



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

14685 Avion Parkway
Chantilly, VA 20151
(703) 383-VDOT (8368)

PHILIP A. SHUCET
COMMISSIONER

THOMAS F. FARLEY
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATOR

Interoffice Memorandum

To: Steven E. Welch P.E. (District Right of Way and Utilities Manager)
William V. Johnson (District Utilities Engineer)
John Muse (District Environmental Manager)
David P. Shiells, P.E. (District Materials Engineer)
Ali A. Foroughi, P.E. (Acting District Structure & Bridge Engineer)
Robert H. McDonald, P.E. (District Transportation Planner)
Paul J. Kraucunas, P.E. (District Land Development Manager)
Loren W. Epton (District Traffic Engineer), Attn: Irma Von Kutzleben
Katherine D. Jefferson (District Traffic Field Operations)
Mark D. Hagan (Smart Traffic Signal Manager)
T.F. "Jimmy" Chu (Smart Traffic Center)
Roger L. Foster (ARE, District CURE)
Robert F. Price (RE, Prince William and Loudoun Construction)
Steven H. Garrett (Central Office Location & Design)
William A. Key (Central Office Construction Division)
Steven G. Ikenberry (District Location & Design Drainage Engineer)
Leon E. Treutle, L.S. (District Location & Design Survey Manager)
Helen Cuervo, P.E. (Manassas Residency Prel. Engineering Manager)
James C. Zeller, P.E. (Leesburg Preliminary Engineering)
Samuel N. Allaire (Leesburg Permits Manager)
Glen Kenney (ARE Leesburg Maintenance Engineer)
Fatemeh Allahdoust (TDP/Bicycle Mobility Planning)
John N. Webb (Asst. District Right of Way Manager)
Carol Lew (Loudoun County) via transmittal

23
before the County
Date: February 24, 2004

Re: Resolution of Field Inspection Recommendations

Project #: 0015-053-125, PE 102
PPMS #: 52533
Rte/Description: Route 15
From: White's Ferry Road
To: 0.25 Mile North Lockett's Road
Jurisdiction: Loudoun

in the plans, perhaps within the project notes or the MOT notes. (Traffic Engineering, Mary Lou Pagano)

Response: The note will be added to the plans.

11. The contractor shall maintain the clear zone requirements for a roadway posted at 45 * MPH (rural shoulders) during all phases of construction. All equipment or obstacles should be removed or protected that remain within the clear zone. This note should appear in the plans, perhaps within the project notes or the MOT notes. (Traffic Engineering, Mary Lou Pagano)

Response: A reminder to remedy this situation will be placed in the files.

12. This segment of Rte 15 was reduced to a 45 MPH speed resolution in February 1999. The reduction in speed was the result of a speed study, existing substandard shoulders, and recent accident history. It was noted to Richmond at the time that several projects were in development to improve and upgrade the shoulders, provide turn-lanes, and improve intersection sight distances. Traffic Engineering, Mary Lou Pagano requests all efforts be made to provide the highest level of sight distance and turning radius's from the intersections (both state roadways and private driveways) to motorists, improve stopping sight distance as possible, and improve the shoulders as shown. With noted improvements to the shoulders, we recognize that speeds will increase whether speed limits are changed or not. Where possible, the highest safety feature criteria reflecting the previous 55 MPH speed limit, should be designed into the plans. (Traffic Engineering, Mary Lou Pagano)

Response: The Field Inspection set was designed to meet a 45 MPH design speed due to budgetary constraints. In particular, increasing the design criteria will significantly increase right-of-way costs and require a significant increase in the modification of the many culvert crossings along the corridor.

13. At the Field Inspection meeting of December 9, 2003, it was noted that the drainage ditches made it impossible to obtain the clear-zone for a roadway design of 45 MPH. Do the plans need to apply for a design exception or waiver to continue forward? All hazards within the prescribed clear-zone should be removed or protected by the project as necessary. Please review. (Traffic Engineering, Mary Lou Pagano)

Response: Cost constraints and impacts preclude meeting clear zone requirements in some locations. There is a need to document these locations, but a design exception is not required.

14. Sheet 1I (1) – Neither this nor subsequent noted sheets reflect maintenance of traffic within them other than through the MOT notes. These notes indicate traffic barrier service along the entire project for protection of the work area. I question whether this will be practical and allow the contractor the necessary egress/ingress to the respective work areas? Further, I see no mention of the run-on protection necessary to protect the blunt ends of the barrier at each opening. Please assure the project contract has bid items for construction signing and all other MOT items necessary to complete the project. All such items shall be NCHRP 350 compliant. (Traffic Engineering, Mary Lou Pagano)

Response: The MOT plans will be revised.

15. The MOT typical sheet (unnumbered, but spaced between sheets 21 and 23) reflect Stage I as paving the existing east shoulder, placing barrier, and transferring the travel lanes over. I don't believe sufficient width exists over some of the drainage structures within the project