

To: DRB  
From: Peter Erb.  
Date: January 31, 2012  
Re: Rick Bryant traffic report and remaining traffic issues

I have included Rick Bryant's traffic report to you in this packet, well ahead of the next Hannaford meeting so that you have time to give it some thought. It is based on a series of questions I came up with that I hope reflects yours as well. Alex and I also had some thoughts and comments about the report for your consideration.

The traffic issue remains a moving target, and there appears to be three "areas" that need to be nailed down before any meaningful analysis can be considered. I am assuming that the overall traffic projections for this area are not in dispute. If that is true, then the first two, agreement on the amount of traffic which will be generated by the new store, and how much traffic should be factored into the analysis when Lantmans is no longer a grocery, are necessary to establish the base line numbers for traffic analysis. The third is should the synchronization of the Charlotte road light be factored in to the analysis right now. Changing the synchronization of that light, which should never have been configured that way in the first place, will be done in any case, and is not dependent on the construction of Hannaford. I, for one, find it confusing to know that traffic will increase, and yet have the traffic analysis indicate no or very little impact and recommend that you request that the analysis include it as existing, not mitigation for the Hannaford project.

The Bryant report # 3 concludes that the Lantman's site traffic generation is purely speculative, and therefore suggests that the Town should enter into a formal agreement to cap the trips at the 100 that the Hannaford report predicts. Alex and I disagree, however, and don't think the Board should define any Hannaford derived limit or "by right" trip generation for the Lantmans site. We don't have a "cap and trade" system for traffic generation and we encourage the Board to make a decision based on the other evidence, perspective, and mitigation measures. While any figure is somewhat speculative, there are several "facts" that we do have.

We do know that the largest parking lot in Hinesburg exists there, ready to be used. Secondly, the Village Growth area encourages and is zoned for, a density of uses. Thirdly, neither the Dickinson nor the Oman projections include the increase in traffic which could result if the separate, former Vet clinic building which, by right, is served by the Lantmans parking and driveways were to change from apartments back to a commercial use.

The Dickinson report included two scenarios, which illustrate how the Charlotte road intersection would be impacted. Table 1 is based on their prediction of 100 trips per peak hour, and table 2 based on the existing Lantman's traffic as the peak hour number.

Both the tables below are based on the intersection light being synchronized, not as it is now.

**Table 1 – 2017 Intersection PM Peak Hour Levels of Service with Lantman's at 100 Pm Peak Hour Trip Generation**

|                                  | Build    |            |            |
|----------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|
|                                  | LOS      | Avg. Delay | Max. Queue |
| <u>VT 116 &amp; Charlotte Rd</u> |          |            |            |
| Charlotte Rd LT                  | D        | 50         | 103'       |
| Charlotte Rd RT                  | B        | 18         | 195'       |
| Lantman's LT/TH/RT               | C        | 21         | 85'        |
| Route 116 NB LT/TH/RT            | C        | 30         | 605'       |
| Route 116 SB TH/RT               | C        | 20         | 842'       |
| <b>Overall</b>                   | <b>C</b> | <b>25</b>  |            |

**Table 2 - 2017 Intersection PM Peak Hour Levels of Service with Lantman's Existing Trip Generation**

|                                  | Build    |            |            |
|----------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|
|                                  | LOS      | Avg. Delay | Max. Queue |
| <u>VT 116 &amp; Charlotte Rd</u> |          |            |            |
| Charlotte Rd LT                  | D        | 54         | 101'       |
| Charlotte Rd RT                  | B        | 19         | 162'       |
| Lantman's LT/TH/RT               | E        | 59         | 299'       |
| Route 116 NB LT/TH/RT            | D        | 49         | 742'       |
| Route 116 SB TH/RT               | C        | 23         | 825'       |
| <b>Overall</b>                   | <b>D</b> | <b>35</b>  |            |

In the section Northbound Vehicle Queues of the Bryant report, he agrees with Oman that future Lantmans traffic could have a significant impact, which is why he proposed the cap and trade.

All the other intersection analysis they have done are based solely on their prediction of the lower 100 figure. If you don't adopt the "cap and trade" and instead settle on a number, as we recommend, depending on that number there is the possibility that the LOS of other intersections could be significantly impacted as well. I urge you to be conservative in your conclusions since it will be extremely difficult to bring Hannaford back to the table

In the section "Oman analytics Future Traffic Conditions" Rick concurs with Oman's observation and has suggested in previous comments that the applicant offer mitigation for these locations. While section #11 suggested future monitoring of traffic operations after the supermarket is built to determine if signal warrants are met, he did go on to conclude that it was suggested as a minimum commitment. Both Alex and I concur that the DRB should be very careful not to state or imply that such signalization might be necessary there or at Silver street) as it is a bigger discussion for the Selectboard, VTrans, and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission – one that will require thorough scoping, assessment of alternatives, etc. The Hannaford traffic analysis should not be accepted until a more thorough evaluation and proposals for mitigation of the Mechanicsville Rd intersection have been done.

The concluding paragraphs of the Bryant report (L & D Response) recognizes the potential for an expensive modification to the Patrick Brook Bridge if the SB LH turn lane on 116 gets slightly longer than Hannaford predicts, and suggests that Hannaford be held responsible if it is necessary. I urge you not to depend too heavily on the Towns ability to make this agreement hold up. The time and effort it would take to clearly establish that Hannaford, and not other traffic, is the cause would be more than a Zoning Administrator could do. It is imperative that this and other concerns be resolved by the best analysis possible if a permit is issued.

Peter