



## **Project Management Team Meeting**

### **RECORD OF MEETING NO. 5**

DATE: Thursday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009

LOCATION: Mn/DOT District 6 Offices

START: 9:30 a.m. Draft Date: June 24th, 2009

ADJOURN: 12:30 p.m. Approval Date:

ATTENDEES: See Attendance List at end of document.

## **MEETING DISCUSSION**

### **I. Approval of Previous Minutes**

- May 14th, 2009 Meeting Minutes (PMT 4)
  - Mn/DOT requested an opportunity to review the PMT 4 minutes before they be considered approved.
  - [SUBSEQUENT NOTE: per Rhonda's email dated June 12, 2009 no further comments are being made to the minutes or the project log.]
  - Therefore receiving no further comments, the meeting minutes for the May 14th, 2009, PMT are considered approved as of June 12, 2009.

### **II. Tasks**

- **1 – Project Management & Coordination**
  - Review Project Log (action item list)
    - Although the group did not review each item on the action item list, the group did agree on the format and presentation of the list.
    - An additional PMT conference call on the fourth Thursday of each month was agreed upon to help get the project back on schedule. The group agreed the conference call would include just the PMT with supporting staff as needed. SRF will send out an official meeting notice to get this meeting on participant's calendars.

▪ **2 – Project Framework**

- Technical Memorandum #1
  - TM #1 has been approved and is posted on the project FTP site. It will also be added to the project website.
- ‘Paired Comparison’ method
  - Richard has requested further information from City staff and will discuss further with the PMT when available. This item will remain on the project task list and tracked.

▪ **3 – Data Collection**

- Technical Memorandum #2
  - TM #2 has been approved and is posted on the FTP site. [TM #2 may be updated in the future as the project progresses.] It will also be posted on the project website.
  - The verification counts summary memo prepared by SRF will be revised to make a few corrections then re-posted on the FTP site.
- Verification Counts
  - This memo will be revised to correct minor text revisions on pages one and two, and arrows on Exhibit 2 will be corrected as identified in the meeting. However, the results and recommendations of the memo were accepted, and it was agreed that the 2006 traffic counts were acceptable to and the study may proceed using the 2006 traffic count data as identified.
- Speed Plot
  - The PMT revisited the speed plot information. The attractions and production of traffic are based upon travel times within the model, the speeds within the model are relative to existing conditions, but are not an exact replica of existing speeds. The ROCOC travel Demand Model is a product of ROCOGs long term effort and calibration techniques, so specific questions should be directed to Charlie Reiter. The PMT agreed to proceed with the current TDM.

▪ **4 – Confirm Issues & Needs**

- Elk Run methodology
  - PMT reviewed information provided by Charlie Reiter. In general the population estimates seem reasonable, but the retail numbers seem a bit high.

- SRF will work with ROCOG to determine Elk Run's and/or Pine Island's component of the population and employment growth with the current ROCOG model
- ROCG will be providing a summary of this data, and is working on the directional distribution of traffic.
- Review Existing and No-Build Models
  - Mn/DOT would like further clarification regarding the LOS F under the existing condition during the p.m. peak hour at the 55th Street intersections with the East Ramps and the East Frontage Road.
  - SRF will obtain the City's recent Synchro/SimTraffic model that was used to update the signal timing along 55th Street and compare to the NRTS existing conditions analysis results. The goal is to "calibrate" the existing micro-simulation models so that the results more closely match the existing conditions.
  - Mn/DOT asked that the title of this memo be revised to note that this traffic analysis only includes intersection analysis (and NOT the TH 52 mainline CORSIM Analysis).
  - For the Existing model (2006) the signal timing has been adjusted to the current settings.
  - For the No Build Model (2035) the signal timing has been optimized to best deal with the anticipated traffic.
  - No Build model (2035) seems to operate well in the Westbound direction.
  - Mn/DOT requested the outputs and assumptions from the Synchro/SimTraffic model runs.
- Safety Analysis
  - Mn/DOT requested that the safety analysis include the year 2008 crash data as soon as it becomes available.
  - The City requested that the Statewide Crash Rates be added to the summary tables.
  - Mn/DOT requested that particular attention be paid to TH 52 crashes in the merge/diverge areas near interchanges.
  - The PMT agreed to only use crash data from 2006 to 2008, since the ROC 52 project makes the 2003 to 2007 crash data suspect.
  - It was discussed and noted that in Tables 2 thru 5 that the critical

crash rate is not calculated for the specific subject corridor. Rather, this critical crash rate is determined for types of roadways and then compared to the subject corridor's calculated crash rate.

- **5 – Initial Concepts**

- Screening Criteria

- Rhonda advised she had recently met with Kevin Kliethermes of FHWA and Jennie Ross of Mn/DOT to discuss the project. During that meeting, Kevin K stated that the project needs to define the 'Purpose and Need' and meet the requirements of FHWA's 'Interstate Access Management Request Policy' (e.g., the interchange 'warrants' process). Kevin K advised that if these are not followed, the project would not be approved for use of federal funds. Kevin K stated that the FHWA has adopted a policy geared toward non-interstates which requires evaluation of the local road system improvements prior to considering a new interchange. For this project, improvements at 55<sup>th</sup> St. should be evaluated prior to considering a new access at 65<sup>th</sup> St.
    - Rhonda advised the PMT that Mn/DOT District 6 will continue to discuss this issue with FHWA further to understand how this impacts the NRTS project.
    - The PMT asked that a list of the various improvements assumed at each intersection be provided along with the analysis results. SRF to send the PMT a "screen shot" of each intersection so the geometric and traffic control improvement assumptions at each intersection is more clear.
    - SRF to add a SB dual left-turn lane to the Southbound TH 52 Off-Ramp at 55th Street, rerun the analysis, and provide the PMT with an updated copy of the analysis results.
    - After a discussion of the next steps for the analysis/alternative screening, the PMT agreed that another local system option (6-lane plus the West Frontage Road) should be evaluated before the 65th Street intersection alternative is analyzed.
    - If the 6-lane option with a West Frontage Road does not solve the

operational issues along 55th Street, the 65th Street Interchange alternatives will then be analyzed.

[ SUBSEQUENT NOTE: it was decided that the 65th Street Interchange alternatives should include: 1) 65th Street (with no other improvements, 2) 65th Street Interchange plus a 6-lane 55th Street, and 3) 65th Interchange plus a 6-lane 55th Street and a West Frontage Road.]

## **6 - Concept Evaluation**

- Mn/DOT asked if the upcoming 2035 No-Build CORSIM analysis will include the Elk Run development trips. SRF confirmed that this would be the case.
- It was noted that SRF has developed the existing CORSIM model and that the model has been reviewed and approved by Mn/DOT Central Office.

## **▪ 7 – Environmental Documentation**

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)
  - American Engineering Testing (AET) will prepare the Phase I ESA. An amendment to the contract will be needed for this work.

## **▪ 14 – Public Involvement**

- Website
  - The project web site will be prepared to go live before the first public meeting.
  - Approved project documents will be posted on the website for public viewing.
  - Although June 30<sup>th</sup> was discussed as a potential date for the first public meeting, the first public meeting will be held after a purpose and need is solidified and the evaluation process has identified a recommended alternative. This will push the PIM date into August, 2009.

### **III. Value Engineering**

- The position of the City is that a Value Engineering study would be most effective after a preferred alternative has been identified. This item will remain on upcoming agenda's to maintain discussion.
- Mn/DOT to investigate to see if a VE study should be performed for the NRTS or if it should be conducted once the project moves into the final design phase.

### **IV. Upcoming Activities**

- Technical Memorandum #3
- Set first Public Information meeting date.

### **V. Next Meetings**

- Future PMT meetings are scheduled for:
  - June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009 PMT Conference Call
  - July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2009 PMT Meeting, Mn/DOT D6 Offices
  - July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009 PMT Conference Call
  - August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009, PMT Meeting, Mn/DOT D6 Offices
  - August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2009 PMT Conference Call
  - September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009 PMT Meeting, Mn/DOT D6 Offices
  - September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009 PMT Conference Call

### **VI. Other Items**

- Project construction schedule needs to become part of the overall schedule. This needs to be included in the schedule which will be posted on the project website.

**VII.**

**ATTENDEES**

**Thursday, June 11th, 2009**

<b>PMT Members</b>		<b>Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>
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
<b>PMT Member's Staff:</b>			
	Greg Paulson, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7502	<a href="mailto:greg.paulson@dot.state.mn.us">greg.paulson@dot.state.mn.us</a>
X	Michael Schweyen, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7636	<a href="mailto:michael.schweyen@dot.state.mn.us">michael.schweyen@dot.state.mn.us</a>
	Craig Lenz, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7542	<a href="mailto:craig.lenz@dot.state.mn.us">craig.lenz@dot.state.mn.us</a>
X	Jeff Bunch, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7557	<a href="mailto:jeffrey.bunch@dot.state.mn.us">jeffrey.bunch@dot.state.mn.us</a>
X	Gary Shannon	507 328-2430	gshannon@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
<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