



Meeting Notes

US 52 Safety, Access, and Interchange Study

PMT Meeting – Goodhue County Public Works
1:00 p.m., April 17, 2012

Attendees:

Nancy Klema, MnDOT	Greg Isakson, Goodhue County	Jack Broz, HR Green
Heather Lukes, MnDOT	Ken Bjornstad, Goodhue County	Ryan Allers, HR Green
Greg Paulson, MnDOT	John Miller, Stanton Township	Dan Edgerton, HR Green
Kristin Kammueler, MnDOT	Roy Otto, Cannon Falls Township	
Mike Kempinger, MnDOT	Richard Samuelson, Goodhue County Commissioner	

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. Project Subareas

- a. Broz explained that the project study area has been divided into smaller subareas in order to facilitate the development and evaluation of alternatives. Subareas were determined based on the independent utility of potential improvements, as well as the logical termini for these improvements.
- b. It was noted that there are seven subareas within the study area. In order to address the highest priority issues and needs first, the focus of the current effort is Subarea 1 (CSAH 14 connection) and Subarea 4 (interchange location within the vicinity of CSAH 1 and CSAH 9).

3. Evaluation of Alternatives

- a. Broz presented the project goals and the measures of effectiveness and explained that each alternative was evaluated against these criteria, based on the technical analysis conducted.
- b. Broz presented the alternative evaluation matrix and explained the rating system with green being beneficial, yellow being neutral, and red being not beneficial.
- c. Dan Edgerton (HR Green) explained the measures of effectiveness under the connectivity and mobility goal, which include a measure for mobility on US 52, regional connectivity, local connectivity, and low impact intersections to remain.

4. Subarea 1 Alternatives and Evaluation

- a. Greg Isakson (Goodhue County) presented the location and rationale for the four Subarea 1 alternatives. The general intent of the Subarea 1 alternatives is to

Meeting Notes

provide a CSAH 14 connection to the US 52/CSAH 24 Cannon Falls interchange project.

- b. Isakson explained that there is an opportunity for the County to leverage excess material from the excavation of the proposed CSAH 14 alignment for the US 52/CSAH 24 interchange project as a potential savings for CSAH 14.
- c. Isakson mentioned that one of the major landowners in the area is willing to sell his property and has contacted the County.
- d. Commissioner Richard Samuelson (Goodhue County) expressed support for closing CSAH 14 access at US 52 due to safety concerns.
- e. Greg Paulson (MnDOT) noted that Alternative 1.C (backage road parallel to US 52) makes it more feasible to close an existing residential access along US 52 over the other alternatives.
- f. The consensus of the PMT was to move Alternative 1.C forward as the recommendation to be presented to the public.

5. Subarea 4 Alternatives and Evaluation

- a. Heather Lukes (MnDOT) presented the location and rationale for the Subarea 4 alternatives. Previous studies have established the need for an interchange in this area. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the interchange location. General areas considered included CSAH 1, CSAH 9, mid-way between the two, and a split diamond with a bridge at both CSAH 1 and CSAH 9.
- b. Nancy Klema (MnDOT) questioned the rationale for leaving right-in/right-out access at CSAH 9 with an interchange a CSAH 1 and stated that all public access within one-mile of the interchange should be closed. It was also stated that a distance scale should be added to the figures.
- c. Paulson raised a concern over showing too much (in terms of access closures) on the figures as the design for the interchange will likely change throughout the final design process.
- d. The group discussed the logic for leaving right-in/right-out access at some locations. Generally, the study acknowledges that the ultimate intent is to implement Vision 52 (convert US 52 to a freeway), however the purpose of this evaluation is to focus on the work that will be done as part of the interchange project. After some discussion, the group agreed that the right-in/right-out access can remain on the figures, but the arrows should be removed and a note should be added to clearly state that these improvements are preliminary and subject to change.
- e. Broz presented a general summary of the evaluation for each alternative and noted that based on the evaluation, Alternative 4.E received the best score.
- f. Isakson explained that upon acceptance of Alternative 4.E, additional design analysis would be done. As an example, changing the skew of the proposed CSAH 9 bridge would be evaluated in an effort to minimize impacts to the adjacent land.

Meeting Notes

- g. The cost estimates shown in the evaluation matrix were questioned. Edgerton stated that the costs are approximate and intended to provide the magnitude of cost differences between the alternatives; they are not a detailed design level estimate. The group agreed that the cost estimates should be revised to show a range with rounded numbers (i.e., round to the nearest half million).
- h. Paulson asked the township representatives (John Miller, Stanton Township and Roy Otto, Cannon Falls Township) if they felt that the evaluation and outcome (Alternative 4.E) would be generally acceptable to their constituents. Miller and Otto agreed that residents generally support the CSAH 9 interchange location.
- i. Commissioner Samuelson emphasized the need to present impacted property owners (i.e., driveway closures) with a mitigation plan.
- j. The consensus of the PMT was to move Alternative 4.E forward as the recommendation to be presented to the public.

6. Public Meeting

- a. Broz explained that the next step in the process is to present the PMT recommendations to the public at a public meeting.
- b. Edgerton stated that meeting would be held at the Urland Lutheran Church, which has open availability for the month of May.
- c. The group agreed on May 15, from 5 to 7 as a tentative date and time for the public meeting, with May 22 as a backup.

Action Items:

- HR Green will revise the Subarea 4 Figures to include a distance scale and a note stating that this work is preliminary. In addition, the right-in/right-out arrows will be removed from the figures.
- HR Green will revise the opinion of probable cost estimates to show a range and rounded numbers (i.e., round to the nearest half million).
- HR Green will work with MnDOT and Goodhue County to coordinate the public meeting and develop the meeting materials.