

**Fair Wind Village Development
206 Bayview Avenue**

**Responses to Traffic Impact Study Comments
May 6, 2025**

1. Comment: Within the roadway geometrics description, revise the Bayview Avenue classification to minor arterial.

Response: Bayview Ave. is now referred to as a minor arterial.

2. Comment: The existing conditions volumes in the table on Page 2 do not appear to match the existing conditions volumes in Figure 1 and the traffic counts attached in the appendix. Review and revise accordingly.

Response: The existing conditions volumes in the table on Page 2 have been modified to match the volumes in Figure 1. The traffic volumes have been modified slightly from the original traffic counts to allow for the higher volumes at Almeida Apartments from the new traffic count.

3. Comment: The estimated trips for Almeida Apartments do not appear to be added to the figures and analyses of the Metacom Avenue and Bayview Avenue intersection. Review and revise accordingly.

Response: Almeida Apartments has been recounted and additional traffic has been added to the intersection of Metacom Avenue and Bayview Avenue.

4. Comment: There appears to be a discrepancy regarding the dates covered in the crash analysis between the text on Page 2 and the table on Page 3. Review and revise accordingly.

Response: The dates in the Table have been modified.

5. Comment: The projected traffic analysis on Page 4 estimates the trips generated for 23 units. The site plan appears to show a total of 20 units, including the existing 3-unit residential building. Review and revise accordingly.

Response: Originally, the development was to be 20 new units plus the 3 existing units. The projected traffic is now for a total of 20 units (17 new plus the existing 3).

6. Comment: Traffic Operations Analysis
 - a. Future traffic volumes do not appear to have been projected to a future design year, typically five years from the study date. There also does not appear to have any approved developments nearby, or lack thereof, mentioned or included in the analysis.

- b. Future no-build analysis does not appear to have been completed.
- c. There appears to be discrepancies between volumes in the figures and traffic counts, and volumes used in the analysis.
- d. It appears that adjustments to the peak hour factor and heavy vehicle percentages were not made to reflect count information.
- e. The timing settings used for the existing and proposed conditions appear to be different. Confirm if there are timing changes proposed to the signal at Bayview Avenue and Metacom Avenue.
- f. The appendix does not have a copy of the traffic signal plan. Provide the existing timing and phasing settings for review.

Response:

- a. Future traffic volumes have been projected for the year 2030. Bristol Planning Department was contacted and they stated there have been no recently approved developments in the area.
 - b. Future No-Build analysis has been done.
 - c. Volumes have been adjusted.
 - d. Adjustments to the peak hour factor and heavy vehicle percentages have been made.
 - e. The timings for existing and proposed are now the same as received from RIDOT.
 - f. The appendix now includes a copy of the traffic signal plan existing timings.
7. Comment: Due to the issues raised in Comment 6 above, revisions to the analysis would be required for Pare to conclusively concur with the level of service conclusion stated in the study.

Response: The Existing Conditions, 2030 No-Build and 2030 Build analysis has been done and revisions have been made as noted above.