



ALLIANT PROJ. NO. 118-0184.0

## SRC MEETING MINUTES

**DATE/TIME:** Tuesday, February 19; 2:00 p.m.  
**LOCATION:** East Grand Forks City Hall  
**PROJECT:** Mn 220 N Corridor Study  
**PURPOSE:** Study Review Committee Meeting 2 – Issues and Needs  
**MINUTES BY:** Mike Anderson, Alliant Project Manager; (612-767-9340)

---

### 1) Introductions

See attached sign in sheet for list of meeting attendees

### 2) Overview of Key System Needs

Mike gave an overview of the key issues identified and discussed at SRC 2. Key highlights are included in the meeting powerpoint. (Attached).

### 3) Overview of Alternatives

Mike provided an overview of the alternatives. The alternatives were identified to address the system needs through improvements to access control, mobility, safety and pedestrian crossings of Mn 220. The alternatives were identified to at intersections, two key segments (23<sup>rd</sup> Street-140<sup>th</sup> Street and 17<sup>th</sup> Street to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street) and other treatments such as pedestrian sidewalk connections. (Exhibit 5-1 is attached).

### 4) Intersection Alternatives Evaluation

Mike discussed the technical metrics and terms used to evaluate the alternatives. Included in the attached powerpoint. In addition, a discussion on the nine categorical metrics that align with project purpose and need, study objectives and the 2045 MTP performance measures, visions and goals. A brief discussion on the priority of the categories occurred. The SRC concurred with the priority that was assigned. MnDOT noted that modal interrelationship at the Mn 220/17<sup>th</sup> Street intersection might be considered more important.

### 5) Intersection Alternatives

Mike and the SRC walked through each alternative developed for the study intersections. Highlights of the discussion include:

17<sup>th</sup> Street

- Concern was raised relative to the need to facilitate the motor coach circulation off of Mn 220 onto the west frontage road.
- The SRC did not like the trade off of routed pedestrians to outside of the frontage roads in the case of the splitter islands being too small. This led to the idea that the RAB could potentially be shifted to the east such that a larger island could be developed facilitating the ped crossing while maintaining access to the west frontage road. In this alternative the media on the east side would extend through the east frontage road
- The SRC found reasonable that a median could extend through the east frontage road and business access be relatively unimpacted due to the supporting access, streets and frontage road. It is acknowledged that certain routes (traveling north/south through along the frontage road) might be affected, but at relatively small inconvenience.
- Truck traffic through the roundabout is of primary concern. MnDOT noted the Mn220 design vehicle is a WB-67. The SRC noted that larger trucks (67') may need to gain access to Valley Trucking and other businesses.
- Agricultural vehicles require extra width. It was noted that the width is not relative to the wheelbase, but the width of the vehicle. Careful design and setback of light poles, signs, structures, etc is required for this consideration and can be accommodated within either alternative.
- **Action: Alliant will further evaluate the RAB with respect to key truck movements and truck trailer sizes and provide follow up with the SRC to ultimately determine if the RAB is feasible from this perspective.**
- It was noted that a traffic signal operation may not be warranted until 2045 and this is with a 3/4 access restriction at 20<sup>th</sup> Street (3/4 Access at 20<sup>th</sup> results in through and left turn traffic using 17<sup>th</sup> Street to help justify traffic control change.
- **Action: Alliant will verify the estimate year the traffic signal will be warranted and follow up with the SRC as this may influence the intersection alternative selection.**

#### 14<sup>th</sup> Street:

- It was noted that the roundabout alternative requires a multi-lane (2x1) footprint. It is anticipated this footprint will impact frontage road operations and is not a feasible control.
- Rebuilding the traffic signal system with key safety and operational improvements were determined to be the preferred approach.

#### US 2/Mn 220

- Discussed signal operation and visibility improvements, including flashing yellow arrow (FYA), signal timing, coordination, signal head placement relative to the signal rebuild options.
- Concluded that the preferred alternative relative to rebuilding the signal system control is the construction of eastbound dual left turn lane and the right turn geometric improvements
- The RAB was discussed and although is expected to have very good operational and safety benefit it was dismissed by the SRC due to multilane design, concern about driver familiarity, increased crashes (though less severe), and is not a consistent traffic control choice given 14<sup>th</sup> Street will remain a signal and a signal is in operation at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.
- The eastbound displaced left turn was dismissed due to its expected frontage road impacts, familiarity concern, and marginal difference when compared to the dual left turn operation.

- High level intersection configurations were discussed. It was noted that traditional interchange design would have significant property impacts and were dismissed. Non-traditional ideas were discussed. The SRC concluded that the large investment required for grade separation is not worth the return, given the operational/safety can be improved with other options, the mobility concern is not that significant in 2045 to warrant such an investment, and the corridor visual/environmental change that would result. Interchange concepts will not be carried further.
- The Alternative A-1 (dual left turn) plus improved right turn lane design was identified as the preferred intersection design
- It was noted that signal improvements could be made in the interim to achieve safety benefit (e.g., FYA and signal head arrangement not requiring full replacement).

23<sup>rd</sup> Street:

- The roundabout was determined to be preferred long term design and intersection control

20<sup>th</sup> Street:

- Concern was raised relative to the small pork chop islands (west side frontage road) relative to truck turns.
- Discussion was made relative to importance of needing a  $\frac{3}{4}$  access. It was noted that the  $\frac{3}{4}$  access helps justify traffic control change at 17<sup>th</sup> Street, and reduces pedestrian crosswalk conflicts.
- The City noted that most pedestrians typically prefer to cross at 17<sup>th</sup> Street and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Addition of sidewalk on the east side from 20<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> would help encourage crossing at those intersections and potentially the crosswalk could be removed.
- MnDOT noted that an RRFB could be a potential improvement at this location if the crosswalk remains.
- Decision on the 20<sup>th</sup> Street design and pedestrian treatments needs further discussion following the selection of the preferred design at 17<sup>th</sup> Street.

15<sup>th</sup> Street:

- The pedestrian crosswalk alternatives at 15<sup>th</sup> Street were identified to encourage pedestrian crossings at an intersection instead of mid-block.
- After discussion, it was determined that establishing a crossing at this intersection is likely to not be used and is not the worth the investment.
- No build alternative is preferred.

10<sup>h</sup> Street:

- Did not discuss

**6) Segment Alternatives**

Mike and the SRC walked through each alternative developed for the key corridor segments. Highlights of the discussion include:

9<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> Street

- Discussed the pavement marking alternative to address the lane merge/left turn lane conflict at 9<sup>th</sup> Street. No comments were made.

23<sup>rd</sup> Street to 140<sup>th</sup> Street SW

- Discussed cross-section alternatives.
- It was noted that the future access locations denoted on Figure 5-1 are consistent with planned locations.
- The SRC concurred that the alternative of adding left turn and right turn pockets (as opposed to continues 3-lane section) made the most sense in terms of implementing improvements as access and developments occur.

17<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street

- MnDOT denoted their preference that 17<sup>th</sup> Street to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street be minimized to the extent feasible. In support of the 2-lane cross-section alternative.
- Cross-section design is dependent upon traffic control selection at 17<sup>th</sup> Street. It is also dependent upon the intersection design for 20<sup>th</sup> Street. Further follow up on the preferred segment design needs to occur.

7) **Next Steps**

- a. **Public Meeting 2 (Early to Mid April)**
- b. **SRC Meeting 3 (Early to Mid April)**

8) **Other Discussion**

None