

# Attachment #1

## Otter Tail County CSAH 9 Corridor Study and EAW Study Review Committee (SRC) Meeting

**Date:** July 29, 2008  
**Time:** 3:30 P.M.  
**Location:** Scambler Township Hall  
18799 State Highway 34  
Pelican Rapids, MN

### MINUTES

#### ATTENDEES:

Everett Erickson	Otter Tail County Commission
Gary Lawrence	Lake Association
Richard Evenson	Rural Landowner
Dennis Carlblom	Scambler Township
Rick West, PE	Otter Tail County Engineer
Charles Grotte, PE	Otter Tail County Assistant Engineer
Jeff Stabnow	Citizen
Rick Lane, PE	SRF
Brian Shorten, Proj. Mgr.	SRF

#### I. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Rick West welcomed the members to the study's first kick-off meeting and provided a brief history of the project. He then introduced Brian Shorten and Rick Lane from SRF Consulting Group, who will be assisting the SRC in completing the study. Each member introduced himself and provided the following issues/goals for the study:

- Reduce traffic and speeds on CSAH 9
- Improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities/safety
- Divert through traffic and heavy commercial vehicles
- Avoid traffic impacts on rural areas of new alignment (Duck Lake Road), and pedestrian/bicycle impacts along any new alignment
- Avoid impacts to new housing development just north of Zorba's
- Improve general corridor safety
- Consider future jurisdiction of CSAH 9 (maintenance, liability, etc.)
- Minimize private property impacts
- Provide mobility for through traffic, less of this traffic along Pelican Lake, while providing local circulation and access
- Establish safety improvements on CSAH 9 (vehicle and pedestrian), even if a new route is constructed

Brian noted that the County has asked SRF to examine a wider variety of conceptual realignment including current alignment modifications, and not just evaluate the earlier County route alternative. The County has indicated all options are on the table for consideration.

Rick West noted SRF was hired to assure all stakeholders that study recommendations are nonbiased and independent of the previous County Highway Department realignment analysis. He noted SRF's project team's vast experience with traffic and corridor studies.

Rick West noted the focus of the study is CSAH 9, not CSAH 20, but if public interest is sufficient, and upon County Board approval, CSAH 20 could be added later.

## **II. STUDY PROCESS**

Brian walked through the various elements involved in the proposed study process; objectives of the study, scope and schedule, partner roles, and decision-making structure. This information was emailed earlier to SRC members.

Brian and Rick West asked for SRC input.

There was agreement on all process elements; however, the Committee felt the draft study schedule should be revised. It was agreed that the study will break in November 2008 and pick up again in May 2009 in order to assure that key stakeholders (especially seasonal cabin owners) can be fully involved in important study milestones. This will extend the study process, but the SRC felt that public involvement was very important. It was also agreed to further maximize public involvement and participation. SRF will provide study products, data findings, analysis, etc. in a format that can go on the County website. Further, the County will provide links to the Scambler Township and Lake Association websites.

## **III. DATA NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

Brian provided maps and handouts to the Committee that documented key data sets resulting from SRF field work, GIS analysis, contact with Otter Tail County departments, Becker County, and Clay County staff, and various state and federal resource agencies.

The SRC reviewed the project base map and issues map and provided additional information.

Rick West noted the County has a surveyor working on clarifying the correct CSAH 9 right-of-way.

#### **IV. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS**

Rick Lane presented the results of SRF traffic data and analysis. He noted SRF had completed an access inventory, travel time runs, turning movement and traffic counts, future traffic forecasts, a safety analysis, and an origin-destination study. As a result of the data, SRF findings indicate:

- High summer seasonal peak traffic – Approximately 1900 vehicles per day, with a dominant movement north on CSAH 9 on weekend evenings, and significant CSAH 20 to CSAH 9 and CSAH 9 to CSAH 20 turning movements.
- Approximately 30 percent of the current CSAH 9 traffic is “through” traffic, and 70 percent is “local” traffic with destinations within the Pelican Lake area (e.g. generally from CSAH 22 to 215<sup>th</sup> Ave.)
- Using established diversion curves, it is expected, based on this data and weekend June conditions, that between 400-500 vehicles per day would divert to a new CSAH 9 realignment (approximately 25% of the June weekend daily traffic).

Dennis asked if the current CSAH 9 speed was lowered from 40 mph to 30 mph if that would change the diversion rate.

Rick Lane answered, yes and if a new alignment closer to existing CSAH 9 was acceptable that this could increase the number of diverted vehicles. Rick noted that upon the development of alternatives, the diversion analysis could be updated for the SRC.

Rick Lane also provided graphics and a brief analysis of safety issues and crash data findings.

Dennis asked if a new alignment for CSAH 9 was established what would happen to the jurisdiction of existing CSAH 9.

Rick West answered that the County would ask Scambler Township to accept the existing CSAH 9 onto the Township roadway system because Otter Tail County cannot afford to maintain both the old and new CSAH 9. Rick mentioned there is a legal process for such jurisdictional transfers that would include the County making certain improvements (possibly resurfacing, pedestrian facilities) before the transfer. Rick doubted the transfer would ever be forced on the Township. He also felt that if an agreement could not be reached, the County would not be able to move on any feasible alternative alignments.

Dennis again noted the Townships concern over maintenance of CSAH 9 and liability issues as the route exists today.

**V. ISSUES/CONSTRAINTS/OPPORTUNITIES**

Brian presented a draft list of Needs/Issues and a Purpose and Need (P/N) Statement for the project. He asked for SRC comments.

The SRC felt the list was appropriate with the understanding that public input could generate revisions or additions. The SRC also concurred upon the draft P/N Statement.

Brian noted that as alternatives are evaluated, later in the study process, these five P/N elements will be one way to compare alternatives and that the P/N elements may change based on public input.

**VI. NEXT STEPS**

- August 6, 2008 3:30 PM SRC Meeting #2 – Consider Variety of Alternatives and Public Meeting Format
- August 16, 2008 10 AM – 12 PM, Open House Public Meeting – Present Information and Early Concepts to Public for Input

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business was presented

**VIII. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 5 PM