



# Meeting Notes

## US 52 Safety and Access Study

PMT Meeting # 10  
Goodhue County Office  
1:00 pm, February 2, 2012

Attendees: Heather Lukes, Mike Kempinger, and Tom Miles, MnDOT; Greg Isakson, Ken Bjornstad, Goodhue County; Dennis Brown, Leon Township; and Jack Broz, Bill Klingbeil, and Dan Edgerton, HR Green.

---

The following is a summary of discussion and action items from the Project Management Team Meeting (PMT):

### 1. **Welcome/Introductions**

Meeting attendees introduced themselves and HR Green gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda.

### 2. **Technical Memoranda 1:**

- a. MnDOT provided a handout with additional comments on TM 1 and stated that they would circulate an electronic copy.
- b. The County noted that the introduction should be updated to reflect a more broadly defined project goal which doesn't suggest that an interchange is the predetermined solution. It was also noted that local roadway network improvements are of equal importance.
- c. The general intent of Goal 1, objective 2: "reduce or eliminate variations in speed caused by merging/diverging traffic" was questioned. HR Green mentioned that things such as turn lane lengths, shoulders, and/or ramps have an impact on creating a consistent speed that improves safety. After some discussion, it was agreed that this objective should remain.
- d. The intent of Goal 5 "Enhance the Character of the Communities..." was questioned. HR Green explained that purpose was to recognize that this project should consider impacts beyond safety and mobility on the US 52 mainline, including residential property access and environmental constraints. The group agreed on alternate wording for this goal, substituting "mobility" for "character."
- e. Considering the tasks listed under Phase 1 of the project work plan, the County asked about how the supporting roadway network/access management improvements would be documented. HR Green explained that these improvements would be documented as part of the technical memorandums which will be prepared for this project, and ultimately a future environmental documentation process.

- f. In regards to the “Prepare a Preliminary Study Layout” task under Phase 2, MnDOT noted that MnDOT Central Office will not approve a “Final Geometric Layout” for an unfunded project. Instead it should be labeled as a “Preliminary Study Layout.”
- g. The group discussed the tasks listed under Phase 3 of the work plan. The need to include “official project mapping” was questioned. It was noted that the “project phasing” task is the priority of this phase. The group agreed that the work plan should be amended as the project evolves. In addition, MnDOT noted that the language in the memo should be changed from “preferred alternative” to “recommended alternative.”
- h. MnDOT commented that the phrase “preferred alternative” should be replaced with “recommended alternative” in all occurrences.
- i. As part of the discussion for Technical Memorandum 3 (TM 3), additional revisions to the project purpose statement were discussed. It was noted that the general goal of the project should be to improve safety by eliminating at-grade roadway access and that county and local roads should be specifically mentioned. It was noted that eliminating at-grade access should be included as an objective under goal 1 and determining the interchange location should be an objective under goal 2.

Action Items:

- 1. *MnDOT will send additional comments on TM 1 to HR Green (electronic version)*
- 2. *HR Green will revise TM 1 and resubmit by the end of the day Wednesday of next week (2/8/12).*

### 3. Technical Memoranda 2:

- a. MnDOT noted that more recent safety data is available and suggested updating the safety analysis in TM 2.
- b. MnDOT stated that the assumptions for the safety analysis (i.e., crash rate formula, typical crash rates, etc.) should be fully documented.
- c. The County mentioned that more recent traffic volume data for county roads is available and suggested updating the TM 2.
- d. It was agreed that the reference to the ongoing University of Minnesota safety study in the area should remain, but the statement about the “positive results” should be removed.
- e. Goodhue County asked for clarification as to whether the segment of CSAH 9 east of US 52 is a high crash segment.

Action Items:

1. *HR Green will revise TM 2 per the comments received. It should be noted that updating the safety analyses with the most recent data available may constitute a change in the scope of work.*
2. *HR Green will verify that CSAH 9 (east of US 52) is a high crash segment and notify the County.*

#### 4. **Technical Memoranda 3/Purpose and Need:**

- a. The group noted that all references to “the City of Hader” should be changed to the proper designation as this community may not be classified as a City.
- b. MnDOT questioned the redundancy between TM 1 and TM 3, as the goals and objectives are listed in both. After some discussion the group decided that the goals and objectives should be included in TM 1 only, with a reference in TM 3.
- c. HR Green presented the draft purpose and need statement and explained the connection to the evaluation criteria. The group discussed and generally agreed on the content of the purpose and need.
- d. The County suggested adding language emphasizing that the purpose is safety, rather than building an interchange. The interchange is a tool and not the goal.
- e. After some discussion, the group agreed that while the goals and objectives generally have the same content, they should be revised such that the objectives in the goals section match the evaluation criteria of the purpose and need.
- f. The group discussed the possibility of simplifying the purpose and need to focus only on safety. It was agreed that additional detail (i.e., need statements and criteria) are necessary and should remain.

Action Items:

1. *HR Green will revise TM 3 per the comments received. HR Green will also update the draft evaluation criteria/matrix to reflect these changes.*
2. *MnDOT and County will further review the purpose and need and evaluation criteria and provide comments to HR Green with the intent to update the matrix with measurements of effectiveness.*

#### 5. **CSAH 14 Improvements**

- a. HR Green briefly presented some preliminary ideas for potential CSAH 14 connections to the Cannon Falls project on the north.
- b. MnDOT and the County explained that the project layout for the Cannon Falls Project has changed and agreed to provide the new version to HR Green.



# Meeting Notes

- c. The County noted that this is a high priority project and that the CSAH 14 connection needs to be evaluated as soon as possible. The County explained that while all of the details may not be agreed upon, the major components of the project (i.e., interchange location, CSAH 14 connection, general roadway network improvements, etc.) should be evaluated so that they can be presented during the current state legislative session as needed.
- d. HR Green explained that much of the analysis needed to evaluate improvement alternatives has been completed.
- e. The group requested that HR Green provide a listing of all of the work that has been completed relative to the development and evaluation of alternatives.

Action Items:

1. *MnDOT will provide HR Green will the most recent layout for the Cannon Falls project.*
2. *HR Green will revise TM 3 per the comments received. HR Green will also update the draft evaluation criteria/matrix to reflect these changes.*
3. *HR Green will develop a description of the alternatives and evaluation completed to date.*

## 6. Next Steps

- a. Issues to be discussed at the next weekly staff meeting (2/10/12) include the following:
  - i. Date and time for the next PMT meeting.
  - ii. Potential change in scope to update the safety analysis presented in TM 2.
  - iii. Review connection between the Purpose and Need, Goals and Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria.

## 7. Adjourn

- a. The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:15.