	5-6-09
▪ Verify TDM speeds in ROCOG model for project area roadways	SRF	5-6-09
▪ Research “Paired Comparison” software availability	City.....	6-11-09
▪ Determine Mn/DOT contact to submit CORSIM models for review	Mn/DOT.....	4-16-09
▪ Revise & resubmit TM No. 2 for review	SRF	5-6-09
▪ Develop methodology to determine Elk Run impacts to the NRTS study area	SRF & ROCOG	5-6-09
▪ Develop preliminary list of screening criteria	SRF	5-6-09
▪ Confirm that CRU review will be performed internally by Mn/DOT District staff	Mn/DOT.....	5-6-09
▪ Confirm that hazardous material review will be performed under the NRTS scope (SRF subconsultant)	Mn/DOT.....	5-6-09
▪ Refine project website for PMT review	SRF	5-6-09
▪ Launch project website	SRF	5-18-09
▪ Research value engineering review to determine if it is applicable to the NRTS	SRF	5-6-09

ATTENDEES

Thursday, April 9, 2009

	PMT Members	Phone	Email
X	Rhonda Prestegard, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7511	rhonda.prestegard@dot.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:			
	Greg Paulson, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7502	greg.paulson@dot.state.mn.us
X	Michael Schweyen, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7636	michael.schweyen@dot.state.mn.us
	Craig Lenz, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7542	craig.lenz@dot.state.mn.us
X	Jeff Bunch, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7557	jeffrey.bunch@dot.state.mn.us
	Gary Shannon	507 328-2430	gshannon@rochestermn.gov
X	John Hagen, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-249-6726	jhagen@srfconsulting.com
X	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