

Mark T. Arienti

From: Jennifer Curtis
Sent: Wednesday, April 1, 2020 10:49 AM
To: Will Haskell
Cc: Mark T. Arienti
Subject: RE: Windham Traffic Peer Review

Thank you Will! Very helpful comments.

From: Will Haskell <whaskell@gorrillpalmer.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2020 6:06 PM
To: Jennifer Curtis <jcurtis@windhammaine.us>
Cc: Mark T. Arienti <mtarienti@windhammaine.us>
Subject: FW: Windham Traffic Peer Review

Hi Jenn,

We offer the following comments on the Traffic Peer Review for the proposed Bangor Savings Bank / Cross Insurance Building in Windham, ME. These review comments were prepared by Randy Dunton, PE, PTOE.

The study was well done and generally followed acceptable standards and methodology. This review included the following:

- Traffic Impact Analysis for Proposed Bangor Savings Bank in Windham – Letter from Diane Morabito, PE, PTOE (Sewall) to Mr. Jason Donovan dated March 16, 2020
- Plan Set from Sevee & Maher signed March 2, 2020
- Site Plan Application dated March 2020 from Sevee & Maher

Based on our review of that information we offer the following comments related to traffic.

- GP agrees with the use of the 10th edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) *Trip Generation* manual. GP agrees that the most representative Land Use Codes (LUC) were used for the existing/proposed office area (LUC 710 – General Office) and proposed bank area (LUC 912 – Drive-In Bank). As mentioned in the report, there is not a representative land use code for retail. The LUC used (820 – Shopping Center) for the existing 938 SF retail building (iPhone repair store), in our opinion, does not accurately represent the use; however, based on the size of the retail building and potential other options that may have been used, changing this trip generation would not be expected to change any of the conclusions of the study.
- GP agrees with the existing trip generation for office and retail space.

- GP agrees with the proposed trip generation for office and bank development, with the exception of the PM Peak Hour of the Generator for the Bank, which we could not reproduce. Since the adjacent street trip generation is used for the remainder of the study and not the trip generation of the generator, the conclusions of the study would not change.
- GP agrees with the methods used to seasonally and annually adjust the traffic counts to a 2021 no-build condition.
- The Trip Assignments provided on Figure 4 do not appear to add from a roadway network perspective. The volumes entering and exiting the site appear correct, but the volumes flowing through the rest of the system do not appear to agree. Resulting changes to other figures or capacity analysis should be revisited.
- The results of the traffic analysis for level of service are correctly identified from the simulation to the report (see above comment for possible changes). The applicant has noted that the level of service of one approach does change from an “E” to an “F”. Per the Town of Windham Ordinance, if the level of service of an intersection is an “E” or worse, the level of service should not decrease because of the additional traffic. The overall intersection level of service is not provided. The applicants traffic engineer should provide a response to this item. This criteria can be waived by the Planning Board.
- It should be noted that the results of the capacity analysis provided in the study are most likely not accurate due to the impacts on traffic flow from the adjacent signalized intersection. However, the results provided in the study can be used as an indicator of the level of impact of the project on the intersection.
- GP agrees with the safety analysis for High Crash Locations and mitigation tactics to improve these locations. This includes additional striping and signage to not block the intersection.
- It should be noted that the proposed access management measures (reduction of driveways and restriction of movements) to this corner should have a net positive impact to the overall area, reducing potential conflicts and improving safety. However, the applicant should address the Town’s double frontage requirements. We recommend the applicant revisit the channelization of the proposed driveways to improve the enforcement of right turn movements only. As currently shown at both driveways, the restrictions do not appear to be prohibitive enough.

Do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or want to discuss in more detail.

Thank you,

William C. Haskell | Principal



707 Sable Oaks Drive, Suite 30 | South Portland, ME 04106
207.772.2515 x235 (office) | 207.318.7052 (mobile)
www.gorrillpalmer.com