

Sianli Blasco

From: Brandy Glenn
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 9:15 AM
To: Sianli Blasco; Nicholas Colvin
Cc: Megan Higgs-Carter
Subject: FW: 24APSM004XX Riverside Townhouses: TIS Comment response review

See below

From: Pradip Patel (D5 SHA) <PPatel10@mdot.maryland.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 9:04 AM
To: mlenhart <mlenhart@LENHARTTRAFFIC.COM>
Cc: Brandy Glenn <Brandy.Glenn@stmaryscountymd.gov>; Amy Morris (Consultant) <AMorris2.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Sarah Gary (Consultant) <SGary.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Julie Wright (Consultant) <JWright16.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Jonathan Makhlouf <JMakhlouf2@mdot.maryland.gov>; Michael Bailey (Consultant) <MBailey.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Simon Chacha <SChacha@mdot.maryland.gov>
Subject: RE: 24APSM004XX Riverside Townhouses: TIS Comment response review

CAUTION: This email originated from OUTSIDE of St. Mary's County Government! Do not click links, open attachments or reply, unless you recognize the sender's Email Address and know the content is safe!

Good morning Mr. Lenhart:

Thank you for the opportunity to review TIS comment response on the referenced project. Upon review of its offer the followings:

- Comments response on the TIS is acceptable, as long as a signal will be installed by the County under separate project at MD 235 and FDR Boulevard intersection.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact Mr. Jonathan Makhlouf at 410-841-1084 or email

jmakhlouf2@mdot.maryland.gov.

Thank you,

Pradip Patel

From: mlenhart <mlenhart@LENHARTTRAFFIC.COM>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2024 4:41 PM
To: Pradip Patel (D5 SHA) <PPatel10@mdot.maryland.gov>; Jonathan Makhlouf <JMakhlouf2@mdot.maryland.gov>
Cc: Amy Morris (Consultant) <AMorris2.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Sarah Gary (Consultant) <SGary.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Julie Wright (Consultant) <JWright16.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>
Subject: RE: 24APSM004XX Riverside Townhouses: TIS

Hi Pradip and Jonathan,

We have a Planning Commission hearing for this project on September 9th, and I'm hoping I can get Amy, July, and Sarah's concurrence with our point by point responses so we can get an "Approved" or "Approved with Comments" by September 4th or earlier if possible.

I've cc'd them on this email, and I've prepared a point by point response to their comments below. The comments were all minor in nature, and hopefully easy to review and confirm they are ok.

I'm happy to discuss if anyone has any questions please email or call me on my mobile at 410.980.2367.

Thanks,

Mike

District Five Traffic Comments: - *Ms. Amy Morris*

1. Agree that the proposed development does not significantly increase congestion or queues at the study intersections. However, the mitigation proposal is based on the presumption that a signal will be constructed at MD 235 and FDR. Since this is still just at the planning/request stage, this is probably not the correct improvement to use for the fee calculation. In addition, I do not see how a signal at FDR will improve operations at MD 235 and MD 4. Anyone on FDR who currently wishes to turn left onto MD 235 already has the option to go out at the signal on MD 4 and then turn left onto MD 235 at that signal. Or some of those residences can go out White Oak Parkway to Wildewood Blvd. Constructing a signal at FDR does give FDR traffic more options, but it seems unlikely to provide much improvement at MD 4, if any. In any case, the development doesn't really affect MD 235 @ FDR, so it would be more appropriate to contribute to improvements at MD 235 and MD 4, where the development does have an impact, even if slight.

RESPONSE: The application has been reduced to 42 townhouse lots which will generate 18 AM peak hour trips and 23 PM peak hour trips. The SHA Traffic Impact Study Guidelines and the St. Mary's County Zoning Ordinance do not even require a traffic study for sites that generate fewer than 50 peak hour trips. SHA acknowledged in the comment above that this application will not significantly increase congestion. The purpose of conducting this Traffic Impact Study is that it is anticipated that the Planning Commission will have questions regarding traffic impacts. The Traffic Impact Study calculated this projects impact as 0.2% at MD 235 & FDR Blvd and 0.5% at MD 235 & MD 4, for a cumulative impact of 0.7% at the two intersections combined. The Zoning Ordinance allows mitigation to satisfy traffic impacts, and the installation of a traffic signal at MD 235 & FDR Blvd will create a benefit at MD 4 & MD 235. FDR Blvd parallels MD 235 from Buck Hewitt Road through MD 4 and ties into MD 235 about ¼ mile north of the MD 4 intersection. However, all of the traffic on FDR Blvd destined to points north of FDR Blvd on MD 235 must go through the MD 4 & MD 235 intersection. The installation of a signal at MD 235 & FDR Blvd along with the modifications at that intersection to allow left turns from FDR Blvd to northbound MD 235 will have a substantial benefit to the MD 4 & MD 235 intersection. Furthermore, this improvement has been identified by St. Mary's County Commissioners as a priority project in the annual letter to MDOT. Again, this project will not have a significant impact on traffic in the area and the pro-rata payment toward the signal at MD 235 & FDR Blvd will mitigate this applicant's impact.

Traffic Development and Support Division Comments – Ms. Julie Wright

1. Page 24, Section 5 states that the CLV/HCM analysis will not meet adequacy requirements for MD 4 & Patuxent Boulevard. MD 4 & Patuxent Boulevard was not one of the study intersections, confirm that it should be MD 235/FDR Boulevard/By the Mill Road intersection.

RESPONSE: The reference to Patuxent Blvd was a typo. This should reference MD 4 & MD 235 as noted.

2. Exhibit 7B has volumes originating from north on MD 4 with destinations south and east of the MD 235 intersection. Should these volumes be here? They do not appear to match the trip distribution.
RESPONSE: The volumes referenced above are typos on Exhibit 7B. Otherwise, the trip assignment is correct, and the correct number of vehicles are shown exiting the site.

3. Page 15 states there is a 0.2% impact at the MD 235/FDR Boulevard/By the Mill Road intersection but page 13 states that there is 0.3% impact during the PM peak hour. Reconcile these figures.
RESPONSE: Based on the results of the CLV analyses, the 0.2% impact is the correct number. The 0.3% impact stated on page 13 is a typo. As such, the 0.7% overall impact used to determine the contribution towards the traffic signal is correct.

4. The FY 2024-FY2029 CTP does not include proposed signalization for MD 235/FDR Boulevard/By The Mill Road intersection. Provide documentation that this is a planned project that can utilize a fee-in-lieu.
RESPONSE: This is not yet in the MDOT CTP, however, the County can accept pro-rata payments for designation toward this future project. Furthermore, and as noted above, this project has been listed as a priority project by the St. Mary's County Commissioners, and the Planning Commission has already approved at least one project with a condition to pay a pro-rata contribution to the County toward the signal at MD 235 & FDR Blvd.

Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division Comments – Ms. Sarah Gary

1. Despite there only being one entrance, site traffic is depicted as going right past the site's right in right out entrance and never entering the site (2 vehicles in the AM and 9 in the PM)
RESPONSE: The driveway is a right-in and right-out only along westbound/northbound MD 235. The 2 AM and 9 PM vehicles passing the driveway on Exhibit 7a are eastbound vehicles that must pass the driveway (because there is no left in) and make a u-turn at MD 4 to then return to the site and make a right in.

2. For the outbound traffic, volumes are not balanced with 5 in the AM and 2 in the PM being generated out of nowhere going EB past the site and through the MD 4 intersection as well as vehicles added headed southbound on MD 4 going through (2 in the AM and 1 in the PM) and turning right (5 in the AM and 2 in the PM) with seemingly no relation to the site. While they were presumably added as a way to handle traffic which would need to turn left into and out of the site and need an alternate way, the justification for why certain movements are where they are is not given. In the AM, the traffic turning into the site is not balanced.
RESPONSE: The southbound through and left turn trips on MD 4 at MD 235 (Intersection 3) are typos and should be deleted. The remainder of the volumes will balance with outbound flows. Traffic destined to the east on MD 235 at intersection #3 must make a right out of the site and then make a u-turn at FDR Blvd and return east on MD 235.

3. HCM or other microsimulation analysis not performed for MD 4 and MD 235 intersection. Would especially like to see this as the CLV analysis indicates that the intersection fails, and this is relevant to the discussion of the impact that changes in traffic will cause.
RESPONSE: As noted earlier, this application generates a maximum of 23 peak hour trips and does not generate the need for a traffic impact study. With that said, a study was conducted in accordance with the County Zoning Ordinance, which requires the use of Critical Lane Volume (CLV) methodology at signalized intersections. While the study is not required per State or County standards, it was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Corridor Fails at both MD 235 & FDR Boulevard/By the Mill Road and the MD 235 & MD 4 intersections. There is also a queue failure at MD 4 intersection for the EB and WB left turn lanes. Analysis should be performed to see if the proposed traffic signal would mitigate the issue. Assumption by developer is that MD 235 & FDR Boulevard/By the Mill Road signal will mitigate the issues for both intersections. Unclear

how % impact should be calculated; they use overall impact while % increased past point of failure seems more logical or perhaps some other factor. Please advise.

RESPONSE: As noted previously, this project is too small to require a Traffic Impact Study by both SHA and County standards. It was acknowledged by District 5 Traffic that this project will not have a significant impact on traffic or congestion. The traffic signal at MD 235 & FDR Blvd will provide a beneficial improvement to traffic conditions in the area by allowing a path for traffic on FDR Blvd to avoid the signal at MD 4 & MD 235. The State and County have recently approved other projects allowing the payment of a pro-rata fee to the County for a future signal at MD 235 & FDR Blvd. This methodology is consistent with the previously approved methodology.

Thanks,
Mike

Mike Lenhart, P.E., PTOE
President

Office: [\(410\) 216-3333](tel:4102163333) (Ext. 1)
Mobile: [\(410\) 980-2367](tel:4109802367)



The information contained herein is confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message.

From: Pradip Patel (D5 SHA) <PPatel10@mdot.maryland.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 11:40 AM
To: mlenhart <mlenhart@LENHARTTRAFFIC.COM>
Cc: Jessica Andritz <jessica.andritz@stmaryscountymd.gov>; Brandy Glenn <Brandy.Glenn@stmaryscountymd.gov>; James Gotsch <James.Gotsch@stmarysmd.com>; Donald Mills <Donald.Mills@stmaryscountymd.gov>; Kayode Adenaiya <KAdenaiya@mdot.maryland.gov>; Rola Daher (Consultant) <RDaher.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Jonathan Makhoulf <JMakhoulf2@mdot.maryland.gov>; Amy Morris (Consultant) <AMorris2.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Sarah Gary (Consultant) <SGary.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>; Rana Shams <RShams@mdot.maryland.gov>; Simon Chacha <SChacha@mdot.maryland.gov>; Karen Fiasco <KFiasco@mdot.maryland.gov>; Development Review <developmentreview@stmarysmd.com>; Michael Bailey (Consultant) <MBailey.consultant@mdot.maryland.gov>
Subject: 24APSM004XX Riverside Townhouses: TIS

Good morning Mr. Lenhart:

Enclosed you will find the MDOT SHA comment letter on the above noted.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact Mr. Jonathan Makhoul at 410-841-1084 or email jmakhoulf2@mdot.maryland.gov.

Thank you,



Pradip Patel
Transportation Engineer IV
District 5 Access Management

410.841.1073 **office**
ppatel10@mdot.maryland.gov

Maryland State Highway Administration
138 Defense Highway, Annapolis MD 21401

 [Maryland now features 511 traveler information!](#)
[Visit: www.md511.org](http://www.md511.org)



LEGAL DISCLAIMER - The information contained in this communication (including any attachments) may be confidential and legally privileged. This email may not serve as a contractual agreement unless explicit written agreement for this purpose has been made. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or any of its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please re-send this communication to the sender indicating that it was received in error and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system.