

VETTRA Co. *Transportation Planning & Engineering Services*

11535 Gunner Court
Woodbridge, Virginia 22192

Tel: 703/590-4932

Fax: 703/590-1277

Email: vettra@aol.com

June 15, 2010

Ms. Angela N. Foroughi, P.E.
Acting Director of Transportation & Land Use
Virginia Department of Transportation
87 Deacon Road
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22405

RE: Bluff Point
Northumberland County, Virginia

Dear Ms. Foroughi:

This letter is in response to your April 30, 2010 comment letter regarding review of our Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and Traffic Signal Warrant Study both dated December 15, 2009 for the referenced project located along Routes 608 and 669 in Northumberland County, Virginia. Following are our responses to your seven (7) comments:

Comment #1 – re: Signal Warrant Study for Rt.200 & Rt.608 (Bluff Point Rd.) Intersection

Response #1 – We are both in agreement that according to the warrant study the Rt.200/Rt.608 intersection will meet warrants by site buildout in Year 2019. We are also in agreement that prior to any design and construction of a signal, VDOT will first deem that volumes are sufficient to meet warrants. However, we do not concur that the construction of auxiliary (dedicated turn lanes) are required for this intersection at full site buildout in Year 2019. The TIA has factually demonstrated that all three (3) peak hour “overall intersection” and all “approach” Levels Of Service are adequate and safe verifying that dedicated turn lanes are not necessary. Please refer to Table 5 (page 30) of the TIA showing acceptable LOS’s for all conditions with no turn lanes.

Comment #2 – re: Scoping documents

Response #2a – The scoping document in the Appendix reflects the expected site buildout (2018) anticipated at that time of scoping. A year later, due to an unforeseen delay in the project timeline, the TIA was completed reflecting the correct and updated buildout year of 2019. All pertinent design years and analyses were deferred by one year as well. This change does not affect the integrity and completeness of the TIA itself. The scoping documents are provided in the appendices for information purposes and to satisfy Chapter 527 requirements.

Response #2b – The site 898 acres referenced in the TIA is correct. During the one-year project delay 24 acres were eliminated from the site.

Response #2c – At the time of scoping it was agreed that site trip distributions would be provided to staff later – after traffic counts and other information were collected. On November 12, 2008, via email, I sent the final “scoping package” with trip distributions to VDOT and County for approval. On the same day, Mr. Adam Campbell affirmatively responded via email. Nine days after on November 21, 2008 the County did so as well. We proceeded to use these affirmed distributions in the TIA. Regardless, it is noted that staff continues to affirm the used distributions within this comment.

Response #2d – This appears to be an editorial comment, thus no response is necessary.

Response #2e – At the time of scoping for the TIA, both VDOT and County stated that they were aware of no “other” nearby developments. This was confirmed in the November 12, 2008 scoping package affirmed again by both VDOT and County staff.

Response #2f – This appears to be an editorial comment, thus no response is necessary.

Response #2g – The TIA statements are correct and VDOT seems to concur in their comments. If left unimproved (no signal) the Rt.200/Rt.608 will operate at LOS=F for both Years 2019 and 2025 at full site buildout. With mitigation (signal only) the LOS is dramatically improved to acceptable LOS's. Please refer to Table 5 (page 30) of the TIA showing acceptable LOS's for all conditions.

Comment #3 – re: Recommended off-site roadway improvements

Response #3a – We concur that the recommended mitigation measure in the TIA (traffic signal at Rt.200/Rt.608 intersection) should be designed and installed when BDOT deems necessary.

Responses #3b-e – We do not concur that the requested left and right turn lanes at the Rt.200/Rt.608 are necessary. As noted in Response #1 above, these approaches (northbound, southbound, and westbound) do not require additional lanes. The TIA has factually demonstrated that all three (3) peak hour “overall intersection” and all “approach” Levels Of Service are adequate and safe verifying that dedicated turn lanes are not necessary. Please refer to Table 5 (page 30) of the TIA showing acceptable LOS's for all conditions with no turn lanes.

Response #3f – We do not concur that the requested left turn lane at the Rt.608/Rt.669 is necessary. This approach (southbound in the TIA) does not require an additional lane. The TIA has factually demonstrated that all three (3) peak hour “overall intersection” and “approach” Levels Of Service are adequate and safe verifying that a dedicated left turn lane is not necessary. Please refer to Table 5 (page 30) of the TIA showing acceptable LOS's for all conditions with no turn lane.

Response #3g-h – We do not concur that the requested road reconstructions of Rt.608 (from Rt.200 to end of development) and Rt.669 (from Rt.608 to end of development) are necessary. The TIA has factually demonstrated that all three (3) peak hour “link” Levels Of Service are adequate and safe verifying that road improvements along these links are not necessary. Please refer to Table 5 (page 30) of the TIA showing acceptable LOS's for all conditions at the subject “links”.

Comment #4 – re: Required roadway improvements

Response #4a – Although not required per the TIA analyses, a dedicated left turn lane (from Rt.669 into the site entrance) will be constructed at site development. However, due to physical and environmental constraints, a turn lane length waiver may be required.

Response #4b – Although not required per the TIA analyses, a dedicated eastbound left turn lane (from Rt.608 into the site entrance) will be constructed at site development at such time traffic counts warrant. The construction of the Jarvis Creek Area in the Bluff Point project is anticipated to begin in Phase Four or approximately 6-8 years from the time of initial construction of the overall development.

Comment #5 – re: Rt.3/Rt.200 Intersection

Response #5 – Since at scoping both VDOT and County staff deemed this intersection not relevant or pertinent enough to be scoped as part of the TIA, it has now been analyzed by VDOT staff. Since this appears to be an editorial comment, no further response is necessary.

Ms. Angela N. Foroughi, P.E.
June 15, 2010
Page 3 of 3

Comment #6 – re: Rt.3/Rt.200 Intersection

Response #6 – Essentially the same response as in #5 above. Since at scoping both VDOT and County staff deemed this intersection not relevant or pertinent enough to be scoped as part of the TIA, it has now been analyzed by VDOT staff. Since this appears to be an editorial comment, no further response is necessary.

Comment #7 – re: Copies of full-size GDP

Response #7 – As requested, three (3) full-size hardcopies of the GDP are provided herein.

I trust that the above responses adequately address the VDOT's comments. Please advise if you should have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

VETTRA Company

Vernon E. Torney

Vernon E. Torney, AICP
President

attachment: full size (24" x 36") GDP – three (3) hardcopies

cc: Mr. Kenneth Eades – Northumberland County
Mr. Tom Dingleline
Ms. Sharon Sharp