PARE CORPORATION

May 15, 2024

Mr. Raymond Lavey
Executive Director
Waterfront District Commission
145 Taunton Avenue, Town Hall 2nd Floor
East Providence, RI 02914

Re: **Waterfront District Commission – Traffic Peer Review Services**
Metacomet Redevelopment – Crossman Traffic Study
On-Call Professional Engineering Review Services
East Providence, Rhode Island
(Pare Project No. 24039.00)

Dear Mr. Lavey:

Pare Corporation (Pare) has completed our review of the traffic study and site access and circulation for the Metacomet Redevelopment Project. Pare reviewed the following documents provided by the Waterfront District Commission:

- Letter to Bob Rocchio as a supplement to the March 2023 Preliminary Traffic Impact and Access Study, dated December 29, 2023, prepared by Crossman Engineering

In addition, other documents have been provided to us, including:

- Preliminary Traffic Impact and Access Study, Metacomet Golf Club Redevelopment, dated March 2023, prepared by Vanasse & Associates, Inc.
- Proposed Site Plan Documents, Proposed Metacomet Redevelopment dated December 21, 2023, prepared by Bohler Engineering
- Traffic Impact and Access Study, Metacomet Golf Club Redevelopment, dated December 2020, prepared by Vanasse & Associates, Inc.
- Traffic Engineering Peer Review, Proposed Land Development Project – Master Plan Submission, The Metacomet Golf Club Redevelopment, dated March 30, 2021, prepared by BETA Group, Inc.
- Letter to Robert Rocchio, P.E., dated March 1, 2024, prepared by Keep Metacomet Green

The five documents above were not specifically reviewed in this letter, but we refer to Pare's March 15, 2024 letter reviewing the Vanasse & Associates traffic study and the site plans. The remainder of the materials were provided for additional context in the performance of the review.

Pare offers the following comments:

General Comments

1. The introduction to the supplement is clear that its purpose is to assist the developer in obtaining conceptual buy-in from the Rhode Island Department of Transportation (RIDOT) on the proposed mitigation measures for Veterans Memorial Parkway (VMP). As a result, the study focuses almost exclusively on impacts and mitigation measures along VMP and is not intended to be a comprehensive traffic study for the project. Analyses and discussion regarding impacts of the proposed development on City streets and intersections is generally not included in this supplement. The Vanasse & Associates (VAI) study does analyze and discuss some City streets and intersections, but the development uses and sizes have changed since the Vanasse Study was completed, and the Vanasse counts were taken during the COVID epidemic back in 2020. Pare recommends renewed analyses at City intersections utilizing new counts to evaluate the need for mitigation on City streets and the completion of a single, comprehensive traffic impact analysis report with a scope and level of detail befitting a development of this size.

2. It is noted that like the VAI study before it, the study update talked very little about circulation patterns within the site, including whether parking within the site was distributed appropriately between the land uses, if the layout promoted safe and efficient internal circulation, truck delivery routes, etc.

3. There is no discussion of traffic safety anywhere in the document. The crash data in the VAI report is likely still adequate and updating this data is unlikely to result in different conclusions. However, there is no discussion regarding stopping sight distances approaching the proposed roundabout or intersection sight distance, either at the proposed roundabout or at any of the proposed site driveways, which should be based on the existing 85th percentile travel speeds on these streets.

Project Area

4. The description of the existing conditions of the roadways and intersections appears to be representative of existing conditions.

Traffic Volumes

5. Updated traffic counts were performed in November 2023. This count period is both post-COVID and prior to the closure of the westbound Washington Bridge structure. Therefore, these volumes are acceptable for determining current and likely future conditions. It should be noted that ATR counts were conducted on VMP, Lyon Avenue, and South Broadway, but manual turning movement counts were only performed at the VMP intersections with Lyon Avenue and South Broadway. This manual turning movement count effort did not include any of the other intersections included in the VAI study.

6. Figure 3 shows existing intersection traffic volumes. It appears that the volumes at the Lyon Avenue intersections with Mercer Street and Fort Street, as well as the intersection of South Broadway at Fort Street appear to be combinations of the recent ATR counts and the turning

movement counts from the VAI study, but this is not clear, either in the figures or in the text.

7. There was no discussion regarding whether seasonal adjustments to the November 2023 count data should be applied. Please confirm.

Trip Generation

8. It appears the 11th Edition of the *Trip Generation* manual was utilized in calculating the anticipated trip generation. This is the latest edition available and is therefore acceptable.

9. There is no discussion of the amphitheater in the trip generation discussion. What types of events are anticipated to be held here? Should this be included in the trip generation for weekday PM and Saturday peak periods?

10. It is noted that there were no trip generation credits taken for pass-by traffic or internally captured trips. This will result in build condition traffic volumes being conservatively high, which is acceptable.

Operational Analysis

11. A 5-year design horizon, as used in this study is standard and acceptable.

12. The 1.5 percent annual traffic growth rate used in the study is acceptable.

13. Pare agrees that where mitigation is clearly anticipated, performance of future no-build condition analyses is unnecessary. However, there are other intersections that may need evaluation for impacts where no-build condition analyses would be useful. See comment 15 below.

14. While there are trip distribution figures in the appendix, there is no discussion regarding how this trip distribution was generated or what factors were included in determining the trip distribution. It is expected that different uses will have different trip distributions, both within the site (based on location and proximity to various site access points) and external to the site. A golf course will likely have a different trip distribution than a supermarket or a residence, for example.

15. How was the percentage of site trips that use City streets determined? Is it realistic to expect that none of the exiting site traffic will utilize Mercer Street, which provides direct access to VMP? Assuming many of the trips distributed to/from the west on Fort Street will be destined for Interstate 195 to/from Providence, are they using First Street or Second Street to access VMP, and subsequently, the I-195 ramps? Should the intersections of VMP with Mercer, First, or Second be evaluated for potential traffic safety and capacity impacts? In addition, very little site traffic appears to be assigned to South Broadway to/from the north, even though this appears to be the most direct route for anybody whose origin or destination would be oriented east of the site and accessed via Interstate 195, or points north within East Providence, including the Henderson Bridge. Are there intersections along those paths that should be evaluated?

16. Based on the Proposed Traffic Volumes diagram, there are more than 150 left turns into the site expected at the site access to VMP during the weekday afternoon and Saturday midday peaks, without the benefit of a dedicated turn lane to remove these vehicles from the stream of southbound through traffic. As adding additional lanes will further degrade the parkway aesthetic along VMP, not permitting this movement should be strongly considered.

17. The analyses were completed using HCS7. It does not appear that the analyses were adjusted for peak hour factors or heavy vehicles. Please adjust as necessary.

18. The southernmost site access on Lyon Avenue is quite close to the proposed roundabout at VMP. Consider making this access right-in, right-out only or eliminating it.

19. Given some of the other comments above relative to the distribution of site-generated trips, the results of the analyses presented in Table 3 may change.

20. As noted in Pare's review of the VAI study, based on the site plans reviewed, it appears there are two significant intersections within the development, including one all-way stop, and one roundabout/traffic circle. Consideration should be given to analyzing these intersections as well to ensure they are designed appropriately.

21. As noted in Pare's review of the VAI study, will there be a specific route for trucks delivering to the retail establishments, especially the grocery store, which will likely need to be accessed by 53-foot trailer semi-trucks? It should be noted that VMP is not a RIDOT-approved route for such vehicles.

22. Based on the site plan reviewed, there appears to be one connection to the East Bay Bike Path, located at the proposed roundabout. Should there be another near the south/east side of the development, near the amphitheater?

The applicant should provide a formal response to address each comment.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 401-578-8543 or dhug@parecorp.com.

Sincerely,

Derek L. Hug, P.E., PTOE
Managing Engineer

DLH/kls

Z:\JOBS\24 Jobs\24039.00 East Providence - Metacomet Rev-RI\REPORTS\Traffic\Metacomet Crossman Traffic Peer Review.docx