

---

# U.S. HIGHWAY 169

## PRELIMINARY HIGHWAY AND LANDSCAPE DESIGN

### TAC MEETING NOTES

*Meeting Number 2*

*Feb. 9, 2006*

10:00 – 12:00 PM

**Attendees:** See Attached Sign-in Sheet

---

#### **Summary of Action Items:**

- January 12th meetings minutes called approved and will be posted on website as is.
- SRF to scan and create PDF's of all concepts presented and email to TAC members.
- BMI will further develop Area A concepts, discuss with TAC in April
- BMI will draft some more details of Area C concepts following input today

#### **Item #1 – Review of Minutes**

##### **Discussion:**

- No changes to minutes for TAC Meeting 1 held on January 12th, 2006.

##### **Action:**

- Meetings minutes called approved and will be posted on website as is.

#### **Item #2 – Discussion of Alternatives and Approach to Alternatives (Area B)**

##### **Discussion:**

- As a response to a suggestion that widening may be an alternative (to address median width issues), the city thought it was agreed not to widening out curbs (eg. north of Broadway). Some discussion still needed.
- SRF presented topic to be discussed at PAC meeting today. Small group discussions regarding alternatives:
  - Pros/Cons.

- Reaction/suggest changes to concepts.
- If you have \$100 for the project, where/what would you spend it on?
- SRF gave and overview of Alternatives for Area B (Jefferson Street to Union Street)
  - Alternative A – Existing conditions, no access changes
  - Alternative B – Openings every other block
  - Alternative C – Openings at key intersections (proposed intersections: Jefferson, College, Grace, Broadway, Skaro and Union)
- Mn/DOT's Cultural Resources Unit has been given authority by FHWA to make decisions, SHPO has advisory and concurrence role.
- The City's long term goal is raised medians from Jefferson to Union with maximized length of medians (i.e., green space).
- The city prefers Alternative C – better access control, pedestrian crossing, median development.
- The city's top priority is between Walnut and Broadway for reconstruction with median.
- Design should consider:
  - U-turn restrictions – is there criteria that exists to prohibit U-turns? Potential bottleneck?
  - Semi-trucks may have encroachment issues for right-turns with bump-outs, review truck turning radius onto city streets and from street to T.H. 169.
  - Residents already tend to use signalized intersections to make side-street through and left-turn movements. Visitors tend to be the driver that attempt turns from unsignalized side-streets.
  - Will SHPO/CRU allow bump-outs or medians?
  - Group agreed to shorter taper lengths on medians (10:1 ratio or 120 feet). Storage length to be determined by operational analysis.
  - Minimum median width is 4 feet (6 feet desirable); 11 or 12 foot lanes (12' standard); concrete versus grass/tree median; turn lane lengths and widths discussed.
  - Consider the need for crossing by emergency services at Walnut/Mulberry (County Courthouse).
  - Length of turn lanes: Storage 1 truck = 3 cars; need to assure vehicles out of thru lanes.
  - Most truck delivery is thru alleys.
- Potential locations for traffic signals:
  - Broadway, Mulberry, College may be preferred for signals (Need to remember that signals need to meet warrants).
  - Walnut or Grace - High School (and Community Center) signal locations?
  - May not need signal at Grace – better at Walnut?

### **Item #3 – Approach to Technical Analysis (Area B)**

#### **Discussion:**

- SRF presented approach to technical analysis.
  - Safety – will be quantified by determining the number of conflict points (ex: vehicles competing for the same space – goal is to significantly reduce) for existing access (intersections and driveways) for Area B and comparing to alternatives with closed access.
  - Circulation – will be quantified by determining the percent of vehicles that will

experience no impact (mainline through and all right-turning vehicles), moderate impact (all left-turning vehicles) or high impact (side-street thru vehicles) due to closing of access points.

- Intersection Operations – Quantified by conducting a Level of Service analysis.

#### **Item #4 –Concept Alternatives (Areas A and C)**

##### **Discussion:**

- Area A – South end of TH 169 at TH 22
  - Concept alternatives for Area A were presented and reviewed
  - Roundabouts in several options.
  - Don't mix free flow with Pulse flow.
  - All alternatives would infringe on 4.f.land (DNR) but no known cultural resource issues.
  - Peter concerned with alternatives that seem to commit to a bypass in future. Good alternatives are able to be staged.
  - Vertical grade issues at T.H. 99 area.
  - An alternative that aligns T.H. 99 and 22 will encourage local collector traffic to go to T.H. 99 and cross T.H. 169; therefore, reduces southbound T.H. 169 left turns to south T.H. 22.
  - The following are four options for this area:
    1. Existing (do nothing)
    2. Signal at TH 22
    3. Figure 4 (moving TH 22 to be realigned with TH 99 with a roundabout or signalized intersection) as an interim design, Figure 5 as ultimate design.
    4. Figure 11 – Realignment of TH 99 to square intersection, with inside acceleration lanes and right-turn channelization at both TH 22 and TH 99.
  - BMI will further develop these concepts, discuss with TAC in April.
- Area C – North end of TH 169 at TH 22
  - Concept alternatives for Area C were presented and reviewed
  - Concern about exposure time of loaded trucks getting across T.H. 169.
  - Concern about left onto northbound causing conflicts.
  - City is concerned about potential of adding industrial (ex: distribution center) that would significantly add truck traffic. Also, this is where residential growth is happening.
  - These concepts would be an interim solution (x years).
  - “Big Box” is also possible out on west T.H. 22.
  - Currently, signal not warranted.
  - Dave will send out PDF's of concept alternatives.
  - TAC decision is NOT to consider moving location of intersection.
  - The following are five options for this area:
    1. Existing (do nothing)
    2. Existing with an inside acceleration lane for eastbound to northbound left-turns and a southbound channelized right-turn lane.
    3. Signal at TH 22
    4. Figure 3 – Reduced Conflict Intersection
    5. Figure 2 – Tight Diamond Interchange
  - BMI will draft some more details of concepts following input today.

**Action:**

- SRF to scan and create PDF's of all concepts presented and email to TAC members.

**Item #5 – Next TAC Meetings (held at the St. Peter Community Center):**

- Thursday, April 13th, 2006, 10:00 to Noon
- Thursday, May 11th, 2006, 10:00 to Noon
- Thursday, June 8th, 2006, 10:00 to Noon

# TH 169/St. Peter Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-In Sheet

February 9th, 2006 10:00 – 12:00 PM  
St. Peter's Community Room

<u>PRESENT</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>CONTACT PHONE #</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Peter Harff	Mn/DOT	507-389-6877
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marc Flygare	Mn/DOT	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Giles Abbe	Mn/DOT	507-389-6880
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lew Giesking	City of Saint Peter	507-934-0670
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Russ Wille	City of Saint Peter	507-934-0661
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mike Wagner	Nicollet County	507-931-6800
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dave Montebello	SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-475-0010 612-269-4999 (cell)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jon Huseby	Bolton & Menk, Inc.	507-625-4171 507-380-4180 (cell)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mike McGarvey	SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-475-0010
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rena Corneliussen	SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-475-0010
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brett Benzkofer	Bolton & Menk, Inc.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brian Bruckhoff	Mn/DOT	