

July 13, 2020

Todd M. Penney, P.E., Town Engineer/Wetlands Agent
Office of the Town Engineer
Town of Coventry
1712 Main Street
Coventry, CT 06238

Re: Garrett Homes, LLC Retail Development @ 1600 Boston Turnpike

Dear Mr. Penney:

We are in receipt of your comments dated July 8, 2020, regarding Fred Greenberg's Traffic Overview Memorandum for the project noted above. Our responses are indicated below in ***bold italic*** text and are as follows:

1. A CDOT Encroachment Permit shall be required for the development and more significant Traffic Analysis maybe required.

Response: Agreed.

Remainder of comments go in order of the paragraphs in the Memo

2. Paragraph 2: Require actual sight line distances be provided and confirm they meet or exceed CDOT's requirements based on comparison table format in the memo.

Response: Acknowledged. Based on the likely prevailing speeds near the site (assumed to be 50 mph), the driveway would need about 550' of sight distance. Please see the sight distance plan showing those distances are met. CTDOT will be reviewing sight distance as part of the encroachment permit application as well.

3. Paragraph 3: I would request more elaboration in the memo as to how this proposed development's access management will impact and/or not impact the surrounding other developments within a 500-foot diameter on CT RT 44. In particular;
 - a. Key Bank Driveway
 - b. Walgreens Driveway
 - c. Two CVS Driveways (one in Enter only)
 - d. Residential Driveway (but is zoned commercial)

Response: Acknowledged. We don't anticipate any significant impact on any of the nearby driveways.

a. Key Bank - about 275' from site

- b. *Walgreens, opposite Key Bank - about 275' from site*
 - c. *CVS - in only is about 50' from site, but has little potential conflict. Full access is about 200' from site.*
 - d. *Residential-adjacent to site. If redeveloped as commercial, they will have to address their driveway location.*
4. Paragraph 7: I would request more detail are put in the memo on the remaining 14 reported crashes not at the signalized intersection and how this development will or will not impact these crashes.

Response: Acknowledged. BL provided crash data as requested. The remaining 14 reported crashes were not intersection related and showed no discernable pattern. The Site is 800' from signal, beyond any specific impact.

5. Paragraphs 6, 8, & 9: There seems to be a fair amount of focus of each of the legs at the signalized information and I'm not 100% why. I would suggest is that how does this development impact the signal and/or how does it assist the development in providing gaps for exiting traffic in the eastbound direction.

Response: Acknowledged. BL described the signalized intersection just to convey the traffic environment, as it is the only significant intersection nearby. The signal may help site egress by providing gaps in the Route 44 traffic stream.

6. Paragraph 10: The memo references the level of service from the Save N' Go development for the Boston Turnpike/Main Street/Grant Hill Road intersection. I recommend the actual trips for the peaks be added in the memo to give the Commission comparison to the trips that are listed in Table 1 of the memo. The memo should provide input on where the development with impact the Level of Services referenced.

Response: Acknowledged. Save N' Go was projected to add 10 weekday morning peak hour A.M. peak hour trips and 11 weekday afternoon peak hour trips. BL did not perform a traffic impact study, so we can't suggest any LOS changes will or will not occur at the nearby intersection.

7. Paragraph 11: This paragraph references CRCOG's Eastern Gateway Study from April 2019. One of the focuses in that Study attached to the Memo is access management issues due to high frequency of driveways in close proximity to each other. This memo does not provide any analysis on this issue for this proposed development. I go back to my comment number 3 for Paragraph 3 and recommend the applicant's expert provide more input on this subject.

Response: Acknowledged. The Eastern Gateway study was only provided as background information that could be used by local and State agencies to help improve operations in the area in the long term. The developer here is requesting a single curb cut, to replace the existing one. No new curb cuts are being added.

8. Paragraph 12: I would recommend the memo elaborate on estimated Saturday peak at 1.5 times the PM Peak. Where does this factor come from? CDOT Traffic Manual or another ITE Guidance? Can the actual ITE Trip Generation Page for the 814 Variety Store be added to the memo for actual reference?

Response: Acknowledged. The 1.5 factor was derived from looking at the PM/SAT ratios for other retail uses. This is a generally acceptable practice. There are copyright issues regarding enclosing actual ITE Trip Generation page in this response letter.

9. Paragraph 12: I would recommend the memo elaborate on the “empirical studies” for “pass-by” trips. What percentage does CDOT allow for in their permitting process?

Response: Acknowledged. The empirical studies are field surveys of trips performed at actual retail sites and compiled by ITE for inclusion in “Trip Generation”. As noted for small retail sites, the “pass-by” component averages 35-45%. We conservatively noted 30% in our memo. CTDOT uses 20%. The difference is 2-8 peak hour trips, depending on the time period. The CTDOT information is decades old, and was collected at totally irrelevant sites, not comparable to small retail uses, resulting in an overestimation of new trips.

We trust this answers your questions and addresses your concerns. If you require additional information, feel free to contact me at 860-249-2200.

Sincerely,

Fred Greenberg, P.E.
BL Companies, Inc.