MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc. (MDM) has prepared the following response to traffic-related comments for the above-referenced project, as issued in a letter by Gwendolyn H. Sandiford and Family, dated August 30, 2016. To facilitate review, specific traffic related comments are paraphrased below with corresponding responses.

Comment T1: "The trip-generation count was based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers residential trip generation equation but the methodology of this equation is not site specific."

Response: The use of Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation methodology is standard practice and for this land use category, complies with standards required under local, MEPA and DCR review and represents trip levels in suburban environments with no reduction for public transportation use.

Comment T2: "The trip-generation count was taken in the month of February which historically is one of the lowest trip generator months of the year."

Response: Based on nearby permanent count station data from MassDOT indicates that traffic volumes in the area for the month of February are within 4% of average season conditions, representing a fluctuation of approximately 50 vehicles during the peak traffic hours. Hence, an adjustment of 4% would not alter the recommendations or conclusions of the May 16, 2016 Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) which indicates that the proposed driveway will operate with modest delay (less than 20 seconds). Furthermore, despite historical records showing flat or declining traffic growth in the area, the TIA adjusts (increases) traffic volumes for analysis by
approximately 4% based on a conservative 7-year build-out and assumed annualized traffic growth rate of 0.5%. In conclusion, traffic volumes used in the TIA analysis are a reasonable representation of peak traffic conditions on Unquity Road without further adjustment.

Comment T3: “This proposed sub-division in not a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood, nor is the neighborhood designed to take advantage of access to the transit networks, town center, banking, shopping, day care, hospitals, and/or recreational activities without the use of a private vehicle.”

Response: The proposed subdivision is being designed to fit in with the existing amenities of the adjacent neighborhoods and roadway system. There are currently no sidewalks on Unquity Road and there is no transit service in the immediate study area. However, the subdivision will include on-site pedestrian accommodations and can accommodate bicycles along the proposed roadway serving the property which will connect to the recently implemented bicycle lane on Unquity Road.

Comment T4: “No adjustment was made to take into account that this location does not have access to public transportation or any other independent variables that could affect the outcome of the trip generation count.”

Response: As outlined in ITE’s Trip Generation¹, the trip rates for land use code (LUC) 210 – Single Family Detached Housing “were primarily collected at suburban locations having little or no transit service, nearby pedestrian amenities, or travel demand management (TDM) programs.” Therefore, no adjustments for lack of public transportation were appropriate or necessary.

Comment T5: “The study does not discuss the day-to-day services for this residential area, which include: school buses, U.S. postal delivery, garbage collection, recycling, maintenance vehicles, and other service vehicles that may be enter and exit during these peak hours.”

Response: The trip rates based on ITE’s Trip Generation account for day-to-day service trips for the residential use such as school buses, U.S. postal delivery, garbage collection, recycling, maintenance vehicles, and other service vehicles that may enter during the peak hours and on a daily basis.

Comment T6: “No discussion was provided on the traffic signal control for peak hour traffic at the intersection of Unquity and Canton Avenue, and no information on how the weekly peak hour traffic impacts the congestion, traffic volume, and traffic back-up long these two roads.”

---

Response: The limited impact of the project does not warrant detailed evaluation of locations beyond the site driveway, as project-related trips represent only 1 percent of current trip levels and fall within normal day-to-day fluctuation in traffic on area roads. Impacts at locations beyond the site driveway including Unquity Road/Canton Avenue will be imperceptible to the average motorist, representing an increase of one vehicle every three to four minutes on average.

Comment T7: “No information was provided on the issues of safety and/or traffic operation within the public Right-of-Way for either pedestrian or bicycle trip generation.”

Response: The TIA includes a crash evaluation for Unquity Road between Canton Avenue and Harland Street that indicates that there were no reported pedestrian or bicycle related crashes in the study area, and that crash experience along this section of Unquity Road is 10 times lower than the statewide average. Therefore, no immediate safety countermeasures are warranted based on the crash history along this segment of Unquity Road. MDM also notes that the DCR recently re-marked Unquity Road to include bicycle accommodations for both travel directions. The safety of pedestrians and bicycles will be fully addressed during the DCR access permit application process per DCR requirements.

Comment T8: “Pedestrian and bicycle access, safety, and needs must be full consideration during the planning and design of this sub-division road.”

Response: There are no known safety deficiencies relative to bicycles and pedestrians in the study area that warrant further evaluation or safety countermeasures. Further, the DCR recently re-marked Unquity Road to include bicycle accommodations for both travel directions. The driveway interface at Unquity Road will include pavement striping, signs and bicycle lane crossing markings that comply with DCR requirements under the pending Access Permit process.