



Meeting Notes

US 52 Safety, Access, and Interchange Study

PMT Meeting – Goodhue County Public Works
12:00 p.m., June 15, 2012

Attendees:

Heather Lukes, MnDOT	Greg Isakson, Goodhue County	Jack Broz, HR Green
Mike Kempinger, MnDOT	Ken Bjornstad, Goodhue County	Ryan Allers, HR Green
Greg Paulson, MnDOT		Dan Edgerton, HR Green
Mike Schweyen, MnDOT		

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 Jack Broz (HR Green) gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda.

2. Corridor Access Management

- a. Broz explained that the comparison of an interchange at CSAH 1 or CSAH 9 doesn't change the decision making for access management between CSAH 1 and Highview Road. The only difference is if the interchange was at CSAH 1 then the access immediately north of CSAH 1 would need to be addressed with the interchange. An interchange at CSAH 9 would allow access near the CSAH 1 area to remain unchanged longer than having an interchange at CSAH 1. HR Green will calculate the travel time difference between having the interchange at CSAH 1 vs. CSAH 9 for the properties north of CSAH 1.
- b. The long-term plan for the area calls for all access along US 52 between existing CSAH 1 and Highview Road will need to be replaced sometime in the future. Access points west of US 52 could be rerouted to CSAH 14 except for those most near CSAH 1. Access near CSAH 1 along the west side of US 52 could be rerouted along a possible frontage road to existing CSAH 1. Access from Wagner Way to CSAH 1 along the east side of US 52 could be rerouted along a possible frontage road. Frontage Road access along the east side of US 52 from Skunk Hollow Trail to Highview Road is also a viable option. Between Skunk Hollow Trail and Wagner Way there are a few options to consider; one being a frontage road along US 52 through the bluff; a second option is building a township road along an existing ravine east of US 52 and west of 90th Ave., and a third option would be building a frontage road from Wagner Way to CSAH 1 and using the existing roadway network to go north to Cannon Falls or to go south on US 52. HR Green will revise the future local connection possibilities graphic to extend further east to the intersection of CR 25 and CSAH 1, revise the traffic flow arrows, update the map legend, and simplify the graphic for public presentation.

3. Subarea 4 Analysis

a. Interchange Design Evaluation:

- i. The three interchange types were discussed, including the following: 1. diamond with perpendicular bridge, 2. diamond with skewed bridge, and 3. Parclo opposite quadrants with skewed bridge. These types were compared using the project evaluation matrix. For the most part the interchange types have no real differentiation except when the social, economic, and environmental (SEE) goal is reviewed. The greatest difference shown is in right of way impacts with the diamond with perpendicular bridge having the highest impact. There is also a slight difference in costs between the interchange types with the diamond with skewed bridge having the highest cost. MnDOT provided costs to use for skewed (\$160 SQFT) and perpendicular (\$125 SQFT) bridge types. HR Green will revise the cost estimates based on the information received from MnDOT. Mike Schweyen (MnDOT) noted that he would not support the Parclo interchange option due to safety concerns.
- ii. In addition to looking at different interchange types CSAH 1 rerouting east of US 52 was also studied with possible routes being 90th Ave, 100th Ave and CR 56. HR Green presented alignments, profiles, construction limits, right-of-way, travel times, and cost estimates. Each route was evaluated using the evaluation matrix. Travel times of each route were all within a minute of each other, all costs were relatively the same and right-of-way impacts for each alternative were relatively similar. It was noted 100th Avenue is the road with the highest maintenance costs and needs the most maintenance in the township. There is an active mine off of 100th Avenue. These two issues were noted as benefits for making 100th Avenue a paved county road not otherwise captured in the evaluation matrix. In addition, Goodhue County added that using 100th Ave would expand the paved county system and would be ideal for a mileage swap with the township for the existing CR 1 alignment. The county explained that a CSAH 1 reconstruction project was ending near a driveway to a farm east of CR 56 and north of CSAH 1, therefore any travel time and cost estimates should be revised to include this piece of CSAH 1. The County also noted there is an existing structure along 100th Avenue that is programmed to be replaced next year. If CSAH 1 is the selected route the structure being installed next year should be adequate for use under CSAH 1 the only cost to account for may be additional lengthening to accommodate a wider roadway. The County also noted there are structures along CR 56 that more than likely will need to be replaced if CR 56 is the chosen route to accommodate a wider roadway.

4. Revised Contract Scoping

- a. The remaining deliverables to be provided by HR Green for this project include the public meeting on June 28th, a technical memorandum discussing access management along the corridor with no published maps or specific references; a

Meeting Notes

technical memorandum discussing the interchange options at CSAH 9 including the analysis completed for the CSAH 1 rerouting using 90th, 100th, or CR 56; and the PEL questionnaire document. MnDOT will determine if a signature page with signature lines for MnDOT D6, MnDOT Central Office and FHWA is required for the PEL questionnaire. The group agreed that including these signatures would be advantageous during the future study phases.

5. Public Meeting Presentation

- a. The presentation will include a general summary of the public comments received at and after the open house held in May and the responses to those comments. HR Green will draft responses to the last round of comments received and send to MnDOT and Goodhue County for review.
- b. Greg Isakson (Goodhue County) will present the preferred CSAH 14 alternative (alternative 1.C) and ask for any last comments from the public. The presentation should also note the subarea 1 alternative for CSAH 14 is on a different timetable than the rest of the study.
- c. Access Management along US 52 between Highview Road and CSAH 1 will be presented as a direct response to questions received from the public at the last open house. It needs to be emphasized that these changes are very preliminary and are concepts only. Actual closures are in the distant future.
- d. Broz and others agreed with the approach to present alternative 4.E (interchange at CSAH 9 with 100th Avenue the new route for CSAH 1) as the preferred alternative for subarea 4. The presentation will also show that other interchange types at CSAH 9 were studied to address comments received from the public at the last open house. The presentation will also discuss the rerouting of CSAH 1 with the potential routes being 90th Ave, 100th Ave, and CR 56. 100th Avenue will be presented as the preferred option.
- e. The presentation will finish with a discussion of the overall project development process and next steps moving forward.

Action Items:

- HR Green will calculate the travel time difference between having the interchange at CSAH 1 vs. CSAH 9 for the properties north of CSAH 1.
- HR Green will revise the future local connection possibilities graphic to extend further east to the intersection of CR 25 and CSAH 1, revise the traffic flow arrows, update the map legend, and simplify the graphic.
- HR Green will revise the opinion of probable cost estimates based on the revised costs for the skewed and perpendicular bridge types used in the CSAH 9 interchange analysis.
- HR Green will work with MnDOT and Goodhue County to coordinate the public meeting and develop the meeting materials.



HRGreen

Meeting Notes

- HR Green will draft responses to the last round of comments received and send to MnDOT and Goodhue County for review.