

TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS REVIEW MEMO

Date: Oct 5, 2020 (Comments Date). Sept 7, 2020 (Resubmittal)

Subject: Anclote Harbor Apartments Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Review Comments

City of Tarpon Springs, Florida

American Project No: 5169367

American Consulting staff reviewed the subject TIA and offer the following comments. Also see attached redlines.

1. In the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP-01), indicate the directional U turn arrows in the two turn lanes and site driveways.
2. Keep City and Reviewer informed on the status of the FDOT Approval of Permit Plans for the NB right turn lane into the site, and the offset median U turn lanes. Provide a copy of any plans that are provided to FDOT, to the City.
3. On Page 3, reference was made to Highway Capacity Software (HCS). Synchro software was used (per Appendices), not Highway Capacity Software. Revise verbiage in the report.
4. General Comment on Figures. Dodecanese Blvd is a WB extension of Live Oak St., and ties in at Alt US 19 north of the Live Oak St./Alt US 19 intersection. Please show it correctly in all Figures.
5. Comments on Figure 2,
 - a. Live Oak St. southbound through shows 63%, whereas Spruce Street southbound traffic shows 65%. Please clarify.
 - b. The Traffic Distribution at the Live Oak St/Alt US 19 does not add up at the adjacent intersections of Live Oak St/US 19 and Spruce St/US 19. Also there is 2% distribution in N-S Direction where are they leading to? Please confirm.
6. Comments on Figure 3,
 - a. Traffic volumes from Beckett Way/US 19 Intersection add up to 12 vehicles for SB direction. Figure 3 shows 13 vehicles. Please confirm.
 - b. Traffic volumes from Beckett Way/US 19 Intersection add up to 37 vehicles for NB direction. Figure 3 shows 38 vehicles. Please confirm.
 - c. See Traffic Distribution Percentages comments from Figure 2, which would affect Figure 3.
7. Comments on Figure 4,
 - a. Traffic volumes from Beckett Way/US 19 Intersection add up to 37 vehicles for SB direction. Figure 4 shows 38 vehicles. Please confirm.
 - b. The traffic volumes do not add up the driveway volumes which is 70 vehicles. Please confirm.
 - c. Traffic volumes for SB approach at Live Oak St/US 19 Intersection show 45 vehicles for SB direction, whereas upstream it is 46 vehicles per Figure 4. Please confirm.

- d. See previous comment on Traffic Distribution Figure. The traffic assignment on Figure 4, at the Live Oak St/Dodecanese Blvd does not add up at the adjacent intersections of Live Oak St/US 19 and Spruce St/US 19. Also there is traffic volumes along N-S Direction, where are they leading to? Please confirm.
 - e. Traffic volumes for SB approach at Live Oak St/US 19 Intersection show 44 vehicles for SB direction, whereas downstream at Spruce St., it is 45 vehicles per Figure 4. Please confirm.
 - f. Traffic volumes for SB approach at Spruce St/US 19 Intersection show 41 vehicles for SB direction, whereas downstream at E Tarpon Ave., it is 42 vehicles per Figure 4. Please confirm.
8. Typical Comment - Determine if comments on Figures 2 through 4, would affect the traffic volumes shown in Figures 5 through 8, and Figures 10, 11.
 9. Typical Comment - Add link volumes on Figures 5 through 8 between all Study Intersections.
 10. Comments on Figure 10, 11-
 - a. For SB traffic at US 19/Live Oak St., traffic volumes adds up to 3720 at the intersection, whereas upstream volumes shows a lower number 3693. Please confirm why the discrepancy?
 - b. For NB traffic between US 19/Live Oak St., traffic volumes adds up to 1481 at the intersection, whereas downstream volumes shows a lower number 1417. Please confirm why the discrepancy?
 11. Page 22, Study Roadway Segments are anticipated to operate at LOS E. Would FDOT be okay with allowing the Applicant not to pay any impact fees for traffic added by the subject project and other future projects contributing to worsen the LOS to E? LOS D is the acceptable criteria. Please indicate in the narrative that FDOT would accept it for reasons described by Kimley Horn in last discussion with reviewer.
 12. Tables 2 and 3, comments-
 - a. Based on comments made on Figure 2 (Project Traffic Distribution Percentages). Confirm if Project Traffic Assignment, Peak Hour values, Project % Service Volumes, etc. in Table 3 will change and update the table.
 - b. Last Column under Table, should be LOS D Capacity. It was shown correctly before in the last submittal. Please change it back to LOS D. Update the last column to say YES where applicable, on any roadway segments that exceeds LOS D Service Volumes, which is the acceptable LOS. LOS E and F are unacceptable.
 13. Page 25 comment, Tables 4 and 5 too –
 - a. Previous comment not implemented. In addition to V/C ratios, add LOS for each of movements and overall intersection LOS and corresponding delay in vehicles/second. Mention if LOS D thresholds can be met with any countermeasures to improve the operation of the movements/overall intersection. When would the improvements be needed and who will address operational improvements? Revise narrative under Intersection Analysis, and corresponding Table 4.
 - b. General Comment for Tables 4 and 5 - Confirm if any of the previous comments made on the Figures would change any of the V/C ratios listed. Also include LOS.

- c. Previous comment not implemented. It was discussed during comment resolution meeting that the general public and council members do not understand what V/C ratio is. Previous comment "Include a LOS chart with LOS A thru F with corresponding delays so City staff and laymen can understand the operations. Also include the thresholds for V/C (volume/capacity) ratio (such as what is acceptable and what is failure), so it is easily understandable to City council and anyone reviewing this report."

14. Table 6 Comments –

- a. Revise NBL to NB U Turn, and SBL to SB U Turn.

15. Page 31 Comment-

- a. The Parking Waiver requested by Applicant for Parking is 46 spaces. Work with City of Tarpon Springs on this waiver. This may encourage parking outside community when events occur in the clubhouse or any guests are having parties. Clarify where would overflow parking be accommodated?

16. Page 32, Multimodal Comment-

- a. Since, this is a requirement for Applicant to make Multi-modal improvements. Can it be made contingent upon Applicant to provide Design Construction Plans to City/FDOT and applicant pay for Construction of the same concurrently with the proposed development. A more detailed review will be done by City's Consultant of the Design Plans.

17. Page 35, Conclusion –

- a. As part of the Conclusion, summarize all Recommendations of what the Applicant will provide?

For any questions or concerns, please call Patricia at the City to coordinate a meeting if required with Consultant reviewer.