



**PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING**  
**RECORD OF MEETING NO. 9**

DATE: Thursday, October 8, 2009

LOCATION: MnDOT D6 Offices

START: 9:30 a.m. DRAFT DATE: October 19, 2009

ADJOURN: 3:30 p.m. APPROVAL DATE: November 17, 2009

ATTENDEES: See Attendance List (end of document)

**Meeting Discussion**

**I. Approval of Previous Minutes**

- July 23, 2009 conference call #2 minutes were approved.
- August 13, 2009 conference call #3 minutes were approved.
- August 20, 2009 meeting minutes (PMT 7) were approved.
- PMT 8 (September 10<sup>th</sup>) meeting minutes were tabled due to access issues on the FTP site.
- Conference Call #4 (September 24<sup>th</sup>) meeting minutes were tabled due to access issues on the FTP site.

**II. FHWA / MnDOT Meeting recap**

Rhonda provided a summary of the meeting with Kevin Kliethermes at FHWA recently.

Rhonda and Kevin K reviewed Technical Memorandum #3; Kevin provided comments which Rhonda passed on to the PMT. Some of the comments include:

- Purpose and Need should be factual and address the problems identified in the Technical Memorandum. [Note: It was decided by the PMT to create a separate memorandum for the PMT addressing Purpose and Need.] The EA will include the final version of the Purpose and Need for the project.

- Kevin requested a statement acknowledging the addition of dual lefts at the 55<sup>th</sup> Street east ramps and that the new verification count summary recognize that. This will be added to TM No. 3.
- A statement should be added clarifying that the frontage road on the east side of TH 52 from 65<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> be completed concurrent with future development. This will be added to the P&N document being crafted as an attachment to TM No. 3

Other miscellaneous comments from Kevin K have been incorporated into TM #3 and will be reissued. TM No. 4 will also be revised and redistributed.

### **III. Right of Way Discussion**

Mn/DOT Right of Way staff Mark Trogstad-Isaacson and John Paulson provided the PMT with right of way cost estimates for the various interchange configurations and frontage road alignment options.

- For NEFR consider closing the existing 55<sup>th</sup> Street frontage road to Bandel Road and also close Bandel road at 55<sup>th</sup> Street. Give consideration to a possible ri/ro or just a right in at the existing Bandel Road location.
- The realigned NEFR should incorporate access control back to the next public access roadway.
- Revise NEFR alignment to reduce impacts to residential area and mitigate access potential issues.
- Review NWFR options - house on north end may likely be a taking, as well as the house near Whaler/Clearwater intersection.
- NWFR option adjacent to highway should be straightened out.
- MnDOT owns a parcel (thru forfeiture) north of the Calgary Baptist church. Look for opportunities to make the best use of the forfeited property.
- Frontage Road naming conventions should be revisited to help identify them better.
- Need to identify limit of public streets on church property. Is church GDP still valid or has it expired?
- If properties have been dedicated they should be shown as a different color from other potential takings.

The concept drawings were updated to reflect their comments.

### **IV. Tasks**

- Task No. 1 – Project Management and Coordination
  - Project Action List to be updated and redistributed to aid in tracking intermediate tasks and status.
  - Schedule and Budget was discussed briefly. The first public meeting will be held Thursday, November 19<sup>th</sup>. Submittal of a final EA to FHWA will

occur in May 2010. This will allow the project to progress to official mapping to preserve the needed right of way for phased improvements.

- SRF is monitoring the project budget and will continue to advise the PMT of the status. The PMT agreed to look for opportunities to minimize CORSIM analysis on alternatives not likely to be considered due to significant right of way and/or cost impacts. SRF will formally propose to the PMT any changes from the current scope of services.
- Task No. 3 – Data Collection
  - SRF will investigate further the possibility of converting the existing bridges at both 55<sup>th</sup> and 65<sup>th</sup> St. into bridges which can accommodate a Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI). Record plans provided by Mn/DOT suggest an extra 1' of vertical clearance, making the necessary widening of the bridges feasible.
  - Mn/DOT provided plans showing a bridge along TH 65 in Anoka County which was converted to a SPUI.
- Task No. 4 – Confirm Issues and Need Technical Memorandum No. 3: The Purpose and Need section of this TM will be moved into a separate memorandum to the PMT. [Note: A revised TM #3 has been posted to the FTP site for final review and comment.]
- Task No. 5 – Initial Concepts
  - The PMT reviewed the various concept drawings showing the different interchange configurations and frontage road alignments.
  - At 55<sup>th</sup> St., a partial cloverleaf (ParClo) and a Single Point Urban Intersection (SPUI) are under consideration. However, Jim Rosenow has advised that a (three lane) round-about should also be considered at 55<sup>th</sup> Street. Jim feels that the concept of a round-about should not necessarily be dismissed due to three lanes in each direction.
    - SRF's preliminary analysis showed that a three-lane roundabout likely would have enough capacity, but PMT had concerns about introducing a three-lane roundabout.
    - PMT wishes to consider a three-lane roundabout with six legs – 55<sup>th</sup> Street, east ramps, and east frontage road/Bandel road.
    - SRF to conduct a RODEL analysis to further evaluate the opportunity, especially on the east side for a roundabout. RODEL will provide basic, but not comprehensive evaluation of Queuing needs between intersections. SRF to provide assumptions of inputs for review.
  - SRF will analyze the operation of a round-about as part of the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process.
  - Roundabouts at the ramp terminal and the frontage road intersection would need to be analyzed together. This can be done with VISSIM software.

- At 65<sup>th</sup> Street, a diamond, folded diamond, and a SPUI are under consideration.
- For all interchange configurations, several frontage road alternatives have been developed. [Note: a series of drawings illustrating the various frontage road alternatives have been developed and posted to the FTP site.] As part of the right of way discussion with Mn/DOT staff, the frontage road alignments of the various alternatives were adjusted to further minimize impacts.
- Tech Memo No. 4: Comments regarding TM 4 include:
  - Revise to incorporate changes to TM 3.
  - Add alternative lettering nomenclature to figures 1 thru 3
  - In figures 1 thru 3 illustrate that improvements are cumulative.
  - Add figure 5 (ramp volumes and ADTs) in support of Table 1.
- Task No. 6 – Concept Evaluation
  - LOS Tables have been updated to reflect the current interchange configurations.
  - LOS Exhibits 2, 2.1, 3, and 3.1 represent the first generation of analysis for the alternatives. Add a color legend to the exhibit.
  - LOS Exhibits 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b represent the second generation of analysis for the alternatives. Alt. E represents a diamond interchange. Add a color legend to the exhibit.
  - Exhibits 7, 7a, 8 and 8a represent the third generation of analysis of the alternatives. Add a color legend to the exhibit.
    - Ex. 7 add intersection LOS for 55<sup>th</sup> Street at TH 52 ramps in SPUI configuration.
    - Verify data placement in rows, some appear to be misaligned.
    - Address DOT question regarding 7a, Scenarios 3 and 4 delays versus Exhibit 3b, alt D delays.
    - Verify shading on the bottom of 7a: 1) E4, WB 55th@clearwater, 2) E3, NB 55th@ TH 52 ramps, 3) E1, NB 55<sup>th</sup>@TH 52 east ramps, and 4) F4, NB 55<sup>th</sup> @TH 52 ramps.
    - Stopping sight distance from end of ramp nose to end of Queue, verify that vehicles can stop in time. Consider using a 10% buffer and note on exhibits.
  - The naming convention will be revised for simplicity sake.
  - 55<sup>th</sup> Street Concept Drawings: the EFR relocation seems to be the appropriate way to address the traffic issues. There are RW issues to both commercial

and residential. The west frontage road connection/alignment will warrant further discussion and public input.

- At 65<sup>th</sup> Street, verify that SPUI and 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue frontage road work operationally given the intersection spacing. Richard and Rhonda will meet with the church representatives to receive input regarding their future plans of the property and look for ways to minimize impacts accordingly.
  - SRF will review the ramps geometry on the SPUI's in an effort to tighten up the angle approaching the bridge and possibly make the bridge less expensive to modify.
  - SRF to study the exit geometry at 65<sup>th</sup> Street to understand the implications of a folded diamond exit.
  - The concept drawings can be updated by showing the 'best' frontage road connection for each interchange configuration; SPUI, PARCLO, Diamond, folded diamond, etc. (The frontage road connections are the vital piece to the traffic analysis, not the actual alignment.)
  - SRF to do initial evaluation of TH 52 weaving conditions for an assumed worst case (highest volumes and shortest distance between ramps).
  - Scope calls for a full CORSIM analysis of a system solution. In an attempt to reduce costs a Highway capacity Analysis (HCS) and/or CORSIM "lite" could be used to evaluate weaving. This would be an option to quickly identify any fatal flaws.
    - The City requested that F3, Scenario 2 (folded Diamond at 65<sup>th</sup> Street with no WFR) be analyzed in order to show the affects of the WFR.
    - F3, Scenario 2 (ParClo) at 55<sup>th</sup> Street with no WFR should also be analyzed.
- Task No. 14 – Public Involvement
    - Website: The website is in the process of being updated prior to the upcoming public meeting. Website must be updated prior to the first public announcement.
    - Open House: the open house will be held Thursday, November 19<sup>th</sup> from 5:00 pm to 7:30 pm. The location of the meeting has yet to be determined. SRF will coordinate the details of the meeting. [Note: public meeting will be held at the Presbyterian Church located at 3705 55<sup>th</sup> Street. Two sessions will be held, one from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. and the second from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.]

## V. Next Meetings

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

- November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009, 5:00 pm to 7:30 pm – Public Open House Meeting
- December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009 – 9:30 am to 12:30 pm – PMT 11 at MnDOT D6 Offices

**VI. Other**

- SRF to supply past project documentation to Kevin Kliethermes at FHWA in PDF format.

# NORTHERN ROCHESTER TRANSPORTATION STUDY

## Project Management Team Meeting No. 9

October 8, 2009

### ATTENDEES

	PMT Members	Phone	Email
X	Rhonda Prestegard, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7511	<a href="mailto:rhonda.prestegard@state.mn.us">rhonda.prestegard@state.mn.us</a>
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 District 6	507-286-7502	<a href="mailto:greg.paulson@state.mn.us">greg.paulson@state.mn.us</a>
X	Michael Schweyen, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7636	<a href="mailto:michael.schweyen@state.mn.us">michael.schweyen@state.mn.us</a>
	Craig Lenz, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7542	<a href="mailto:craig.lenz@state.mn.us">craig.lenz@state.mn.us</a>
X	Jeff Bunch, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7557	<a href="mailto:jeffrey.bunch@state.mn.us">jeffrey.bunch@state.mn.us</a>
X	Fausto Cabral, Mn/DOT District 6	507-286-7552	Fausto.Cabral@state.mn.us
X	Mark Trogstad-Isaacson, Mn/DOT District 6 (partial)	507-286-7607	Mark.Trogstad-Isaacson@state.mn.us
X	John Paulson, Mn/DOT District 6 (partial)	507-286-7614	John.J.Paulson@state.mn.us
X	Gary Shannon, City of Rochester (partial)	507-328-2430	gshannon@rochestermn.gov
X	Mike Nigbur, City of Rochester (partial)	507-328-2410	<a href="mailto:mnigbur@rochestermn.gov">mnigbur@rochestermn.gov</a>
X	John Hagen, SRF Consulting Group, Inc. (partial, call-in)	763-249-6726	<a href="mailto:jhagen@srfconsulting.com">jhagen@srfconsulting.com</a>
	Marie Cote, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-249-6716	<a href="mailto:mcote@srfconsulting.com">mcote@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	<a href="mailto:kjullie@srfconsulting.com">kjullie@srfconsulting.com</a>
<b>Project Partners:</b>			
	Mike Sheehan, Olmsted County	507-328-7070	<a href="mailto:sheehan.michael@co.olmsted.mn.us">sheehan.michael@co.olmsted.mn.us</a>
	Kaye Bieniek, Olmsted County	507-328-7070	<a href="mailto:bieniek.kaye@co.olmsted.mn.us">bieniek.kaye@co.olmsted.mn.us</a>
	Charlie Reiter, ROCOG	507-328-7136	<a href="mailto:reiter.charlie@co.olmsted.mn.us">reiter.charlie@co.olmsted.mn.us</a>
	Kevin Kleithermes, FHWA	651-291-6123	<a href="mailto:kevin.kliethermes@fhwa.dot.gov.us">kevin.kliethermes@fhwa.dot.gov.us</a>