

| VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECT REVIEW COMMENT AND RESOLUTION SHEET | | | | CODES: A. ACCEPT COMMENT—WILL BE CORRECTED, ADDED, OR CLARIFIED. B. DESIGNER WILL EVALUATE. C. DELETE COMMENT D. DEPARTMENT TO EVALUATE. | |
|--|-----------------------|--|---------|--|--|
| VDOT PROJECT NUMBER: N/A | | UPC NUMBER: N/A | | REVIEWER(S): | DATE: 03/04/2026 |
| DESCRIPTION: BUC-EE'S REZONING TIA, STAFFORD COUNTY – RC25156318 | | REVIEW PHASE & TYPE: REZONING TIA AND GDP - REW 4 | | DISCIPLINE: TRAFFIC ENGINEERING AND LOCATION & DESIGN | CRM: (IF REQUIRED) |
| ITEM NO. | DWG. NO.(1) | COMMENTS | CODE(2) | RESPONSE(2) | FINAL DISPOSITION(3) |
| COMMENTS ON BUC-EE'S TIA | | | | | |
| 1 | Pages 13-14 and 30-31 | <p>The narrative focus is on the overall intersection LOS and does not discuss specific movement/approach delay/LOS. There are several movements and approaches that experience significant delay degradation in the Build scenario and have no identified mitigations.</p> <p>The TIA should identify and summarize these affected movements/approaches and identified mitigation measures. Specific movements/approaches of concern will be noted in other comments.</p> | A | <p>Stafford County Comprehensive Plan Policy 7.7.7 of the Transportation Plan recommends new development maintain a LOS C or better, or if projected LOS without the project is below C, the proposed project not degrade the intersection further.</p> <p>The results of the isolated traffic operational analysis indicate that with the traffic generated by the proposed Buc-ee's, the overall intersection delay at the study area intersections are expected to meet the recommendation under the future build condition.</p> <p>It should be noted that it is expected that delay at minor street approaches at an unsignalized intersection increase when the intersection</p> | <p>Acknowledged that Stafford County's policy is based upon intersection LOS.</p> <p>Acceptance of this comment response does not alleviate concern that specific movements and approaches experience significant delay degradation even in Scenario A. Focusing on Scenario A (2032) SimTraffic findings, these include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southbound Mine Rd at Courthouse Rd • Eastbound Sunflower Dr at Austin Ridge Dr |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | <p>becomes signalized. However, the volumes along those approaches are minimal; therefore the increase in delay is not anticipated to negatively affect the overall intersection operations.</p> | <p>Applicants Response: Results have been revised with the addition of an additional (3rd) WB thru lane at Austin Ridge Drive and Courthouse Road.</p> <p>REW 3: See Comment #23.</p> <p>REW 4: See comment #24.</p> |
| 2 | Page 16 | <p>Intersection 4, the westbound left turn movement reports both a LOS E during the AM peak and LOS F during the Sunday peak with nearly doubling the delay of the no-build scenario. It is recommended that mitigation measures be identified to improve delay for this movement.</p> | C | <p>Same response as 9 above.</p> | <p>As of September 2025, a majority of Embrey Mill Commercial is built and open, including high-volume land uses such as Wawa. This is no longer an “expected” development and should be considered as part of background No Build Scenario A. It is reasonable to expect Intersection 4 delay to be influenced by this now existing development.</p> <p>Even without Embrey Mill Commercial traffic, Scenario A (2032) intersection delay is 34.0 (PM) and 34.7 (Sunday), just below the 35.0 sec threshold for LOS D, which would trigger additional mitigation per</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>Stafford County policy. Buc-ee's BD analysis is also redistributing significant green time allocation within the cycle length from EB/WB Courthouse Rd to SB Austin Ridge Rd. By striping the 3rd westbound thru lane on Courthouse Rd, and doing some minor widening in the northwest quadrant of the Austin Ridge Rd intersection, Buc-ee's could provide a 3rd WB thru WB lane of signal capacity that then lane drops at Miracle Dr</p> <p>Applicants Response: Results have been revised with the addition of an additional (3rd) WB thru lane at Austin Ridge Drive and Courthouse Road.</p> <p>REW 3: See Comment #23.</p> <p>REW 4: See comment #24.</p> |
| 3 | Pages 19-20, 25-26, 36-37, and 42-43 | Based on maximum queueing observed in the SimTraffic simulation and SimTraffic queue reports in the Appendix, traffic appears to be in saturated conditions in portions of the study area, thereby not accurately representing HCM delay and LOS | A | The TIA was updated to include the delay reported using SimTraffic. Note that the microsimulation delay reported using SimTraffic does not equate to a LOS using HCM | While it is acknowledged that Stafford County's policy is based upon HCM LOS methodologies and that |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>calculations. Based on the SimTraffic simulation, multiple movements, including Austin Ridge Drive, Sunflower Drive, and existing driveways for Embrey Mill, likely experience significantly more delay than reported in the TIA based on HCM Synchro calculations.</p> <p>It is recommended that SimTraffic microsimulation delay be used to for portions of the study area with substantial queueing is observed, particularly Austin Ridge Drive and Sunflower Drive.</p> | | <p>methodologies. Therefore, after discussing this with Stafford County on July 8, 2025 it was decided to keep the LOS/delay based on HCM calculations, and supplement this with SimTraffic delay per VDOT's request.</p> | <p>microsimulation does not produce HCM LOS, there is an outstanding concern that HCM LOS is not accurately capturing saturated conditions traffic impacts, particularly in Scenario B.</p> <p>REW 3: No comment response provided by applicant.</p> <p>Applicants Response: SimTraffic microsimulation analysis was run and delay reported as suggested. The results are included in Appendices E and F of the TIA report. Note, the microsimulation delay results were provided as a reference and were not used to determine the improvements recommended to mitigate expected project traffic.</p> <p>REW 4: See comment #25.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Page 33 | <p>Intersection 5, the eastbound Sunflower Drive approach reports LOS E during the AM and PM peak, with 50+ and 60+ second delay increases of the no-build scenario. It is recommended that mitigation measures be identified to improve delay for this approach.</p> | A | <p>Same response as comment 27 above.</p> | <p>Acknowledged that Stafford County's policy is based upon intersection LOS.</p> <p>Acceptance of this comment response does not alleviate concern that specific movements and approaches experience significant delay degradation even in Scenario A, including eastbound Sunflower Drive at Austin Ridge Dr.</p> <p>Additionally, as of September 2025, a majority of Embrey Mill Commercial is built and open, including high-volume land uses such as Wawa. This is no longer an "expected" development and should be considered as part of background No Build Scenario A. It is reasonable to expect Intersection 5 delay to be influenced by this now existing development.</p> <p>REW 3: See Comment #23.</p> |
|---|---------|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|---|---|---|
| 5 | Page 39 | <p>Intersection 5, the eastbound Sunflower Drive approach reports LOS E during the AM and PM peak, with 50+ and 60+ second delay increases of the no-build scenario. It is recommended that mitigation measures be identified to improve delay for this approach.</p> | A | <p>Same response as comment 27 above.</p> | <p>REW 3: See disposition comment 4 above. See Comment #23.</p> <p>REW 4: The 2026 scenario reflects 50% of the Embrey Mill commercial area as built out; yet current conditions indicate that more than half of the development is open. The additional traffic may impact intersection 5.</p> |
| 6 | Page 44 | <p>Please provide more explanation on the selection of the recommended mitigation improvements, including whether they are based on the Build or Secondary Analysis. Please identify and summarize outstanding impacts that the recommended improvements are not mitigating.</p> | A | <p>The TIA was updated to clarify that the recommended improvements are based on the results of the isolated analysis, which does not include the traffic attributable to other planned/approved developments. The analysis that includes other planned/approved developments was provided to serve as “check” scenario to show that the applicant is mitigating the impacts attributable to the Buc-ee's development.,</p> | <p>County to determine whether to accept Scenario A mitigation, Scenario B or a Hybrid of both combined.</p> <p>Applicants Response: Results have been revised with the addition of an additional (3rd) WB thru lane at Austin Ridge Drive and Courthouse Road. This mitigates LOS concerns except for the weekend peak hour.</p> <p>REW 3: See Comment #23.</p> <p>REW 4: See comment #24.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|------|--|---|---|---|
| 7 | C2.1 | <p>Per previous VDOT comments, dated Jan. 17, 2025, provide connectivity of proposed pedestrian facilities along Austin Ridge to existing sidewalks.</p> | C | <p>GDP shows pedestrian facility connections.</p> | <p>Clarify if this is a shared use path or a sidewalk. The width is called out as 8' wide.</p> <p>The County and Applicant should consider extending the pedestrian connection from Isreal Rodriguez Drive to the existing sidewalk across TM 29-60G. There appears to be sufficient ROW for this connection.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p><i>Applicants Response:</i></p> <p><i>The 8' sidewalk along Austin Ridge Drive is not intended to be a shared use path. The 8' width is consistent with the Embrey Mill Commercial sidewalk along the west side of Austin Ridge Drive.</i></p> <p><i>Since the applicant does not own parcel TM 29-60G the sidewalk will terminate at the north east quadrant of Austin Ridge Drive and Israel</i></p> |
|---|------|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>Rodriguez Drive as shown on the GDP.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged – comment closed.</p> |
| 8 | C2.1 | Provide traffic arrows to designate lane configuration along SB Austin Ridge at/around each driveway/intersection. | A | GDP has been updated to show lane configuration along SB Austin Ridge. | <p>There are missing traffic arrows on some of the turn lanes, please revise. The turn lane arrows for westbound Courthouse Road after the signal for the first entrance into Embrey Mill Town Center need to be rotated to be right turn arrows.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>The GDP has been revised to include arrows.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged – comment closed.</p> |
| 9 | C2.1 | Per Proffers, dated 03/2025, NB Austin Ridge Dr. at intersection with Courthouse Rd. should be an exclusive left, shared Thru-Left, and two right turn lanes – update plan. | A | GDP has been updated to show the correct lane configuration and will match the figure shown in the TIA. | <p>The GDP does not match the lane configuration. There is a exclusive left, shared through-left , one thru-right and one right. Confirm and update the plan as necessary. This lane configuration has</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>been removed from the revised proffer statement and TIA.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>The GDP and TIA have both been revised to reflect dual left-turn lanes, shared through-right and right-turn lanes.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged – comment closed.</p> |
| 10 | C2.1 | Right-in entrance turn lane from I-95 SB slip lane, to include adequate decel, storage, and taper per VDOT design standards for selected design speed. | A | GDP has been updated to show new location of site entrance #1 along Austin Ridge Drive. | <p>There is no supporting data that shows a 100'x100' turn lane and taper are adequate for the slip-lane entrance from I-95 (first entrance). No volumes are called out for the entrances and the Volume Figure does not appear to have assigned volumes for this access.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission. No data supporting the 100x100 has been</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>provided.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>A 100x100 has been provided consistent with other Buc-ee's sites. This is a free flow uncontrolled movement so there will be no queuing. This has been verified by real-world experience at other Buc-ee's facilities (i.e., Rockingham County store). All volumes are located in Appendix I.</p> <p>REW 4: Appendix I does not appear to contain volumes for TIA Driveway #5.</p> |
| 11 | C2,1 | <p>Per previous VDOT Comments, dated Jan. 17, 2025, right- in entrance from the I-95 SB slip lane is less than desired 750' per VDOT RDM, App. F., AM-E may be required a design exception and approvable by District Engineer.</p> | A | <p>GDP has been updated to show new location of site entrance #1 along Austin Ridge Drive.</p> | <p>Please label the entrance numbers to identify which are being discussed in the TIA and comment response.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>A revised GDP has been submitted. The entrance numbers have been</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>labeled as requested. It is understood that an AM-E may be required or a design exception approvable by the District Engineer.</p> <p>REW 4: Since the GDP has been revised, is an AM-E or design exception still necessary? If so, clearly identify what features in the GDP will require an AM-E or design exception. Also, design exceptions would need approval from the State L&D Engineer.</p> |
| 12 | C2.1 | Per previous VDOT Comments, dated Jan. 17, 2025, any limited access adjustments required as part of development will need to be coordinated/approved by CTB and VDOT RW as part of LACC process. | A | Noted. See the OSAR framework document. | <p>REW 3: OSAR framework is currently under review. Additional comments may be forthcoming.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>A revised OSAR framework document and responses to VDOT's comments has been submitted on 2/17/2026.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged. Be advised that this project will require CTB, FHWA, and</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|------|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | | VDOT approval. |
| 13 | C2.1 | Per previous VDOT Comments, dated Jan. 17, 2025, existing overhead signage improvements will be required along 95SB ramp, provide conceptual signing layout/detail for review. | A | OSAR will require a conceptual signing plan for the preferred alternative and will be developed during the OSAR process. | <p>REW 3: OSAR framework is currently under review. Additional comments may be forthcoming.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>A revised OSAR framework document and responses to VDOT's comments has been submitted on 2/17/2026.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged. Comments for the OSAR framework will be provided under separate cover.</p> |
| 14 | C2.1 | Per previous VDOT Comments, dated Jan. 17, 2025, provide auto turn simulation exhibits for appropriate design vehicle to confirm general layout. | C | Provide a reference to a VDOT code where that is required for a rezoning application. | Reference VDOT IIM-LU-200.3 for VDOT's roll in review rezoning proposals. VDOT review and comments on rezoning applications provide guidance to the applicant to ensure the future success of the project through the review process prior to the applicant's first submittal of a site plan. Auto turn shown on the GDP will ensure the |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>design vehicle can maneuver the site with the proposed layout and access points. This is highly recommended by VDOT on the GDP to ensure adequate land and layout prior to detailed site plan submission. This plan will require large fueling vehicles to maneuver the site which could impact the major road network fronting and adjacent to this project if measures are not considered early in the design.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>Kimley-Horn has performed a cursory review and we are comfortable with the concept presented. We understand that detailed design will require refinements that can be further vetted during the site plan review process.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged – comment deferred.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | Be advised that the site plan must meet VDOT truck turning standards, which may require changes to the roadway geometry as shown on the GDP. |
| | | LAND USE COMMENTS | | | |
| 15 | n/a | Provide intersection sight distance plan and profile for all entrances. This early analysis ensures that there is adequate right of way set aside and prevents sight distance from becoming an issue during site plan design. | C | Provide a reference to a VDOT code where that is required for a rezoning application. Intersection sight distance plan and profiles will be evaluated during the site plan process. | Reference VDOT IIM-LU-200.3 for VDOT's roll in review rezoning proposals. VDOT review and comments on rezoning applications provide guidance to the applicant to ensure the future success of the project through the review process prior to the applicant's first submittal of a site plan. Vertical sight distance may not be available at this time. Horizontal sight distance triangles should be added to the GDP to ensure any easements or additional land acquisition is considered prior to detailed site plan submission. |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>Kimley-Horn has performed a cursory review and we are comfortable with the concept presented. We understand that detailed design will require refinements that can be further vetted during the site plan review process.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged – comment deferred. Be advised that sight distance will need to be met at site plan stage.</p> |
| 16 | n/a | Provide a preliminary utility plan showing proposed major utility locations and alignments. The plan should clearly indicate any utilities intended to be placed within VDOT's right-of-way. | C | Provide a reference to a VDOT code where that is required for a rezoning application. Utility design is not included as part of the County's GDP checklist and will be evaluated during the site plan process. | Reference VDOT IIM-LU-200.3 for VDOT's roll in review rezoning proposals. VDOT review and comments on rezoning applications provide guidance to the applicant to ensure the future success of the project through the review process prior to the applicant's first submittal of a site plan. Any existing utilities that are outside of pavement that would be under |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>future pavement associated with this project (turn lanes, widening, etc.) will require relocation outside of proposed pavement. This can be a large cost and should be considered at the GDP phase to ensure the projects impacts to existing utilities are understood.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>Kimley-Horn has performed a cursory review and we are comfortable with the concept presented. We understand that detailed design will require refinements that can be further vetted during the site plan review process.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged – comment deferred. Be advised that the cost of utility relocation could be significant and that the project is expected to meet</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | <p>VDOT standards at the time of development.</p> |
|-----------|-------------|---|----------|--|--|
| <p>17</p> | <p>C2.1</p> | <p>Label the turn lane taper and storage lengths. Are these lengths supported by the turn lane warrant analysis Appendix F of the Road Design Manual or by the traffic model?</p> | <p>A</p> | <p>GDP has been revised to show turn lane taper and storage lengths.</p> | <p>Not all turn lane and tapers lengths are called out. Please revise. Any new or altered turn lane and taper should have a length in feet shown on the GDP. If the widening, extending, addition of turn lanes or through lanes is a proffer condition, add the proffer number next to the improvement call out on the GDP for tracking and clarity.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>Kimley-Horn called out turn lane and taper lengths for all ingress lanes. Turn lane and taper lengths along Austin Ridge Drive were removed from roadway geometry since they will be determined during the</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>OSAR process.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged. As noted above, the OSAR, which has not been prepared, will determine the turn lanes which could affect the roadway geometry as shown in the GDP.</p> |
| 18 | C2.1 | To qualify as a public road, Israel Rodriguez Drive must meet Secondary Street Acceptance Requirements (SSAR) for public benefit. Refer to the Administrative Code of Virginia, 24VAC30-92. This means the road must be extended to provide a future connection to the Westgate development. | A | GDP has been updated to show Israel Rodriguez Drive ROW extended to the property boundary, with elevations to be left at grade, to allow for a future connection to the Westgate Development. Roundabout is shown to provide a stub to facilitate future road connection to the Westgate Development | <p>This submission shows a stub on the west side of the roundabout. This does not fully satisfy the SSAR requirement and will need to be shown as being built to the property line. Not left at grade.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>Kimley-Horn extended the road as requested.</p> <p>REW 4: Completed – comment closed.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------|--|----------|--|--|
| <p>19</p> | <p>C2.1</p> | <p>There is insufficient information provided on the roundabout for VDOT to determine if it will function properly. Please refer to <i>NCHRP-1043 for Roundabouts</i> for information. Provide the necessary information to allow VDOT to conduct a preliminary design assessment.</p> | <p>C</p> | <p>Provide a reference to a VDOT code where that is required for a rezoning application. Performance checks package will be provided during the site plan process.</p> | <p>Reference VDOT IIM-LU-200.3 for VDOT's roll in review rezoning proposals. VDOT review and comments on rezoning applications provide guidance to the applicant to ensure the future success of the project through the review process prior to the applicant's first submittal of a site plan. It is the applicants responsibility to ensure adequate land and space is provided for the roundabout. VDOT will further review the detailed roundabout design when submitted. If any additional land is needed to accommodate the roundabout intersection it would benefit the applicant to know this at the GDP phase of the project.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>Kimley-Horn has performed a cursory review and we are</p> |
|-----------|-------------|--|----------|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|----|------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>comfortable with the concept presented. We understand that detailed design will require refinements that can be further vetted during the site plan review process.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged – comment closed. Detailed design of the roundabout can be done at site plan stage. Be advised that final design could affect the site layout.</p> |
| 20 | C2.1 | Label the corner clearance distance from the drive aisle the intersects Israel Rodriguez Drive with Austin Ridge Drive. | A | GDP has been updated to include corner clearance distance labels. | <p>This measurement is short of the 225' minimum and appears to be measured incorrectly. The distance should be measured from edge of pavement on Austin Ridge Drive to edge of pavement of the drive isle.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant. No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response:</p> <p>Kimley-Horn has included corner clearance dimension as requested.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | REW 4: Completed – comment closed. |
| 21 | C2.1 | Provide auto-turn movements at the entrances, right turn slip lane from I-95, right turn lane from Courthouse Road onto Austin Ridge Drive, and other critical paths to verify that the geometric design can handle the expected movements. | C | Provide a reference to a VDOT code where that is required for a rezoning application. | <p>Reference VDOT IIM-LU-200.3 for VDOT's roll in review rezoning proposals. VDOT review and comments on rezoning applications provide guidance to the applicant to ensure the future success of the project through the review process prior to the applicant's first submittal of a site plan. Auto turn shown on the GDP will ensure the design vehicle can maneuver the site with the proposed layout and access points. This is highly recommended by VDOT on the GDP to ensure adequate land and layout prior to detailed site plan submission. This plan will require large fueling vehicles to maneuver the site which could impact the major road network fronting and adjacent to this project if measures are not considered early in the design.</p> <p>REW 3: No Response from Applicant.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>No GDP with this submission.</p> <p>Applicants Response: Kimley-Horn has performed a cursory review and we are comfortable with the concept presented. We understand that detailed design will require refinements that can be further vetted during the site plan review process.</p> <p>REW 4: Acknowledged – comment deferred. Be advised that the site plan must meet VDOT truck turning standards, which may require changes to the roadway geometry as shown on the GDP.</p> |
| COMMENTS ON BUC-EE'S TIA 3rd Submission | | | | | |
| 22 | TIA | In Table 8 (Scenario A 2032), Intersection 4 (Austin Ridge Dr / Courthouse Rd), the delay/LOS was not updated for the Build condition PM peak (i.e., reported results match August 2025 TIA submission). New results should reflect the update of including the 3 rd westbound through lane on Courthouse Rd. | A | Table 8 was updated to address this comment. | REW 4: Acknowledged – comment closed. |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|---|----------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>23</p> | <p>TIA</p> | <p>The following impacts remain unmitigated in the Scenario B 2032 scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Austin Ridge Dr / Courthouse Rd <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intersection delay: 105.9 sec (F) in PM; 80.0 sec (E) on Sunday ▪ Westbound Courthouse Rd: 122.9 sec (F) in PM ▪ Southbound Austin Ridge Dr left turn: 179.3 sec (F) in PM ○ I-95 / Courthouse Road interchange <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Western DDI crossover intersection on Courthouse Rd: 78.0 sec (E) intersection delay in PM ▪ Eastbound Courthouse Rd: 1,000+ ft queue (AM and PM) that extends into the Austin Ridge Dr intersection ▪ Northbound I-95 off-ramp: 1,100 ft queue (AM and Sunday) and 1,750+ ft queue (PM) that extend well down the ramp and into the I-95 mainline ramp gore area in the PM ○ Austin Ridge Dr / Sunflower Dr intersection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eastbound Sunflower Dr: 900+ ft queue (PM) and 1,400+ ft queue (Sunday) that extend into and beyond the existing Embrey Mill commercial unsignalized intersection ▪ Southbound Austin Ridge Dr: 1,100+ ft queue (PM) that extends into and beyond the proposed Israel Rodriguez Dr signalized intersection | <p>A</p> | <p>Per Stafford County code we have mitigated Austin Ridge Drive and Courthouse Road in the weekday AM and PM peak hours, but not the weekend peak.</p> <p>Based on discussions with Stafford County and VDOT staff, it was agreed that there are limitations to using Synchro to model a DDI. SimTraffic results show minor degradation.</p> <p>Noted. An auxiliary lane concept was examined but does not fit within existing right-of-way.</p> <p>With the proposed geometric changes the eastbound queue is reduced to compared to the no-build conditions, prior to the completion of the project.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. The Southbound Austin Ridge Dr: queue is projected to extend + 1,000 ft during the PM peak hour under no-build conditions, prior to the completion of the project.</p> | <p>REW 4: See comment #26.</p> |
| <p>24</p> | <p>TIA</p> | <p>The following are text edits; typos that need correction.</p> <p>Report Table 7. At intersection #5, Austin Ridge & Sunflower Drive, the overall intersection delay under 2026 Build AM conditions (Scenario A) is reported as 8.1 seconds of delay, LOS B. This should be reported as LOS A. Under 2026 Sunday results, the Westbound through</p> | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>movement reports 30.2 seconds of delay LOS “ – “, the corresponding LOS should be revised to report LOS C.</p> <p>Report Table 9. At intersection 4, Austin Ridge and Courthouse Rd, ensure the label “ s “ is reported under all scenarios for the eastbound right movement.</p> | | | |
| 25 | TIA | <p>SimTraffic, as a microsimulation tool, shows several movements operating at failing conditions, with delays reaching into the hundreds or even thousands of seconds, as documented in Appendix D (Pages 1721–1730 and 1762–1771) and Appendix F (Pages 26–27). Although these SimTraffic results were provided for informational purposes, since County guidelines follow the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) Level of Service and delay for reporting and mitigation, the microsimulation outputs should be considered in long-term planning for the roadway system.</p> <p>Specifically, during the PM and Sunday peak hour, 2032 Scenario B conditions, southbound traffic along Austin Ridge Drive appears to be gridlocked between Courthouse Road and beyond the modeled roadway link to the north. Due to this significant congestion along Austin Ridge Drive, eastbound and westbound approaches of Sunflower Drive / Driveway 1 (Intersection 5), Driveway 2 (Intersection 19), Israel Rodriquez Drive (Intersection 20), and Imaginary Road (Intersection 103) experience hundreds/thousands of seconds of delay.</p> <p>The raw SimTraffic data in Appendix D reports also does not appear to match the summary SimTraffic data in Appendix F.</p> | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|---|--|--|--|
| 26 | TIA | <p>The 2026 Build Condition LOS is acceptable compared to the No-Build Condition with no significant degradation; however the following movements experience increased delays without mitigation in the Scenario B 2032:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Austin Ridge Dr / Courthouse Rd <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Westbound Courthouse Rd through movement: 188.4 sec (F) in PM ▪ Southbound Austin Ridge Dr: 90.6 sec (F) in PM ▪ Intersection delay: 104.2 sec (F) in PM ▪ Southbound Austin Ridge Drive queue of 1,900 feet in PM and Sunday, extending through multiple upstream intersections ○ Austin Ridge Dr / Sunflower Dr <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Northbound Austin Ridge Dr left turn: 280.8 sec (F) in PM; 109.3 sec (F) on Sunday ▪ Eastbound Sunflower Dr queue length of 1,000+ feet in PM and Sunday, extending through Miracle Drive intersection | | | |
| 27 | TIA | <p>The TIA is based on a 2026 build year, and under that assumption the 2026 Build Condition LOS is acceptable. However, it is already 2026. What would be a realistic build year and where would that fall relative to the 2026 and 2032 scenarios, particularly since the 2032 analysis shows failing movements.</p> | | | |