



NORTHERN  
**ROCHESTER**  
TRANSPORTATION STUDY

SRF No. 0096730 0270

Page 1 of 5

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING**

**RECORD OF MEETING NO. 8**

DATE: Thursday, September 10, 2009

LOCATION: MnDOT D6 Offices

START: 9:30 a.m. DRAFT DATE: September 22, 2009

ADJOURN: 12:30 p.m. APPROVAL DATE: November 7, 2009  
Amended: November 16, 2009

ATTENDEES: See Attendance List (end of document)

**Meeting Discussion**

**I. Approval of Previous Minutes**

- June 25, 2009, conference call #1 minutes were approved.
- July 9, 2009 meeting minutes (PMT 6) were approved.
- July 23, 2009 conference call #2 minutes were tabled to allow additional time for review.
- August 13, 2009 conference call #3 minutes were tabled to allow additional time for review. SRF to enhance minutes with descriptions of how and why changes were made.
- August 20, 2009 meeting minutes (PMT 7) were tabled to allow additional time for review. Comments received at the meeting are as follows:
  - Page 2, task 2: regarding the bridge documentation that SRF is researching. The City requested the note identify that this is for the 55<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge.
  - Page 2, last paragraph: study will continue with the current forecast numbers which are approximately 7% higher than the ROCOG model. The preferred alternative will be analyzed in the EA with the lower numbers to verify the alternative is acceptable.
  - Page 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: PMT requested that ROCOG enhance the closure statement.

- Page 4, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet: regarding discussion of impacts (high, low), City requested that “impacts” be defined as property impacts which identify RW acquisitions and/or takings.
- Page 5: coordinate names of LOS options with concept drawings to make referencing between data easier.
- Page 7, last item: typo in last sentence. “being” should be “bring”.

## II. Tasks

- Task No. 1 – Project Management and Coordination
  - Project Action List to be updated and redistributed to aid in tracking intermediate tasks and status.
- Task No. 2 – Data Collection
  - Prior to the meeting, Rhonda had provided copy of 55<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge email discussing the costs associated with widening the bridge.
  - 55<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge widening: Mn/DOT is reviewing the options to convert 55<sup>th</sup> Street to a Single Point Diamond Interchange. It may be possible to use prestressed girders and/or a rectangular shape to accommodate the SPUI geometrics. There is a question as to whether or not the “unused” portion would need to be decked. The key issue to modifying the existing bridge appears to be the vertical clearance that can be maintained without too much widening over the mainline. Tightening up the geometrics and/or raising the bearing elevations may be the solution.
  - MnDOT is also reviewing the Right of Way costs on the affected parcels. SRF to provide the estimated square footage of impacts on each parcel to D6.
- Task No. 3 – Confirm Issues and Need
  - Elk Run Update: the ROCOG memo produced by Charlie was discussed. The PMT agreed that the memo had incorporated the changes requested and adequately addresses the traffic component regarding the Elk Run development such that the NRTS study could move forward. The ROCOG memo is considered FINAL by the PMT. It was agreed that this memo should be included in Tech Memo 5 as an appendix item. SRF to verify that page 20 in the memo is blank due to a printing error, and that text is not missing in the final version.
  - The City expressed a concern that some may interpret this memo such that the Elk Run Development might be considered a connected action. The PMT agreed that this was not the case. The Elk Run Development is not a connected action. The study and subsequent memo were done in order to verify that the external station in the ROCOG travel demand model accurately reflected the anticipated traffic volumes for the potential development. PMT requested that Tech Memo 3 and Tech Memo 5 include language addressing this issue so as to make very clear the intent of the study.
  - Technical Memorandum No. 3: this memo addresses the existing conditions, No Build conditions and the safety review that was completed. These

elements build the Purpose & Need for the project. The memo should include a conclusion section stating that a No Build scenario is a significant issue, and should make recommendations about proceeding.

- Task No. 5 – Initial Concepts

- Technical Memorandum No. 4: this memo has received some comments from MnDOT and will be revised slightly based on Tech memo 3 text. SRF noted that there will be some overlap in Tech Memos 3, 4, and 5. This is due somewhat to make reviewing the memos easier (e.g., don't need to refer to previous memos) as well as make sure that each memo can be a stand alone document. SRF to verify the LOS tables are current.
- Alternatives Evaluation matrix: MnDOT has provided some comments on the matrix, and the PMT reviewed the list. The matrix will be revised to incorporate comments and to reorganize some of the items. One item to be added is “can the existing structure be utilized and/or modified”.

- Task No. 6 – Concept Evaluation

- PMT discussed tables 2, 3, and 5. These are the tables which are comparable to the 2006 study. It more accurately reflects the same levels of improvements, and should be used when discussing the differences from 2006. The titles are to be revised to reflect the improvements incorporated. New tables should be re-dated to identify current set. Tech Memo 5 should discuss the use of forecast numbers versus a range of values. A sensitivity analysis tests a range of values to be sure an alternative is viable. Specific differences from the 2006 study include: a) land use is now a higher density, b) flow rates are now 1900, c) turn move forecasts are now developed thru the ROCOG model. PMT requested a discussion memo to overview these differences and what they mean to the results.
- LOS Tables: Tables 2a, 3a, and 4a have not changed. SRF to be sure that dates are revised each time these are presented after changes are made; that way, the PMT is assured to be using the current tables.
- Preliminary Results of Additional Analysis: PMT reviewed exhibits 6 and 7 (to be renamed 7 and 8).
  - Naming convention is to be coordinated with Concept drawings.
  - Expand the table to include delay times for intersections (like exhibits 2 and 3).
  - Add alternative D to the table. Need to determine the viable frontage road.
  - SimTraffic was used for this analysis. The change in LOS from exhibit 3a analysis takes into accounts the queues and intersection interaction.
  - SRF to compare the longest and shortest queue lengths.
  - Add alternative definitions.

- SRF to summarize the traffic signal timing used in the analysis
  - Red cells indicate queue lengths which spill back into the adjacent intersection. SRF to review Queue tables, there are several queues of 1000 feet or more that are not shaded red.
  - Line up tables top and bottom.
  - On 55<sup>th</sup> Street it would appear that alternatives F and G have frontage road scenarios that do not have queuing spillback issues.
  - On 65<sup>th</sup> street traffic issues do not seem to be the deciding factor as almost all of the options and frontage road scenarios work at acceptable levels.
  - PMT discussed how to appropriately use the queuing and LOS information for decision making.
- Concept Drawings: PMT reviewed the interchange configuration drawings. Some questions arose regarding the turn lane development and adequate left turn lengths on 55<sup>th</sup> Street for the SPUI and the frontage roads. SRF to review the turn lane needs for the concepts.
  - MnDOT is planning to schedule a meeting with FHWA and CO to discuss our development and process in the hopes of avoiding issues in the future.
  - 55<sup>th</sup> Street Concept Drawings: the EFR relocation seems to be a viable option to address the traffic issues. There are RW issues to both commercial and residential. The west frontage road connection / alignment will warrant further discussion. The NEFR RW impacts are greater than currently tabulated. SRF to revise table to incorporate RW impacts due to access concerns.
  - 65<sup>th</sup> Street Concept Drawings: The NWFR should be extended from 65<sup>th</sup> Street to 75<sup>th</sup> street. PMT discussed options for WFR between 55<sup>th</sup> street and 65<sup>th</sup> street. There may be an opportunity to utilize 34<sup>th</sup> Ave. as the frontage road depending on interchange configuration and intersection spacing. If shifted to the west, the city suggested moving away from the residential properties along the westerly property line. How and where to make the shift to be reviewed by SRF.
- Task No. 7 – Environmental Documentation
    - Mn/DOT has received a no-effect determination regarding federal threatened and endangered species.
    - Mn/DOT has received a determination of no known architectural/historical resources and no known archaeological resources. Therefore, SHPO concurrence is not required.
    - SRF has received locations of potentially contaminated sites.

– If any structures are to be removed, an asbestos/regulated materials assessment may be required.

- Task No. 14 – Public Involvement

– Website: the City provided some additional text edits. SRF and Mn/DOT have been coordinating other edits to the site. The City and Mn/DOT will link to the project website. A link to “sign up” for information is to be added to the site. Mn/DOT will provide the address to “sign up” link.

– Open House: the open house will be postponed until further analysis is completed.

### **III. Upcoming Activities**

- SRF to progress the interchange analyses.
- Overall system improvements need to be packaged together in order to do CORSIM, Benefit/Cost, and Evaluation studies.

### **IV. Next Meetings**

- September 24, 2009, 8 am to 10 am – PMT conference call #4
- October 8, 2009 , 9:30 am to 12:30 pm – PMT 9 at MnDOT D6 Office
- October 22, 2009, 8 am to 10 am – PMT conference call #5
- November 12, 2009 – 9:30 am to 12:30 pm – PMT 10 at MnDOT D6 Offices

### **V. Other**

- None discussed.

# NORTHERN ROCHESTER TRANSPORTATION STUDY

## Project Management Team Meeting No. 8

September 10, 2009

### ATTENDEES

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
<b>PMT Member's Staff:</b>			
X	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, City of Rochester	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