From: John Roos
To: hinesburgzoning@gmavt.net
Subject: DRB Hannaford hearings
Date: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 9:19:23 AM

Dear Peter,
It is my understanding that the DRB will have future hearings regarding the changes to their proposal approved a year ago. I wish to underline a couple of elements that I feel are important to consider.

The area proposed for the farmers market that has a proposed culvert to transmit stormwater has permanent standing water and cattails. From my eye, this is clearly a class 2 wetland.

With the 116 repaving this summer, there were a couple of new things that came up that caused some back and forth in proposals by Hannaford to accomodate first the left turn lane setback of southbound 116 and then later when the speed limit was reduced to 30mph. Where it landed in terms of final Hannaford plan is that to acccomodate the room for the proposed 7 car capacity of stacking (175 feet), center line shift, and taper that there would be widening of both sides of 116 south of the Patrick Brook culvert and extending up to the needing to widen some elements of the guard rail on the east side just south of the culvert. It is my estimation that these changes are within 15 feet of the Patrick Brook crossing or less than the 25 feet used to factor a single vehicle length involving turn lane stacking.

The current left turn lane setback was made to accomodate a wheel base 44 truck. I had meetings with VTrans staff during the summer that were the ones that designed and implemented the current 60 foot setback and I was told by them that when Hannaford comes in with their changes, that they would require the intersection to accomodate a WB 62 or even perhaps a WB 67. During the Act 250 hearings, David Saladino who was in my opinion poorly chosen by the town (mostly because RSG works for developers and has worked for Hannaford a number of times in the past) to create a schematic of turning radii. The best he could do was to use a WB 55 that showed trucks crossing 2 lanes and making very wide turns that still conflicted with oncoming traffic. The town should not use him or RSG again but should use someone like Stantec that never works for developers.

The fellows I met with at VTrans who told me that they would require the intersection to accomodate a bigger wheel base are Josh Schultz (Joshua.Schultz@state.vt.us) and Michael LaCroix (Michael.LaCroix@state.vt.us).
Josh is the lead on this and who I talked with primarily.

Michael LaCroix
Project Supervisor
Highway, Safety & Design Section
Vermont Agency of Transportation
(802) 828-4672
michael.lacroix@state.vt.us

The left turn lane setback would need to be extended further to make this accomodation such that the road changes would reach to and past Patrick Brook.

When the left turn lane setback was originally put forward by VTrans this summer and before the proposed speed limit reduction, the road changes proposed by Hannaford were extending north of Patrick Brook. In reviewing this, ANR made submissions to the Act 250 commission that with work involving the area of Patrick Brook that they would require the bridge to be rebuilt to make this undersized structure geomorphically compatible and aquatic organism passable.

Clearly we have traffic congestion issues in Hinesburg and knowing that it took 10 years to get the new bridge over the LaPlatte at Silver Street, it is in the residents best interest that we not have to go back after the store is built to get Hannaford to make the necessary changes to Patrick Brook. Even if it is to accomodate a longer queue in the left turn lane of southbound 116, just one more vehicle length in the prediction would block thru traffic at the bottle neck of Patrick Brook. I would hope that the DRB would recognize that with these changes and the threat to unacceptable gridlock that they would require that necessary mitigation of the Patrick Brook area be done prior to the opening of the store.
Sincerely,
John Roos