



October 22, 2021

Mr. Doug McLean
Principal Planner
Cranston City Hall
869 Park Avenue
Cranston, RI 02910

Re: 200 Comstock Parkway, Cranston, RI
Traffic Study Peer Review
Fuss & O'Neill Reference No. 20200078.T30

Dear Mr. McLean:

Fuss & O'Neill has conducted a review of the traffic study relating to the proposed development at 200 Comstock Parkway in Cranston, RI. The development is proposed to be primarily industrial use with some office space.

Materials Reviewed:

1. Traffic Impact Study completed by BETA Group, Inc. titled "Proposed Industrial Development" dated 9/30/2021.

We offer the following comments:

3.0—Existing Conditions

3.3—Traffic Flow Data

1. The 2021 traffic count data in Appendix A only includes automobile and truck traffic. We request that pedestrian count data be included in the appendix as well if it is available.

4.0—Safety Analysis

2. We concur with all safety recommendations in this section.

108 Myrtle Street
Suite 502
Quincy, MA
02171
t 617.282.4675
800.286.2469
f 617.481.5885

www.fando.com

California
Connecticut
Maine
Massachusetts
New Hampshire
Rhode Island
Vermont

Mr. Doug McLean

October 22, 2021

Page 2

5.0—Impact Analyses

5.1—Trip Generation

3. The proponent uses ITE Land Use Code 150 “Warehousing” to determine that the proposed development is expected to generate 46 vehicle trips (35 entering, 11 exiting) during the morning peak hour, and 52 trips (15 entering, 37 exiting) during the afternoon peak hour. This land use code may be expected to provide a reasonable estimate for the trip generation of this development, and trip generation has been calculated correctly based on the development square footage. However, the number of anticipated peak hour trips does not appear to be aligned with the proposed 217 employee/visitor parking spaces on site.

It is recommended that the proponent consider reducing the number of employee parking spaces on site, as the proposed parking seems excessive compared to the trip generation.

Alternatively, if the number of proposed employee/visitor parking spaces on site is required for facility operations, the predicted trip generation may be too low. If this is the case, a more accurate trip generation estimate should be calculated using the number of employees at the facility, or by representing the facility with a different industrial land use code.

5.2—Future Traffic Volumes

4. The conditions analyzed include the 2021 existing condition and the 2024 Build condition. In order to determine the impact of this development, the 2024 Build condition must be compared to a 2024 No-Build condition. Comparing the future Build condition to the existing condition may incorrectly attribute the impact of ambient traffic growth to the proposed development.

It is also recommended that the proponent contact the City of Cranston to determine if any other approved developments in the area should be considered in the development of the No-Build condition.

5. A computer drafted volume figure should be provided of the 2024 No-Build Traffic Condition for comparison with the Build Condition.
6. A computer drafted volume figure of the anticipated trip distribution percentages should be provided for clarity.

Mr. Doug McLean

October 22, 2021

Page 3

5.3—Operational Analysis

7. Capacity analysis should be updated to include the 2024 No-Build Condition.
8. It is reasonable to conclude that HCM analysis over represents vehicle delay for eastbound vehicles at the intersection of Western Industrial Drive and Comstock Street, and the stop-delay study has been performed correctly.

However, an estimate of delay must be provided for the No-Build and the Build Conditions. The analysis indicates that the delay on the eastbound approach more than triples from the existing to the Build condition. Given that the average delay measured in the existing condition indicates that the westbound left turn movement operates at LOS E, it is reasonable to expect significant delay at this approach in the Build condition.

9. MUTCD signal warrant analysis should be performed to determine if a signal may be warranted at the intersection of Comstock Parkway and Western Industrial Drive.
10. Table 4 – Level of Service Summary (Future Build Conditions) does not include results for the site driveway westbound right turn. The proponent should include results for this movement.
11. The peak hour factor at the intersection of Comstock Parkway and Western Industrial Drive is not consistent for all movements at the intersection under the Build condition in the afternoon peak hour. Per the HCM, 6th Edition, the overall intersection peak hour factor should be used for each movement.
12. The proponent states that 30 and 20 percent of site generated traffic is expected to be truck traffic during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. However, the heavy vehicle factor used in analysis for traffic entering the site and exiting the site is two percent. Analysis should be updated using the appropriate heavy vehicle percentages.
13. The proponent states that capacity analysis is performed using HCM methodology, however the capacity analysis worksheets in the appendix for the signalized intersection of Comstock Parkway and Plainfield Pike do not appear to include HCM analysis. HCM Capacity analysis worksheets should be provided for this intersection.



Mr. Doug McLean
October 22, 2021
Page 4

We appreciate the opportunity to provide the City of Cranston with this peer review. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Katherine O'Shea'.

Katherine O'Shea, EIT
Transportation Engineer

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Matt Skelly'.

Matthew W. Skelly, PE, PTOE
Project Manager