



Record of Meeting

SRF No. 11648

Location: SRF Consulting Group – Great Plains Conference Room

Client: Fargo-Moorhead Metro COG

Date: 4/4/2019

Subject: SRC Meeting #4

Attendees: Michael Maddox (Metro COG), Kristie Leshovsky (City of Moorhead), Jonathan Atkins (City of Moorhead), Mary Safgren (MnDOT), David Leonard (MSUM), Lori Van Beek (MATBUS), Leif Garnass (SRF), Emily Gross (SRF)

Purpose of Meeting:

Update the SRC on the progress, discuss year 2045 build alternative draft concepts and evaluation and provide information on the plan for Round 2 of engagement.

Summary of Meeting:

1. Schedule Update
 - a. Leif provided an overview of the schedule. We are still currently on track. Round 2 of public engagement expected to occur in May and Round 3 (which will be just informational) is anticipated in July.
2. Draft Alternatives and Evaluation
 - a. Status of Tech Memos
 - i. Data Collection – finalized and on the website.
 - ii. Existing Conditions – Leif sent out a revised memo; waiting for comments before finalizing and adding to the website.
 - iii. Traffic Forecasts– Leif sent out a draft memo; waiting for comments.
 - iv. Purpose and Need – SRF to send out a draft memo for review the week of 4/15.
 - v. Year 2045 Conditions – SRF revising based on SRC Meeting #4 comments and will send out a draft memo for review the week of 4/15.
 - vi. Implementation Plan – forthcoming.
 - vii. Engagement Summary – Round 1 summary has been provided; full draft memo will be provided after Round 3.
 - viii. ICE Reports for US 10/US 75 East Junction and US 75/20th Avenue – forthcoming.
 - ix. Executive Summary – last tech memo to write.



b. US 10 East Focus Area Alternatives

- i. Alternative 1 (Removing the Ditch Median between 21st Street/1st Avenue and 30th Street)
 1. Obtain public feedback on the proposed access closures and restrictions at 24th Street/26th Street as well as the alternative options between 28th Street and 32nd Street (signal at 28th Street or 30th Street).
 2. Note that there are transit impacts with this alternative. Currently Transit Route #4 makes an eastbound right-turn at 24th Street onto the Frontage Road (access proposed to be closed under both options).
 - a. Group discussed a few options to address the transit impacts:
 - i. Provide transit stop in-lane along US 10 (urbanizing the corridor and reducing the speed provides the opportunity for in-lane stops). Buses currently can't stop on higher speed roadways.
 - ii. Add an eastbound right-turn into 24th Street (north side would remain closed).
 - iii. Consider bus pull-outs with the additional width available.
 3. Michael asked if SRF had considered pushing US 10 to the north rather than the south as shown in the graphics:
 - a. SRF noted that the road had been pushed south to reduce the skew at the 21st Street/1st Avenue intersection. Further, the north side of US 10 provides more opportunity to repurpose the land if redevelopment in the space was desired, since there is a ditch and frontage road on the south side. If the road was pushed north, the lane on the south side could likely only be utilized for green space.
 - b. **Action Item:** Follow up with MnDOT to understand what would happen to the "vacated property" land and if/how it could be utilized for development?
 4. **Action Item:** SRF to develop graphics to illustrate the two improvements and facilitate feedback from the public.
 5. **Action Item:** Review concepts – is there an opportunity to reduce the median from what is shown in the draft concept? For wider areas (more than 10' wide) consider 6' green and 2' stamp concrete on each side – show adding green space; likely not grass, but low-maintenance landscaping.
- ii. Alternative 2 (Adding Trails)
 1. Three options were presented. Provide trail on the north side, provide trail on the south side, or provide trail on both the north and south sides.
 2. Metro COG supports recommended an option that provides trail on both sides to keep pedestrians from having to walk on frontage roads.
 3. SRF noted that there is space along US 10 to accommodate trail on both sides within the existing right-of-way.

4. **Action Item:** SRF to develop a graphic showing trail on both the north and south sides of US 10.
- iii. Alternative 3 (21st Street/1st Avenue)
 1. Multiple options were presented:
 - a. Alternative 3A – maintains split phasing. Two different intersection configurations were shown, one with the northbound channelized right-turn and one without. Under both options, the east approach pedestrian crossing would likely need to be removed for operational reasons (minimum green time too long with the pedestrian crossing).
 - b. Alternative 3B – modifies the intersection to provide northbound/southbound protected/permitted phasing. This option requires that the westbound stop bar be placed far back from the intersection. Pedestrian safety and vehicle compliance (not stopping at the stop bar) were noted by the group. This alternative was not recommended.
 - c. Alternative 3C – a roundabout was tested here and does not work operationally and therefore was not recommended for further review.
 2. Jon noted that the sidewalk on the west side of 21st Street is proposed to be removed. If a pedestrian crossing is not provided at the east approach, pedestrians/bicyclists wanting to travel to/from the east/west may elect to cross at the east approach regardless of if there is a permitted crossing. Since a trail is proposed on the south side pedestrians can be directed to cross elsewhere. Additional alternatives that discuss pedestrian crossing options at US 10/US 75 East Junction or a grade separated alternative are provided later.
 3. The intersection alternatives are not recommended for public feedback (too technical).
 - iv. Alternative 4 (US 10/US 75 East Junction)
 1. Three options were presented, however, the roundabout was eliminated since a roundabout at 21st/1st Avenue is not expected to operate acceptably.
 2. Alternative 4A – typical urban signal
 - a. Provides opportunity to add pedestrian crossings on US 10.
 - b. Consider alternatives to reduce the center median on the north approach and add a southbound and westbound right-turn channelized right turn to reduce the pedestrian crossing distance.
 3. Alternative 4B – continuous green T
 - a. This option does not provide an option for pedestrians to cross US 10.
 - b. Consider alternatives to reduce the center median on the north approach and add a southbound and westbound channelized right-turns to reduce the pedestrian crossing distance. Need to obtain feedback from the public on their experience with channelized right-turns.

- c. Michael noted that we don't want to add too many signals/stopping locations and reduce the travel time through this area (under this alternative the eastbound approach would be free). He noted this is a high recreational traffic corridor.
 4. Consider adding a box culvert on the north approach crossing underneath US 75?
 5. Further reduce the US 75 skew north of US 10.
 6. Ask for public feedback on this alternative. May need to demonstrate options with a video?
- v. Alternative 5 (34th Street)
 1. Recommendations from the 2013 Study were presented.
 2. The group preferred the alternative that showed the South Frontage Road as RIRO (concerns with northbound left-turn queuing the southbound left-turn queues onto the South Frontage Road impacting the US 10 intersection).
 3. There is a proposed development plan northeast of the Tesoro gas station. The development plan is proposing similar access modifications to what was presented.
 4. Due to ongoing safety issues at the South Frontage Road, the City is planning to make changes at that intersection prior to the implementation of any findings from the US 10/75 Corridor Study.
 5. No public feedback is needed in Round 2 for this alternative. Show concept in Round 3 on the locally recommended layout.
- vi. Alternative 6 (Ped/Bike Grade Separated Crossing)
 1. Get feedback from the public in Round 2 to help gauge the need for a grade separated crossing and "how they would like to cross US 10".
 2. The study group discussed that with the changes to the US 10 corridor and the US 75 East Junction intersection it will be challenging for the public to comment (crossing the existing cross-section vs. the proposed urbanized/lower speed cross-section are different).
 3. While an underpass tends to be a less expensive option, there are concerns with safety and lighting.
 4. 28th Avenue is a main corridor for pedestrians and bikes, and the City is planning improvements to better the environment for these users in 2019. This corridor also provides the best connectivity.
- c. Downtown Focus Area Alternatives
 - i. Alternative 1 (Grade Separated Crossing)
 1. Group agreed that no public engagement from this study should occur for the grade separated crossing to ensure that consistent messaging is provided and no conflicts.
 2. Cross-hatch out the study area for the 11th Street grade separated alternative and note that access closure/restrictions are being considered as part of that study.

- ii. Alternative 2 (Center Avenue 3-Lane)
 - 1. Add an alternative that considers a cycle track and on-street parking.
 - 2. Additional study is needed to determine how this segment ties in with the planned three-lane section on Center to the west and future trails along 11th Street.
 - 3. While this study will not recommend how the space should be allocated, it is an opportunity to hear from the public what they support (on-street parking, bike lanes, wider sidewalk, etc.).
 - 4. Future studies should consider how/where transit will stop.
- iii. Alternative 3 (Add Trail)
 - 1. Note that the long vision for the Center Avenue (US 10) corridor is to add trails (would occur when the railroad bridge is reconstructed).
 - 2. Inform public in Round 3.
- iv. Alternative 4 (5th Street One-way to Two-way Conversion)
 - 1. Develop a concept to illustrate what this would look like to understand lane alignments and potential access implications.
 - 2. Ask for public feedback in Round 2 of engagement.
- v. Alternative 5 (Modify Striping along Main Avenue to TWLTL)
 - 1. Michael noted that any opportunities to beautify the corridor or add amenities should be considered.
 - 2. If Alternative 4 (converting 5th Street to two-way) is recommended, then a five-lane corridor makes sense. However, if it is not recommended, then the striping should be designed to not confuse motorists and to block out a westbound left-turn lane at 5th Street.
 - 3. A new Alternative was offered for consideration: Convert Main Avenue to a Three-lane Corridor between the River and 11th Street.
 - a. Year 2045 traffic volumes along Main Avenue from the river to 8th Street are estimated to be 24,900 vpd and between 8th Street and 11th Street 19,300 vpd.
 - b. Planning level capacity thresholds for a three-lane facility suggest that segment with approximately 17,000 vpd would work operationally as a three-lane.
 - c. Fargo Main Avenue will be reconstructed to a three-lane corridor in 2019/2020. While the Fargo Main Avenue traffic study did not anticipate major traffic volume changes to the Moorhead side, if the Fargo project does divert traffic away from Main Avenue in Moorhead to approximately 17,000-18,000 vpd, then a three-lane should be considered.
 - d. The group also discussed potentially maintaining the five-lane for peak periods and converting the outside lane to on-street parking during non-peak periods and weekends.

- e. **Action Item:** Add a new alternative that provides narrative for if/when a three-lane should be considered.
 - vi. Alternative 6 (Additional Items to Consider)
 - 1. Various streetscaping and pedestrian enhancement options.
 - 2. Ask during public engagement which options the community would support to help prioritize.
 - vii. Alternative 7 (Access Restrictions/Closure Considerations)
 - 1. Further review by the SRC is needed.
 - 2. Inform access restriction/closure locations during Round 2 of public engagement and ask for feedback/comments.
 - d. US 75 South Focus Area Alternatives
 - i. Alternative 1 (Raised Median between 2nd Avenue and 3rd Avenue, Signalizing 4th Avenue)
 - 1. Additional consideration/review is needed to determine if/how pedestrian crossings should be designed.
 - ii. Alternative 2 (Lane Shifts at 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue)
 - 1. Need to ask the public their opinion on removing the on-street parking.
 - iii. Alternative 3 (Trail along 8th Avenue)
 - 1. Inform the public of the impacts and ask opinion.
 - 2. At 12th Avenue, recommend ways to encourage ped/bikes to use the 12th Avenue trail. Wayfinding signage in addition to trail modifications should be considered.
 - iv. Alternative 4 – 12th Avenue
 - 1. Additional coordination with the 12th Avenue project team is needed.
 - 2. Potential safety impacts with the proposed concept.
 - v. Alternative 5 – 20th Avenue
 - 1. Further discussion is needed.
 - 2. Ask public about concept options.
- 3. Public & Stakeholder Engagement
 - a. A summary of Round 1 of Public Engagement was provided to the SRC for review. A few initial comments included:
 - i. Change the title from “US 10/75 Corridor Study Public Engagement Report” to “Round 1 of the US 10/75 Corridor Study Public Engagement Report”.
 - ii. Consider modifying the focus group representation from number of people, to say that “representatives from local businesses, other agencies, institutions, were present”.

- iii. **Action Item:** SRC to provide comments to the Round 1 summary and SRF to update accordingly. The summary will be added to the website.
- b. Leif passed out a one-page summary of the proposed Round 2 public engagement:
 - i. SRF is preparing a Round 2 survey as well as boards/handouts for the upcoming engagement.
 - ii. Concordia College commencement Ceremony will take place on Sunday, May 5, 2019. If possible, the planned pop-up event on campus should occur prior to commencement.
 - iii. **Action Item:** SRF to send out revised proposed upcoming engagement plan and draft survey/materials for upcoming meetings. SRC to review and provide comments to the material.

Actions Needed:

Actions Needed	Responsibility	Status
SRC to provide comments on tech memo	SRC	In progress
Follow-up with MnDOT regarding process of vacated property	SRF	In progress
Develop graphics/materials for Round 2 engagement	SRF	In progress
Review median width for US 10 east concepts	SRF	In progress
Develop graphic illustrating trails on both sides of US 10 east	SRF	In progress
Add alternative for three-lane corridor on Main Avenue in downtown	SRF	In progress
SRC to provide comments on Round 1 engagement summary	SRC	In progress
Revise engagement plan	SRF	In progress
Update alternatives and develop evaluation matrix	SRF	In progress
Update project map	SRF	Ongoing