May 3, 2017

# TRANSMITTED VIA FIRST-CLASS U.S. MAIL <br> AND VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL TO SAINTA@CO.THURSTON.WA.US 

Arthur Saint<br>Thurston County Development Review<br>Thurston County Public Works<br>2000 Lakeridge Drive Southwest<br>Olympia, Washington 98502-6045<br>\section*{Re: Project No. 20131044632, Plat of Oak Springs Response to Development Review Comments dated December 29, 2016}

Dear Mr. Saint:

This firm represents the Applicant for the above-referenced project, Conwell Investments LLC, and its principal, Mark Conwell. The enclosed March 8, 2017 letter from Carl Springer, P.E., of DKS Associates attached at Tab A is provided in partial response to Development Review comments dated December 29, 2016, a copy of which is attached for your reference at Tab B.

Our firm will provide additional substantive response regarding the project's compliance with Thurston County Concurrency Requirements under TCC 17.10.030 under separate cover.


## HLB/ach

Enclosures:
Tab A: Letter from Carl Springer, DKS Associates, March 8, 2017
Tab B: Development Review Comments, December 29, 2016
cc: Tony Kantas, Thurston County Resource Stewardship (via email only)
Mark Conwell (via email only)

TAB A
LETTER FROM CARL SPRINGER, DKS ASSOCIATES DATED MARCH 8, 2017

March 8, 2017

Arthur Saint, Development Review
Thurston County Public Works
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98502-6045

## Subject: Response to Thurston County Comments on Oak Springs TIA <br> DKS Project: P15155-000

Dear Mr. Saint:

This letter responds to the comments submitted by Thurston County Public Works staff on our supplemental Traffic Impact Analysis for the above site dated September 2016. Our responses are numbered according to the items in your memorandum dated December 29, 2016.
\#1 Additional Study Intersections Recommended For Analysis
The County lists six additional study intersections beyond the five locations that were included in our supplemental analysis. Before we proceeded with our work, we submitted a scoping letter to the Public Works department for review and approval. On March 21, 2016, you emailed us the County's comments, which included responses by Scott Davis. The County agreed that the five study intersections that we proposed were acceptable. Therefore, we conclude that our TIA scope is sufficient as submitted in September, and we do not need to further evaluate additional locations along Marvin Road.

Copies of our original February 2016 scoping letter and the email from Mr. Davis are attached, for your reference.

## \#2 - \#4 Corrections To Volume Diagrams for Locations 4 and 5

We reviewed each of the corrections noted, and found that in all cases they were errors in the report graphic only. The values used for the actual capacity analysis are correct, as reflected in the appendices, and the performance results reported are correct.

We have revised the report graphics, and a copy of the two changed figures are attached.

Response to Thurston County Comments on Oak Springs TIA
March 8, 2017
Page 2

## \#5 Recommended Mitigation and Concurrency Requirements

The suggested mitigation measure at 19th Avenue SE and Marvin Road SE intersection is to share the cost of the improvement that the County has already applied to the Oak Tree Preserve development. Therefore, no further justification was presented as to the merits of upgrading traffic control since the County already imposed that improvement on another development project. As referenced on page 17 of our report, the County required either a signal or a roundabout before the construction of Oak Tree Preserve Phase 2, expected in 2018, as stated in the Oak Tree Preserve TIA. We also note that the proposed Oak Springs development represents about $5 \%$ of the traffic volume growth at that location.

Our analysis did demonstrate that all of the concurrency requirements could be met on the Marvin Road corridor if a traffic signal (or a roundabout) were installed at that 19th Avenue SE and Marvin Road SE intersection. Furthermore, the applicant would support working with the County in their alternatives analysis for that intersection, and reaching agreement on a possible fee en lieu of improvements. The agreed upon fee could be made a condition of approval for Oak Springs.

That concludes our response to these preliminary comments. If you have questions, please reply or give me a call.

Best regards,


Reah Flisakowski, P.E.
DKS Associates




22 Feb 16<br>Scott Davis 720 SW Washington St

Suite 500
Portland, OR 97205
503.243.3500

## Subject: Transportation Impact Analysis Scoping Letter for Oak Springs Site in Lacey, Washington

Dear Mr. Davis:

DKS is under contract to update a 2013 Transportation Impact Analysis for the proposed Oak Springs development near Lacey, Washington. We are submitting this letter in advance of this update to get your confirmation on or assumptions, scope and methodology.

## Project Description

The Oaks Springs property is designated for residential development, and it is located adjacent to Marvin Road SE in the urban growth area south of Lacey, Washington. The site is located at 3146 Marvin Road SE, just south of an existing residential subdivision. Vehicle access will be provided through the existing neighborhood streets to the north, and access to Marvin Road would be provided via Woodgrove Street SE.

## Traffic Study Assumptions

The location, type and size of the proposed development have not changed since the previous TIA prepared by Heath \& Associates in November 2013. The proposed project includes 89 single-family detached housing units. This update will utilize the many of the same assumptions as that previous study, specifically the trip generation and distribution assumptions, with newer information regarding baseline traffic volumes and the approved pipeline development.

## Trip Generation and Distribution

We plan to use the same trip generation and distribution assumptions as were done in 2013. The resulting trip estimates were as shown below, Table 2 excerpted from the Heath \& Associates study, and the trip generation assumptions are shown on the attached Figure 4 from that same study. The trip distribution values were based on travel model data provided by Thurston County.

TABLE 2
Project Trip Generation
89 Single Family Units

| Time Period | $\frac{\text { Volume }}{}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| AWDT | 847 vpd |
| AM Peak Inbound | 17 vph |
| AM Peak Outbound | 50 vph |
| AM Peak Total | 67 vph |
| PM Peak Inbound | 56 vph |
| PM Peak Outbound | 33 vph |
| PM Peak Total | 89 vph |

## Study Intersections

Pacific Avenue SE / Union Mills Rd. SE
Marvin Road SE / Pacific Avenue SE
Marvin Road SE/ Union Mills Rd. SE
Marvin Road SE/ $19^{\text {th }}$ Avenue SE
Marvin Road SE / Woodgrove Street

## Study Scenarios

The updated TIA will include the following traffic forecast and operational scenarios. Future years would be estimated using a fixed annual growth rate for background traffic, and specific forecasts for approved projects, such as Oak Tree Preserve:

- 2016 Baseline Conditions: Update the baseline year of analysis, to 2016 to represent Existing Conditions. New traffic counts will be collected at study locations during weekday PM peak periods.
- 2020 Baseline With Full Development of Oak Tree Preserve (Future Baseline Without Oak Springs): Revised 2020 forecast using updated background annual growth rate, specific forecasts from the Oak Tree Preserve TIA, and pipeline traffic from other approved developments.
- 2020 With Full Development of Oak Springs: Same as previous scenario with full development of the proposed Oak Springs project.
- 2022 With Full Development of Oak Springs: Same as previous scenario plus two additional years of background growth.


## Traffic Mitigation and Documentation

- For 2020 and 2022 scenarios, the operating conditions at study intersections will be reviewed and compared to the County's acceptable performance targets.
- New traffic mitigations will be developed to address deficiencies.

A new complete TIA report will be submitted for this site to present the findings, methods and recommendations for this property.

If you have questions, please reply or give me a call.

Sincerely, DKS Associates


Carl Springer, P.E.
Principal

Cc: Heather Burgess, Philips Burgess Law, PLLC; Mark Conwell, Conwell Investments, LLC


# Email Response To Scoping Letter Review Comments From Scott Davis 

From: Scott Davis

Sent: Friday, March 18, 2016 1:18 PM
To: Kevin Hughes [HughesK@co.thurston.wa.us](mailto:HughesK@co.thurston.wa.us)
Subject: Oak Springs Scoping Letter

Kevin

Here are our other scoping comments

Growth Rates - use regional model growth rates (contact Thurston regional planning council) for county roads. The city may want a different rate for their roads.

- Pipeline Projects - provide attached file originally emailed by B.Meier.
- Study Scenarios - ok
- Selected Study Intersections for Marvin Rd - ok
- Please note Marvin and Mullen Rd based upon approved projects currently does not meet Thurston County concurrency requirements. This intersection was not noted to be studied since fewer than 25 pm peak hour trips are projected to use it. However, this intersection will impact the ability of this project to move forward as the current traffic distribution indicates trips from this proposal will use it.


## Software

- Unsignalized Intersections use HCS from McTrans
- Signalized Intersections use Synchro
- Roundabouts use aaSidra
- Signal Timing - use signal timing parameters provided by City of Lacey (e.g., Pacific/Union Mills). Do not change parameters on future scenario analysis. If timing changes are needed those can be discussed in the mitigation section with proposed timing plan included in the appendix. Timing plans should include LOS analysis, ped crossing time review, consistent with City of Lacey procedures and include completed controller input worksheets.

Scott Davis, PE
Traffic Engineering \& Operations Manager
Thurston County Public Works
360-867-2345
davissa@co.thurston.wa.us

TAB B
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 29, 2016

An Accredited Agency of the

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Tony Mantas, Thurston County Resource Stewardship
FROM: Arthur Saint, PE, Thurston County Public Works Development Review $\qquad$
DATE: December 29, 2016
SUBJECT: 3146 MARVIN RD SE 13-112596
PROJECT \#: 2013104463
REFERENCE: Traffic Impact Analysis - Dated September 2016

Upon review of the proposed project referenced above, Public Works has the following comments:

1. A transportation concurrency evaluation is required for a development that contributes 1 or more trips to Marvin Road Corridor, per Thurston County Code section 17.10.020, A, 2.
a. Add Mullen Rd to Study Area
b. Add $25^{\text {th }}$ to Study Area
c. Add Lake Forest Dr to Study Area
d. Add Wathew St to Study Area
e. Add $15^{\text {th }}$ Ave to Study Area
f. Add Scarlet Oak Dr SE to study area
2. Figure 2 - Intersection 5 - Woodgrove right movement should be 28 not 82 based upon traffic counts.
3. Figure 3 - Intersection 4 - Marvin Rd southbound thru should be 38 not 30 based upon traffic counts.
4. Figure 3-Intersection 5 - Marvin Rd and Woodgrove St, Woodgrove left movement should be 7 not 0 based upon traffic counts.
5. Chapter 4
a. Table 8 suggests a Traffic Signal will mitigate concurrency at $19^{\text {th }} /$ Marvin Rd however no signal warrant analysis was provided to justify mitigation strategy and an complete alternatives analysis would need to be provided to select applicable intersection improvements.
b. Payment of impact fees or stating Oak Springs developer will coordinate with Oak Tree Preserve does not satisfy Thurston County Concurrency Requirements under TCC 17.10.030. In order to meet concurrency Oak Springs would need to:
i. Construct or financial secure improvements to satisfy corridor concurrency needs.
ii. Wait until sufficient capacity exists
iii. Participate in optional concurrency strategy
6. Note - Thurston County is currently engaged the following efforts regarding this corridor
a. Marvin Rd \& Mullen Rd - in Preliminary Design Phase
b. Marvin Rd at $19^{\text {th }}$, Union Mills and $15^{\text {th }}-$ in Alternatives Analysis Phase

Please be aware, further issues may be addressed as discovered, or as changes are made to the plans.

Please note that this preliminary review memo is from one department out of several reviewing this project. Revised plans should not be submitted until you receive a preliminary review letter from the Thurston County Planner for this project.

If you have any questions or comments, please call me at (360) 867-2043.
cc: Steve Hatton, Hatton Godat Pantier
Mark Conwell

