



U.S. HIGHWAY 169

PRELIMINARY HIGHWAY AND LANDSCAPE DESIGN

TAC MEETING NOTES

Meeting Number 4
May 11th, 2006
10:00 – 12:00 PM

Attendees: See Attached Sign-in Sheet

Summary of Action Items:

- April 20th, 2006 meetings minutes called approved and will be posted on website as is.
- SRF and MnDot will discuss additional hours to complete more detailed analysis of Areas A and C.
- SRF will complete the technical analysis and BMI will complete costs for each alternative by the June 8th meeting.
- City staff will recommend the best location for a roundabout on the north end
- Need to get more input from the County

Item #1 – Review of Minutes

Discussion:

- No changes to minutes for TAC Meeting #3 held on April 20th, 2006.

Action:

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

Item #2 – Discussion of Areas A and C

Discussion

- More detailed analysis of the Area A and C alternatives that is noted in the project scope is being considered per MnDot. SRF and MnDot will discuss additional hours to complete this analysis.
- Area A – South End: Hwy 169/TH 22 and Hwy 169/TH 99 intersections
 - Dave presented VISSIM animation of double roundabout
 - SRF to determine if double roundabout alternative can be staged as part of the long-term bypass. This will be noted in the traffic memorandum.
 - Frontage road access at the Hwy 169/TH 22 intersection with a roundabout can be accommodated.
- Area C - North End: Hwy 169/TH 22 intersection
 - Dave presented VISSIM animation of the modified Michigan U-turn alternative
 - Some think this alternative may be too confusing and an at-grade signalized intersection or an interchange is the best option
 - MnDot believes that the Michigan u-turn intersection type is easier to use than one might think, and this is a good location to put an intersection of this kind.
 - MnDot would like to look at this alternative.
 - Five alternatives will be looked at at this location: At-grade signalized intersection, interchange, roundabout, Michigan U-turn and as is with acceleration lanes.
 - Methodology for testing Michigan U-turn for future conditions will be to increase traffic on TH 169 based on historic traffic growth patterns and do incremental increases for the side-street (double, triple, etc.) to determine how this type of intersection operates with the increased traffic.
- SRF will complete the technical analysis and BMI will complete costs for each alternative by the June 8th meeting.

Action

- SRF and MnDot will discuss additional hours to complete more detailed analysis of Areas A and C.
- SRF will complete the technical analysis and BMI will complete costs for each alternative by the June 8th meeting.

Item #3 – Union Street Discussion

Discussion

- The Union Street area at Hwy 169 is currently a high crash location with high traffic speeds and a lot of driveway access points, but it is not a location that has significant operational problems.
- Traffic at Union Street will be impacted by the Wal-mart development. Should an analysis of this intersection be completed at this time to determine what would need to be improved or wait until Wal-mart comes in with a proposal and do analysis later?
- Other developments will come in at the same time if Wal-mart comes in, but they won't come without it.
- MnDot would prefer to look at this as part of the overall concept, but figure out the details if

the project moves forward

- The Union Street area is a good location for a potential roundabout, would help slow speeds before traffic gets into town.
- A roundabout near Union Street would provide circulation to areas that are impacted by the medians.
- At this point, a roundabout will be presented as a concept; no design or details will be developed.
- City staff will recommend the best location for a roundabout on the north end

Action

- City staff will recommend the best location for a roundabout on the north end

Item #3 – Area B Discussion

Discussion

- We are at a point in the process where we need to decide how we can move forward to choose the median locations. What should the process be so we can get to a point where we can make a recommendation to the city council? Goal for today's meeting is to narrow down to a couple alternatives and decide the recommended alternative by the June 8th TAC meeting.
- The group would like to work towards deciding an alternative today that can be commented on by the public. Public is more likely to voice their opinion when given only one option.
- Nothing less than a median every other block should be considered (would not provide any aesthetic or pedestrian benefit if it were shorter).
- A more restrictive design (minimal number of full access intersections) will give more landscaping options and it will reduce crossing distance substantially.
- The decision on median locations is not a traffic operations issue, any alternative will work traffic-wise. Median locations should be decided based on aesthetics, circulation, safety benefits and local input.
- Traffic volumes at College Avenue/Minnesota Avenue may not meet signal warrants. This intersection should be a full access with side-street stop control, with the understanding that a signal could be installed in the future if the traffic volume increases
- The City of St. Peter's input:
 - Consider a more restrictive option that maximizes aesthetics and provides improved pedestrian accommodations.
 - Medians will force local traffic to use 3rd Street and Front Street, which is desirable in order to keep traffic down on Hwy 169. This will also help to promote more businesses on 3rd and Front Streets.
 - Most traffic already uses signalized locations for crossing anyway.
 - Full access at Grace Street is not desired; this is not considered a high traveled road and is the "backdoor" to Gustavus College. The City and Gustavus College do not want to see this street as a major roadway. Gustavus wants Broadway Avenue to be roadway used to access campus.
 - Consider a continuous median from Walnut to Broadway
- Access to the county offices and courthouse (input/discussion with Mike Wagner)
 - Main entrance to the building is on Mulberry.
 - Having full access at Mulberry and Hwy 169 is important to the County since most people coming to the building are not familiar with the area. Closing access would make it more difficult for unfamiliar patrons to get to the building.
 - The group is open to considering a southbound left-in only on Hwy 169 to Mulberry.

- Instead of providing a left-in at this location, providing detailed signing will help unfamiliar drivers get to the courthouse.
- During the driveway counts in Ruttles parking lot, it was noticed that many vehicles pulled into the Ruttles parking lot in order to drop off people that were going to the courthouse.
- Include courthouse as part of the workshops on May 25th in order to get their opinion on Mulberry access
- Pedestrian crossings in downtown area
 - City would like to see countdown pedestrian timers installed at all signalized intersections.
 - The city is concerned about the lack of controlled pedestrian crossings between Walnut and Broadway. Crossings will be provided at all cross-streets, but they will not be signal controlled.
 - The perception will be that these crossings will not be as safe as those at a signalized intersection. Children and elderly people have problems deciding if vehicle gaps are big enough to cross and do not feel comfortable using uncontrolled crossings. (Some observations show that people violate current signals and cross wide street at the controlled locations also)
 - One of the biggest concerns and reasons for this project is pedestrian safety. Safety must be improved as part of this project.
 - Nassau, Broadway and Walnut are currently the high-pedestrian crossing volume intersections in the downtown area.
 - It was suggested that a pedestrian-only signal be considered at one of the cross-streets. This is a traffic signal that only turns red and stops traffic on TH 169 when a pedestrian pushes the call button.
 - Since Nassau is currently the highest pedestrian volume area and a signal is already in place at this intersection, maybe the existing signal can be converted to a pedestrian only signal?
 - Is a pedestrian-only signal in Hwy 169 a policy issue for MnDOT?
- Possible left-out only at Myrtle for use by the sheriff's office needs to be discussed with the sheriff. Walnut is accessible from the back of the sheriff's office so this may be a better option. Sheriff would have signalized intersection to access Hwy 169.
- Ruttles requested medians be built from Broadway to Mulberry, not to Walnut.
- Alternative to propose to the PAC this afternoon: Walnut and Broadway as signalized intersections, possible signal at College in the future, possible SB left-in only at Mulberry and possible pedestrian-only signal at Nassau.
- Medians along Hwy 169 will be built in segments:
 - Segment One: Walnut to Broadway
 - Segment Two: Elm to Walnut and Broadway to Ramsey
 - Segment Three: Jefferson to Elm and Ramsey to Union
- Segments wont necessarily be "staged", segment one and two may be built at the same time with segment three being built in the long-term. All od this depends on financing.
- Discussed PAC attendance. Are we getting well balanced input? Do we need to do something different?

Item #4 – Next TAC Meetings and other meetings (held at the St. Peter Community Center):

- Open House #2: Thursday, May 25th, 2006 4:30-6:30 (Senior Center)
- TAC Meeting #5: Thursday, June 8th, 2006, 10:00 to Noon
- TAC Meeting #6: Thursday, July 13th, 2006 10:00 to Noon
- Final Open House: Thursday, July 27th 2006 (tentative)

TH 169/St. Peter Technical Advisory Committee Meeting 3 Sign-In Sheet

April 20th, 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 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 checked="" 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 Corneliuss	SRF Consulting Group, Inc.	763-475-0010
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brett Benzkofer	Bolton & Menk, Inc.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brian Bruckhoff	Mn/DOT	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Todd Prafke	City Administrator	507-943-0663
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nick Haggemiller	City of Saint Peter	507-934-0663