



PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING
RECORD OF MEETING NO. 7

DATE: Thursday, August 20, 2009

LOCATION: City of Rochester Public Works

START: 9:30 a.m. DRAFT DATE: August 27, 2009

ADJOURN: 2:00 p.m. APPROVAL DATE: September 10, 2009

ATTENDEES: See Attendance List (end of document)

Meeting Discussion

I. Approval of Previous Minutes

- It was discussed that approval of meeting minutes and some documentation has fallen behind. The bi-weekly meetings/conference calls have created a scenario in which large amounts of data are being created for the next successive meeting, but this does not always allow for adequate review/preparation by the PMT members.
- The conference calls seem to help with the understanding of the technical data, but dispersal of information prior to calls is problematic.
- For PMT meetings, agendas should be out three (3) days in advance. For conference calls, agendas should be in advance as much as possible.
- June 25, 2009, conference call #1 minutes were thought to have been approved at PMT No. 6. SRF is to check notes and reconfirm.
 - Add: 11) SRF is to modify 55th Street exhibit to illustrate lane continuity for two through lanes in the eastbound direction.
- July 9, 2009 meeting minutes (PMT 6) were conditionally approved.
 - Page 2, Task 4 – coordination with FHWA: second bullet should refer to 8 criteria, not 13.
- Page 3, Task 6 – second bullet should delete strikeout within paragraph. Minutes for July 23, 2009 and August 13, 2009 conference calls were tabled.

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.
 - Letter documenting reallocation of scope fees to be completed by SRF and forward to the City.
- Task No. 2 – Data Collection
 - SRF is researching for previous bridge documentation for the 55th St. bridge.
 - Rhonda stated she had a copy and would forward to SRF.
- Task No. 3 – Confirm Issues and Need
 - Elk Run Update: Charlie Reiter joined the meeting via conference call. The discussion reviewed Step #4 of the methodology where two scenarios are to be reviewed. One scenario was to assume that all the trips generated by the Elk Run Development would be new trips and therefore would need to be added to the ROCOG model traffic projections. The second scenario assumed that the ROCOG model contains sufficient traffic to account for 40% of the full-build Elk Run Development.

This 40% threshold accounts for the Bioscience land use, a good portion of the housing development, and approximately 600,000 sq. ft. of the 2.7M sq. ft. of the commercial retail. Charlie's knowledge of the area and research indicate that this is a reasonable estimate.

Charlie's analysis indicates this threshold results in traffic volumes approximately 7% higher than the current ROCOG model at the northern external station. Model variations for arterials such as TH 52 within 5% are considered acceptable.

The PMT agreed that the ROCOG model did adequately account for the Elk Run traffic and that the first scenario of having to add the volumes was not necessary. Mn/DOT requested that the Conclusion Statement within the ROCOG Report be more definitive.

The discussion turned to: should the model be re-run to account for the 7% +/- increase since it is just outside of the window of acceptability. This process is not as simple as adding the volumes to the external limits. The model needs to be re-run so that the trips are distributed throughout the area.

It was agreed that the analysis would continue with the current ROCOG traffic volumes in order to remain consistent with the earlier work. Then, when the Preferred Alternative is identified, it will be re-analyzed (per the scope) with the increased volumes and model re-run included.

The belief is that since the difference in volumes is an increase, testing later will not preclude any options being considered.

The future external station volume is to be 69,435. SRF is to coordinate with ROCOG to have this run completed, so that it is ready for later analysis.

- Safety Analysis Memorandum: Mike S. had some comments in that he was looking for discussion of contributing factors—identifying what is happening in problem areas, and identifying merging issues. John H. clarified that the intent of this memorandum was to look at accidents at a higher level in order to build the Purpose and Need framework. Based upon this conversation, the PMT agreed to accept the memorandum as is.
- Technical Memorandum No. 3: this memorandum will be forthcoming.
- Task No. 5 – Initial Concepts
 - Technical Memorandum No. 4: no comments have been received on this memorandum yet. The question arose regarding whether this memorandum was meant to undergo future revisions (dynamic). SRF will verify and email the PMT. SRF is to double check LOS tables to be sure they are current.
- Task No. 6 – Concept Evaluation
 - ADT Maps: color coding and capacity thresholds have been added. SRF is to revise the date to August 20, 2009, re-post on FTP site, and notify the PMT.
 - Ramp ADT figures: color coding and capacity thresholds have been added. SRF is to revise the date to August 20, 2009, re-post on FTP site, and notify the PMT.
 - LOS Tables: Tables 2 and 3 were presented. These reflect the build alternatives with existing geometrics and can be used as a direct comparison to the earlier study, as the base improvements are consistent throughout. The title defines the only improvements included in this analysis. The PMT requested Table 4 (Summary of Improvements) be added. Additionally, prepare the table with delay (seconds) shown, as was previously done for Tables 2a and 3a. SRF is to revise the date, re-post on FTP site, and notify the PMT.

LOS Tables: Tables 2a and 3a have been updated and include LOS criteria thresholds. Analysis shows that geometric improvements in Options E, F and G show a benefit, but do not result in a solution for the overall system. That is to say that local road improvements help, but do not solve the problem alone. SRF is to revise Table 4 to 4a.
 - 55th Street Critical Lane Analysis: Alternatives B and G are used as the extremes to help narrow the alternatives. Alternative B has significant issues in the PM peak hour for all options. Alternative G has two options (2 and 5), which operate under capacity for both peak hours. In general, it is the easterly intersections that have the biggest issues.

- 65th Street Critical Lane Analysis: Alternatives E and G are used to analyze options at 65th Street. All options operate under capacity for both peak hours for both alternatives.
- 55th Street Concept Drawings: the PMT reviewed concept drawings of each alternative used in the LOS analysis, and also reviewed the concept alternatives matrix that contains information on right of way, bridge, and frontage road impacts.
- 65th Street Concept Drawings: the PMT reviewed concept drawings of each alternative used in the LOS analysis, and also reviewed the concept alternatives matrix that contains information on right of way, bridge, and frontage road impacts.
- 55th Street Interchange Alternatives: the PMT discussed each option as it related to LOS and physical impacts. Option 1 (conventional diamond) was dropped because it had the worst LOS performance. Options 3 (4 ramps, 3 loops) and 4 (full cloverleaf) were dropped because they had the highest physical impacts and LOS performance issues. Option 2 (Parclo A 4-quad) and 5 (single point urban interchange) will be carried forward for additional study.
- 65th Street Interchange Alternatives: the PMT discussed each option as it related to LOS and physical impacts. Since LOS for all options was acceptable, the conversation focused on impacts and the ability to handle the expected heavy movements (NB to WB, EB to SB). Options 3 (4 ramps, 2 loops), 4 (4 ramps, 3 loops), and 5 (roundabouts) were dropped due to their high physical impacts, particularly south of 65th Street. Option 1 (conventional diamond) was retained as it has the ability to be shifted to the west (as shown) to allow for loops on the west side, if needed. Option 2 (folded diamond) was also retained.

Although Option 2 has a high physical impact, it is all north of 65th Street on vacant lands and does not directly cause the taking or relocation of any businesses. Option 6 (single point urban interchange) was also retained due to its low physical impacts; however, it may cause the existing bridge to be reconstructed. Therefore, Options 1, 2 and 6 will be carried forward for additional study.

- The PMT was not comfortable packaging these interchange options into overall project alternatives (e.g., identifying interchange combinations at 55th and 65th to be analyzed together). However, the PMT did request SRF analyze each remaining option with potential frontage roads in order to understand the true operational capabilities and overall impacts associated with each interchange option. As such, the PMT identified the following interchange and frontage road combinations:

55th Street

	West	East
Option 2:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SFR ties into loop/ramp then is offset to Chateau Road for the NFR.2. SFR is realigned through Walmart parking lot to connect to Chateau Road.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SFR is realigned to the east, then continues north and ties back into Bandel Road.
Option 5:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SFR stays on existing alignment to 55th, then is offset to Chateau Road for the NFR.2. SFR stays on existing alignment, then extends north on Clearwater Road.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SFR is realigned to the east, then continues north and ties back into Bandel Road.2. SFR and Bandel Road stay on existing alignment.

65th Street

Option 1:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Frontage road runs N-S approximately 1,000 feet west of existing 34th Avenue. 34th Avenue is realigned to connect to the frontage road.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Frontage road remains on existing Bandel Road and extends north through Prairie Crossing Development.
Option 2:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SFR is on 34th Avenue, then offsets to approximately 1,000 feet west.2. Frontage road runs N-S approximately 1,000 feet west of existing 34th Avenue. 34th Avenue ties into west ramp/loop.3. Frontage road runs N-S approximately 1,000 feet west of 34th Avenue. 34th Avenue is realigned to tie into N-S frontage road and does not tie into ramp/loop.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Frontage road remains on existing Bandel Road and extends north through Prairie Crossing Development.
Option 6:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Frontage remains on existing 34th Avenue and existing NFR.2. Frontage road runs N-S approximately 1,000 feet west of 34th Avenue.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Frontage road remains on existing Bandel Road and extends north through Prairie Crossing Development.

Existing 34th Avenue and
existing North Frontage
Road are realigned to tie
into the new N-S frontage
road.

- The PMT requested SRF review the bridges at 55th and 65th to determine if they could be used in an SPUI configuration or would need to be fully reconstructed.
- Technical Memorandum No. 5 will be the overall traffic memorandum leading to the identification. The PMT requested it be developed in parts so it can be reviewed easier. Otherwise, it may be a bit overwhelming and extremely technical to review at one time.
- 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

- August 27, 2009 – conference call is cancelled.
- September 10, 2009 – PMT 8 at Mn/DOT District 6 offices
- September 24, 2009 – PMT Conference call 4
- October 8, 2009 – PMT 9 at Mn/DOT District 6 offices

- October 22, 2009 – conference call #5
- November 12, 2009 – PMT 10 at Mn/DOT District 6 offices

V. Other

- A draft of an evaluation matrix to be used help select the preferred alternative was handed out to the PMT. PMT was asked to review and consider the items identified and bring suggestions to the next PMT meeting.

NORTHERN ROCHESTER TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Project Management Team Meeting No. 7

August 20, 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
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
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
	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
X	Charlie Reiter, ROCOG (**call in)	507-328-7136	reiter.charlie@co.olmsted.mn.us
	Kevin Kleithermes, FHWA	651-291-6123	kevin.kliethermes@fhwa.dot.gov.us