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Project Overview

• Study Location
  – Begins:
    • Highview Road South of Cannon Falls
  – Ends:
    • 135th Avenue South of Hader
Project Overview

• Previous Studies
  – Identified recommended Highway 52 safety improvements
    • Interchange in the vicinity of CR 1 & CR 9
    • Removal of all direct access to US 52, including CR 14

• Current Study
  – Identify recommended locations of safety improvements
    • CR 14 alignment and connection
    • Interchange location in the vicinity of CR 1 or CR 9
## Project Overview

- **Project Development Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td>US 52 Safety, Access. and Interchange Location Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming/Funding</td>
<td>STIP/TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No identified Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development/NEPA</td>
<td>Alternative Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Finalize Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Operations Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Study Will Inform NEPA and Design
Public Input Summary

• Previous Public Meetings
  – August 25, 2010
  – April 7, 2011
  – May 15, 2012
  • Over 40 residents attended
  • Public input requested on alternatives
    – CR 14 (Subarea 1)
    – CR1/9 interchange location (Subarea 4)
Public Input Summary

- May 15th General Comments:
  - Acceptance of the project need (SAFETY!)
  - Support for closing CR 14 and extending north
  - Support for interchange construction
  - Concern over travel time and route if access at either CR 1 or CR 9 is closed/modified (i.e., backtracking)
CR 14 Evaluation

• Meeting Comments
  – Highest support for Alternative 1.C (backage road)
  – Some concerns over property impacts
Regarding the CR 14 options:

“I see Alt. 1.C as the best answer – it’s the most cost effective, less land to develop, and would provide the maximum investment efficiency considering the new Cannon Falls interchange.”

-Resident Comment
Alternative 1.C (backage road) recommended
- Supported by technical analysis
- Supported by majority of public
Local Connections

- Reasonable connections possible
- Options are the same regardless of interchange location (CR 1 or CR 9)
  - Impacts vary by interchange location
    - Travel times
    - Closure of driveways in interchange area
- Future connections will be made as needed for:
  - Safety
  - Operational issues (rising traffic volumes)
Local Connections

- West of US 52
  - Possible connections to CR 14 & CR 1
  - Some frontage roads, but not continuous

- East of US 52
  - Highview Rd. to Skunk Hollow Tr.
  - Skunk Hollow Tr. To Wagner Hill Way
    - Frontage road along Wagner Hill
    - Backage road along ravine
    - Existing grid (go south)
  - Wagner Hill Way to CR 1
Interchange Evaluation

- Some support for Alt. 4.E (CR 9) for subarea 4
  - Concern over local access if CR 1 is closed
  - Concern over CR 1 to CR 9 connection (100th Ave)
  - Concern over CR 9 interchange design
  - Concern over impacts to prime farmland
Interchange Evaluation

- Technical analysis supports CR 9 interchange location
  - Performs best for safety (better for regional system)
  - Impacts the least amount of properties
  - Least impact on regional travel times, but higher impact on local travel times
CR1/9 Connectivity

- Connection needed to maintain route connectivity for existing CR 1 and CR 9
- New designated north/south county route east of US 52 necessary
- Improvements required regardless of the interchange location
CR1/9 Connectivity

- Three alternatives evaluated
  - 90th Ave
  - 100th Ave
  - CR 56

- Evaluated based on:
  - Safety
  - Access
  - Connectivity-mobility
  - SEE
  - Cost effectiveness
## CR1/9 Connectivity

### Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Access Mgmt.</th>
<th>Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90th Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th Ave</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CR1/9 Connectivity

• Evaluation results:
  – 100th Ave is the shortest and has lowest travel time
  – 100th Ave most cost effectiveness with several benefits:
    • Paved road will improve safety/maintenance for heavy trucks (mining operation)
    • 100th Ave has most maintenance requests in township
    • A bridge on 100th Ave is currently programmed for replacement
    • 100th Ave would add pavement to the county-wide system without increasing overall mileage
Interchange Evaluation

- Technical analysis supports CR 9 location
- Supported by majority of public
- Additional evaluation was completed in response to public input and concern over:
  - Access replacement and local connection
  - Re-routing of CR 1 on 100th Ave
  - CR 9 interchange design and impacts to prime farmland
    - Interchange design evaluation
Interchange Evaluation

- **US 52/CR 9 Design Alternatives**
  - 3 alternative designs evaluated
  - A preferred alternative will **not** be selected as part of this study
  - Completed as part of environmental documentation and final design process once funded
  - Instead, this study will identify an interchange footprint to guide future development
Interchange Evaluation

- **US 52/CR 9 Design Alternatives**

  - **Alt. 4.E.1: Diamond with perpendicular bridge**
    - Takes advantage of hill on south
    - Shortest bridge and lowest cost
    - High ROW impacts
  
  - **Alt. 4.E.2: Diamond with skewed bridge**
    - Longer bridge and higher cost
    - Less ROW Impacts
  
  - **Alt. 4.E.3: PARCLO with skewed bridge**
    - Longer bridge and higher cost
    - Non-traditional design
    - Minimizes ROW Impacts
Interchange Evaluation

- Identify Footprint to Guide Future Development
Study Conclusions

• County Road 14
  – Recommendation
    • Backage Road (Alternative 1.C)
  – Next Steps
    • County board decision (summer 2012)
    • Right-of-way (fall 2012)
Study Conclusions

• Interchange Location
  – Recommendation
    • Interchange at CR 9
  – Next Steps
    • Complete study documentation (fall 2012)
    • No funding identified
Study Conclusions

• CR 1 to CR 9 Connection
  – Recommendation
    • 100th Avenue alignment for future CR 1 to CR 9 connection
  – Next Steps
    • Complete study documentation (fall 2012)
    • Secure funding
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