

FILE COPY

**LAUDERDALE CITY COUNCIL  
ROSEVILLE CITY COUNCIL  
JOINT WORK SESSION AGENDA  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2001  
CITY HALL, 6:30 P.M.**

The City Council is meeting as a legislative body to conduct the business of the City according to ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER AND THE STANDING RULES OF ORDER AND BUSINESS OF THE CITY COUNCIL. Unless so ordered by the Mayor, citizen participation is limited to the times indicated and always within the prescribed rules of conduct for public input at meetings.

1. **CALL MEETING TO ORDER AT 6:30 P. M.**
2. **INTRODUCTIONS AND ROLL CALL**
3. **BACKGROUND** Marc Goess, MNDOT
4. **TRUNK HIGHWAY 280 FACTS** Nancy Daubenberger, MNDOT
5. **ISSUES** Rick Getschow, Lauderdale  
Dennis Welsch/Deb Bloom, Roseville
6. **DISCUSSION** Lauderdale City Council  
Roseville City Council
7. **NEXT STEPS**
8. **ADJOURNMENT**

## City Council Memorandum

To:	Mayor and City Council		
From:	Rick Getschow		
Council Meeting Date:	August 21, 2001	6:30 p.m.	
Agenda Item:	Lauderdale-Roseville Joint Meeting for Highway 280		

### Background:

Over the past two months the Council has been discussing and planning a joint meeting with the City of Roseville regarding the Highway 280 Reconstruction Project. MNDOT was to soon appear before the Roseville City Council with a preliminary layout, and since Roseville has been informed of the MNDOT proceedings with Lauderdale, they felt that the reconstruction project discussion at this point should involve both communities. This is the reason that the Roseville Council requested that we schedule this joint work session together for the purpose of discussing this project.

The Lauderdale Council, the Roseville Council, and MNDOT will be in attendance at this work session along with any affected residents or businesses of either community. Even though Lauderdale and Roseville residents may attend, it has been made clear that this is a work session between the two City Councils and is not a community meeting or a public hearing.

Overall, MNDOT's current position is to take a step back and re-evaluate this entire project since the Lauderdale Council meeting of June 19, when the interchange proposal met with significant opposition. MNDOT would like to see both cities come to an agreement on the 280 Reconstruction that they could receive upper management and federal funding approval. It is important to note that this is an opportunity for both cities to discuss the possibility of reconstructing Highway 280 that still meets the needs and desires of both cities without facing a no-build option. Through meetings with the City of Roseville and MNDOT in preparation for this meeting, I have a feeling that this can be accomplished. This is because MNDOT is not currently categorizing this project as either interchange construction or no-build option.

Enclosed with the agenda is other background material for the meeting. Please remember that the meeting is at 6:30 p.m. as opposed to normal meeting time of 7:30 p.m.

### Enclosures:

1. MNDOT Background Material
  - a. Purpose and Need for Project, Funding, Brief History
  - b. Cover Page of the Federal STP Application
  - c. MNDOT System Plan Sheets
2. City of Roseville memorandum dated July 13, 2001



## TH 280 DISCUSSION

Cities of Lauderdale and Roseville - Joint Council work session, August 21, Lauderdale City Hall

### Purpose and Need for Project

The following operational problems and infrastructure deficiencies currently exist along the TH 280 corridor over the proposed project segment.

- **High incidence of accidents**

TH 280 Related Accident Statistics from 1997 – 1999

<b>Crash Density</b> (Crashes per mile of roadway)	
<u>Metro Average</u>	<u>TH 280 (from 1000' N of Larpenteur Ave. to I-35W)</u>
62.4	108.4

<b>Accident Rate at Intersections</b> (Crashes per million vehicle-miles)		
<u>Metro Average</u>	<u>TH 280/Broadway St.</u>	<u>TH 280/Co. Rd. B</u>
0.6	1.1	0.6

<b>Accident Severity Rate at Intersections</b> (Severity per million vehicle-miles – factors for the type of accident)		
<u>Metro Average</u>	<u>TH 280/Broadway St.</u>	<u>TH 280/Co. Rd. B</u>
1.2	1.9	0.8

- **Traffic Congestion**

**Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) Volume\* > 40,000 vehicles**

**Peak Hour Traffic Volumes\* > 4,100 vehicles**

\*from Year 2000 traffic counts

**Broadway St.** is a high-volume “tee” intersection that connects the industrial area in northeast Minneapolis to TH 280. The traffic volume at this location is high enough to require an interchange.

**County Rd B** intersection is located at the end of the northbound exit ramp to I-35W. During peak hours, traffic on this ramp backs up through the intersection, in the area under the I-35W bridge.

- **Deteriorated pavement**

This section of roadway was constructed during 1956 – 1959. Only minor resurfacing and maintenance has been done since.

- **Traffic Noise**

From noise monitoring performed in the year 2000 for this proposed TH 280 reconstruction project, noise levels at residential receptors along the east side of the highway, north of Larpenteur Avenue, ranged from approximately 62 dBA to 74 dBA (daytime readings, L<sub>10</sub>). The L<sub>10</sub> Minnesota state daytime standard is 65 dBA.

### Funding

See attached sheet from the Federal STP (Surface Transportation Program) Application. Restrictions on the solicitation for this STP funding states that the TAB (Transportation Advisory Board) will not fund Principal Arterial projects of freeway design. Projects on non-freeway routes, including those that upgrade existing roadways to freeway design, are eligible.

See also attached sheets from Mn/DOT Metro Division Transportation System Plan that describes the funding plan for the “middle portion,” or Stage III, of TH 280.



## **TH 280 DISCUSSION**

**Cities of Lauderdale and Roseville - Joint Council work session**

**August 21, Lauderdale City Hall**

### **Brief History:**

**1992-1993** - TH 280 reconstruction was proposed providing pavement rehabilitation, noise abatement, some access closures as well as interchange and intersection modification. A preliminary layout was Mn/DOT staff approved. At a task force meeting in August of 1993, Mn/DOT announced that because of the very tight funding environment, the 1997 redesign of TH 280 will likely be delayed.

**1994** - Legislation was passed (Laws 1994, Chapter 635, Art 1, Sect 35) requiring Commissioner of Transportation to erect noise walls on TH 280 between I-94 and I-35W if Mn/DOT delays the start of TH 280 reconstruction beyond June 30, 1997.

**1995** - Noise walls from Territorial Rd to ¼ mile south of Como Avenue were constructed. (Resolution passed by City of St. Paul supporting wall – April of 1995).

**1996** - Noise wall project from Larpenteur Avenue to I-35W was scheduled to be let in December of 1997. Resolution passed on May 28, 1996 by the City of Lauderdale requesting Mn/DOT **not** construct the noise wall on the east side of TH 280 and that Mn/DOT upgrade the Larpenteur Avenue/TH 280 interchange ASAP.

**Spring, 2000** - Mn/DOT receives STP funding (\$5.5 million) for reconstruction and noise abatement of TH 280 from north of Larpenteur Avenue to I-35W (the only “non-freeway” section of the corridor). Another \$2 million in State Trunk Highway funds was required to match this federal funding.

**Fall, 2000** - Direction was given by Mn/DOT upper staff to look at removing the traffic signal and limiting access at *Broadway Street* as well as County Road B.

### **Project Issues to date:**

- Local cities and businesses expressed concern that the revised layout does not address their current access needs as well as future development needs. Also, upgrades will be required to Industrial Boulevard intersections at Hennepin Avenue (Larpenteur Avenue) and Broadway Street to accommodate the additional traffic due to limiting access at TH 280/Broadway Street. The TH 280 interchange at Larpenteur Avenue would then need to be upgraded as well to a standard “diamond” to accommodate the additional traffic.
- Direction was then given by Mn/DOT upper staff to look at a grade-separated interchange at Broadway Street, upgrading TH 280 to a freeway for its entire length. This interchange would accommodate the future needs of TH 280 as well as the future needs of the Cities of Roseville and Lauderdale, but would impact properties, thus this concept was rejected by the City of Lauderdale.

## FEDERAL STP FUNDING APPLICATION

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Complete and return to Emil Brandt, Transportation Coordinator, Transportation Advisory Board, Mears Park Centre, 230 E. Fifth Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101. (651) 602-1721  
**Applications must be received by 5:00 pm or postmarked on September 20, 1999.**

Office Use Only

### I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. APPLICANT Minnesota Department of Transportation

2. JURISDICTIONAL AGENCY (IF DIFFERENT)

3. MAILING ADDRESS 1500 West County Road B2

CITY Roseville

STATE MN

ZIP CODE 55113

4. COUNTY Ramsey

5. CONTACT PERSON Kimberly Bruch, PE

TITLE Project Manager

PHONE NO.  
(651) 582-1012

### II. PROJECT INFORMATION

6. PROJECT NAME

TH 280 reconstruction from just north of Larpenteur Avenue to TH 36/I-35W.

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Include location, road name and route number, termini, length, type of improvement, etc...)

At present, the north end of T.H. 280, from just north of Larpenteur (but not including Larpenteur) is a four-lane expressway with two signalized intersections and six other at-grade access points within a 1.3-mile segment of roadway. The proposed project would eliminate one of the signalized intersections and all six of the other at-grade access locations, eliminate the substandard geometrics, and improve the safety by eliminating or improving intersecting accesses to the roadway.

8. PROJECT OBJECTIVE

Correct substandard design, improve intersection configurations, eliminate one signalized intersection and six other at-grade access points, reduce crashes, and increase average travel speed.

9. STP PROJECT CATEGORY - Check only one project grouping in which you wish your project to be scored.

"A" Minor Arterials:

☐ Reliever

☐ Connector

☐ Expander

☐ Augmenter

☒ Principal Arterial

☐ Bikeway/Walkway

10. CHECK THIS BOX IF YOU ARE ALSO APPLYING FOR FUNDS THROUGH THE  
 SUPPLEMENTAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROGRAM TO SUPPORT LIVABLE COMMUNITIES. ☐

### III. PROJECT FUNDING

11. FEDERAL AMOUNT \$ 5,500,000

14. MATCH % OF PROJECT TOTAL 20%

12. MATCH AMOUNT \$ 1,375,000

15. SOURCE OF MATCH FUNDS State Trunk Highway Funds

13. PROJECT TOTAL \$ 6,875,000

16. PROGRAM YEAR (CIRCLE) 2002 , 2003 2004

17. SIGNATURE

TITLE



**Table 5-2 2005-2025 Trunk Highway Funding Plan Categorized by Moving Minnesota Strategies**

Table 5-2 2005-2025 Trunk Highway Funding Plan Categorized by Moving Millions				Notes	TOTAL
PRESERVATION (preservation \$ also included below in the corridor-specific costs)					millions
BRIDGE – Repair					\$340
BRIDGE – Replacement					\$300
PAVEMENT					\$500
OTHER PRESERVATION (MISC.)				Traffic control and hydraulic infrastructure preservation	\$290
				<b>PRESERVATION TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,430</b>
MANAGEMENT* (management \$ also included below in the corridor-specific costs)				Notes	TOTAL
Includes Access Management, Advantages for Transit, Hazard Elimination and Safety Improvements, and ITS					\$405
Interchanges – Reconstructing land-access interchanges, conversion of at-grade intersections to interchanges					\$105
				<b>MANAGEMENT TOTAL</b>	<b>\$510</b>
OTHER ALLOCATIONS				Notes	TOTAL
Right-of-Way Acquisition				ROW \$ also included below in the corridor-specific cost estimates	\$249
Supplemental Agreements					\$260
Cooperative Agreements					\$105
				<b>OTHER ALLOCATIONS TOTAL</b>	<b>\$614</b>
INTERREGIONAL CORRIDORS* (includes preservation, management, improvement, expansion, and ROW costs)					TOTAL*
Highway	From	To	Notes		
T.H. 8	I-35	Wisconsin	To be determined by corridor management plans (in progress)	—	
T.H. 10	I-694	Anoka/Sherburne Co.	To be determined by corridor management plans (in progress)	—	
T.H. 36	I-694	T.H. 95	To be determined by corridor management plans (in progress)	—	
T.H. 52	I-494	Dakota/Goodhue Co.	To be determined by corridor management plans (in progress)	—	
I-94	I-494	Hennepin/Wright Co.	To be determined by corridor management plans (in progress)	—	
T.H. 101	I-94	Hennepin/Wright Co.	To be determined by corridor management plans (in progress)	—	
T.H. 169	I-494	Scott/Carver/LeSueur Co.	To be determined by corridor management plans (in progress)	—	
T.H. 212	CR 147	McLeod/Carver Co.	To be determined by corridor management plans (in progress)	—	
Segments of the following IRCs will become eligible to compete for funding after studies are undertaken and completed: I-35, I-35E, I-35W, T.H. 50/61, I-94, T.H. 169					
				<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$502</b>
I-35W	I-694	Anoka/Ramsey Co.	Reconstruction	\$45	
T.H. 36 (St. Croix River Crossing)	T.H. 95	Wisconsin	New River Crossing	\$35	
T.H. 169	I-94	T.H. 610	Interchanges and grade separations	\$53	
T.H. 212	I-494	CR 147	Complete new alignment to CR 147, remainder TBD by CMP	\$145	
				<b>INTERREGIONAL CORRIDOR TOTAL</b>	<b>\$780</b>
BOTTLENECKS/RECONSTRUCTION/LANE ADDS (includes preservation, management, improvement, expansion, and ROW costs)					TOTAL
Highway	From	To	Notes		
I-35E	I-94	I-694	Expansion	\$205	
I-35E	T.H. 110	T.H. 5	Expansion	\$70	
I-35W	Washington Ave.	T.H. 36	Expansion	\$185	
I-35W	46th St.	I-94 Commons	Improvement – includes Lake Street interchange	\$160	
I-35W	T.H. 36	I-694	Improvement	\$50	
T.H. 36	I-35W	I-35E	Expansion	\$110	
T.H. 52	T.H. 156	I-94 (Laf. Br.)	Improvement – includes replacement of Lafayette Bridge	\$90	
T.H. 61	Hastings Br.	Hastings Br.	Expansion – connects the 4 lane portions	\$55	
T.H. 62	I-494	I-35W	Improvement	\$85	
T.H. 62	I-35W	T.H. 55	Improvement	\$45	
I-94	McKnight	T.H. 120	Expansion	\$55	
T.H. 100	36th St.	Cedar Lake Rd.	Expansion	\$45	
T.H. 169	I-494	I-94	Improvement	\$135	
T.H. 252	73rd Ave.	T.H. 610	Expansion	\$20	
T.H. 280	Como Ave.	T.H. 36	Improvement	\$21	
T.H. 610	I-94	T.H. 169	Expansion – completion of new alignment	\$80	
I-494	I-394	T.H. 212	Expansion	\$70	
I-494	I-94	I-394	Expansion	\$80	
I-494	T.H. 100	T.H. 77	Expansion	\$400	
I-694	West Jct. I-35E	East Jct. I-35E	Expansion	\$70	
I-694	East Jct. I-35E	T.H. 36	Expansion	\$70	
I-694	I-35W	West Jct. I-35E	Expansion	\$130	
				<b>BOTTLENECK/RECONSTRUCTION/LANE ADDITIONS TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,231</b>
<b>2005-2025 TRANSPORTATION FUNDING TOTAL</b>					<b>\$5,565</b>
* Significant local or other contributions are expected for IRC projects and any management projects requiring a level of effort beyond minimally managing the facility.					
Note: Project costs are not inflated to the year of construction.					

\* Significant local or other contributions are expected for IRC projects and any management projects requiring a level of effort beyond minimally managing the facility.

Note: Project costs are not inflated to the year of construction.



Table 6-1: Project Development and IRC Study Timing  
Improvement, Expansion, and IRC Corridors\*

HIGHWAY	LOCATION WITHIN METRO DIVISION SERVICE AREA**	PROJECT DEVELOPMENT				
		STUDY TIMING		INVESTMENT TIMING		
		2001-2005	2006-2024	2005-2010	2011-2015	2016-2025
T.H. 8	From I-35 to Wisconsin	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
T.H. 10	From Sherburne County to I-694	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
I-35E	Cayuga Bridge and Phalen connection – replace bridge, improve connection	EIS already approved		EXP		
I-35E	From I-694 to I-94		SU			EXP
I-35E	From T.H. 5 to T.H. 110	Study completed				EXP
I-35W	From Anoka County to T.H. 36		SU			IMP
I-35W	From T.H. 36 to I-94		SU			EXP
I-35W	Lake Street interchange	SC		IMP		
I-35W	From I-94 to 46 <sup>th</sup> Street		SU			IMP
T.H. 36	St. Croix River Bridge Crossing	SC		EXP		
T.H. 36	From I-35W to I-35E		SC			EXP
T.H. 36	From I-694 to T.H. 95	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
T.H. 52	From I-94 to T.H. 156 (includes Lafayette Bridge replacement)	SC		Bridge		IMP
T.H. 52	From I-494 to Goodhue County	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
T.H. 61	Hastings Bridge – replacement	SU			EXP	
T.H. 62	From I-494 to T.H. 55		SU			IMP
I-94	From McKnight Road to T.H. 120 – additional lanes	SC		EXP		
I-94	From Wright County to I-494	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
I-94	From Weaver Lake Road to T.H. 100	Study completed in 2000		In TIP		
T.H. 100	From Cedar Lake Road to 36 <sup>th</sup> Street	SC		EXP		
T.H. 101	From Wright County to I-494	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
T.H. 169	Anderson Lakes, Pioneer Trail, and Belle Plain interchanges	SC		EXP		
T.H. 169	From LeSueur County to I-494	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
T.H. 169	From I-494 to I-94		SU			IMP
T.H. 169	T.H. 610 and Brooklyn Boulevard Interchanges	Feasibility Study completed 1998		EXP		
T.H. 169	Mississippi River Crossing (Dayton/Anoka) alignment to be determined	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
T.H. 212	Construction on new alignment	Study already completed			EXP	
T.H. 212	From McLeod County to T.H. 62	SC		TBD	TBD	TBD
T.H. 252	From T.H. 610 to I-694		SU			EXP
T.H. 280	From Como to TH 36	SC				IMP
I-494	From T.H. 100 to T.H. 77 – additional lanes, Penn Avenue interchange	SC			EXP	
I-494	From I-394 to T.H. 212 – additional lanes	SC		EXP		
I-494	From I-394 to I-94	SC		EXP		
T.H. 610	From I-94 to T.H. 169	Environmental study completed in 1994			EXP	
I-694	Junction I-35E – unweave	SC		EXP		
I-694	From I-35W to I-35E – additional lanes	SC		EXP		
I-694	From I-35E to T.H. 36		SU		EXP	

SU = Study underway SC = Study expected to be completed during this interval IMP = Improvement EXP = Expansion  
TBD = To be determined based on IRC Corridor Management Plan or partnership study

\* IRCs for which no significant study or improvement is anticipated before 2005 are listed on Table 6-2.

\*\* Some corridors extend beyond the Metro Division's jurisdiction. Such corridors will be studied in cooperation with other Mn/DOT districts.





## Memo

2660 Civic Center Drive

Roseville, Minnesota 55113

(651)490-2200

fax: (651)490-2275

**DATE:** July 13, 2001  
**TO:** Neal Beets, City Manager  
**FROM:** Debra Bloom, Acting Public Works Director  
**SUBJECT:** Proposed Trunk Highway 280 Reconstruction

The Minnesota Department of Transportation is planning to reconstruct the portion of Trunk Highway 280 between Highway 36 and Larpenteur Avenue. The State has received a federal grant for the work and the project is programmed for construction in 2004. The main focus of this improvement is the elimination of the traffic signals at Broadway Avenue and County Road B. We have proposed to construct the City's Terminal Road realignment project in conjunction with the State's project. Our project is also federally funded. Together, the projects would provide improved access from 280 into the Rosedale Commercial Area.

### City of Roseville Issues

The initial plan the State proposed showed restricted access at both intersections, making them a right-in/right-out condition. Only southbound traffic would have been able to access the Paper Clemson (PaperCal) Site, and any traffic exiting this site would only be able to exit to the south. This plan was brought to PaperCal earlier this year. The design was unacceptable to them for a number of reasons.

PaperCal contacted the City regarding their concerns about the proposal to cut off their business from turning northbound onto 280. The function of their site revolves around transportation of goods with trucks, and eliminating that access to northbound 280 could be constituted as a taking. The state was interested in discussing what alternatives PaperCal would support for these intersections. PaperCal retained Glen Van Wormer, a traffic consultant with Short Elliott Hendrickson, to start developing some different alternatives for the reconstruction of this road.

The City started attending regular meetings with PaperCal, Glen Van Wormer and the State to discuss the different alternatives and work through some of the issues. The group had come up with a plan that would allow PaperCal to have full access at Broadway, and partial access at their North Driveway. This proposal was a "tight diamond" interchange, with a right in/ right out at the north driveway. PaperCal was comfortable with this alternative; however, the new proposal would eliminate four to five houses in Lauderdale. In order to determine if this was a viable alternative, the State contacted the residents that live in the homes on the east side of this intersection to see how receptive they would be to being bought out.



### **City of Lauderdale Issues**

Concurrent to these discussions, the State had been talking with and presenting their preliminary plans to the City Administrator of Lauderdale, as well as the Lauderdale City Council. There is an undeveloped commercial site to the south and west of this intersection. It is one of the few commercial sites in the City of Lauderdale. The initial proposal would have cut into this vacant parcel making it less developable.

The City of Lauderdale has communicated to the State that any proposal to eliminate homes or eliminate portions of their undeveloped commercial site would not be acceptable to them. They are also concerned about the existing ramps at Larpenteur Ave and Como Avenue. These ramps do not meet today's design standards for speed or safety, and are not included as a part of this project.

### **Mn/DOT Issues**

If we cannot find a solution that is acceptable to everyone, we will not be reconstructing this road in 2004, and will lose the Federal funds that were obtained for the project. As far as an overall timeline, if the State does not reconstruct the road in 2004, they foresee that this roadway segment will remain unimproved for at least 20 years. They stated that any improvements to the interchanges at Larpenteur and Como would be pushed back even beyond that. It is also possible for Mn/DOT to close off the Broadway intersection as a maintenance project, which would have the same impacts to the surrounding property with none of the mitigation.

### **What's Next?**

PaperCal has said that the initial plans were unacceptable, but they could support the "tight diamond" interchange proposal. The City of Lauderdale has said that the plans shown to them thus far are not acceptable. The State would prefer not to lose the money.

The purpose of this joint work session in August is for Mn/DOT to start at the beginning with the design process. The State will focus on the issues, the pros and cons of the project, the Council's goals, and how we can make this project work toward those goals.

As you can tell, there are a number of issues we may not be able to resolve. There are other nuances to these discussions that will be covered in depth at the work session. I have attached both of the alternatives presented by Mn/DOT. If you have any questions, please contact me at extension 221.

DB:dk