

MEMO

To: Town of Ossining Planning Board
Town of Ossining Town Board

From: Osman Barrie, PE, PTOE, PTP

Date: September 16, 2024

Project: Crotonville Conference Center Traffic Study

N+P No:

Subject: Comments on Traffic Study prepared for Crotonville Conference Center

In response to your request, we have reviewed the revised Traffic and Parking studies, along with the responses to our August 8, 2024, comments on the previous Studies for the proposed rezoning of the existing GE Training Facility into a hotel (dated June 2024) prepared by Kimley Horn. The existing facility training center is located in 12 buildings with existing infrastructures on a 62-acre parcel located at 1 Old Albany Post, Ossining, NY. The TIS evaluated the prospective use of the current facility to a 300-room hotel and conference center.

We offer the following comments on the responses to the revised Traffic Impact Study and Parking Assessment:

N+P Comment 1: The overall study methodology followed standard traffic engineering practice.

Kimley Horn Response: *Comment noted.*

N+P Additional Comment 1: No further comment

N+P Comment 2: The traffic impact study assesses the potential impacts of the proposed hotel and conference center on adjacent streets during the weekday AM (7-9 AM), weekday PM (4:15-6:15 PM), and Saturday midday (12:30-2:30 PM) peak hours. However, the peak activity times for hotels do not align with these studied peak hours. Most hotel check-ins occur between 12 PM and 3 PM, and check-outs between 11 AM and 12 PM. Therefore, the study should be updated to include weekday midday counts from 11 AM to 3 PM and extend Saturday counts from 12:30-2:30 PM to 11 AM-3 PM to accurately quantify the potential impact of the hotel.

Kimley Horn Response: *The study performed weekday midday analysis; existing traffic volumes approximated based on continuous count station data. Saturday traffic data review extended from 11AM-3PM using continuous count station data (Saturday analysis revised also).*

For the Saturday analysis a review of the background traffic volumes and individual uses (discussed later) indicated that the project has the greatest potential to impact traffic conditions from 2 to 3 PM. Based on a review of NYSDOT continuous count station data on NYS 9A over the Croton River, it was determined that the 2-3 PM peak hour volumes are 7% higher than the previously studied 12:30 – 1:30 PM volumes. Therefore, to evaluate the 2-3 PM hour the existing Saturday peak hour volumes were increased by 7%.

For the weekday midday analysis, a review of the background traffic volumes and individual uses (discussed later) between 11 AM and 3 PM, indicated that for every hour, the traffic volumes at the key intersection of Route 9 and Old Albany Post Road and the traffic volumes that will be generated by typical activities at the Conference Center will both be lower than the corresponding values at the PM peak hour. Therefore, it was determined that if the project does not impact traffic at the PM peak hour it will not impact traffic at any hour between 11 and 3 PM.

The results of this analysis are included in the revised Traffic Study.

N+P Additional Comment 2: We agree with the methodology of applying a 7% growth factor to the Saturday volumes to reflect traffic conditions during the 2-3 PM peak hour. We have reviewed the updated Saturday midday analysis using the revised volumes, which were increased by 7% from the existing levels. However, no supporting data, such as NYSDOT continuous count station information or a corresponding spreadsheet, has been provided to substantiate the determination of this 7% increase.

Additionally, we concur that if the weekday PM peak hour volumes are higher than the weekday midday peak hour volumes, the midday analysis will not show a more significant traffic impact than the PM peak hour results. In the Event Condition Analysis, the weekday midday volumes were derived from NYSDOT continuous count station data on Route 9 over the Croton River. However, we request that the applicant provide a comparison sheet that includes continuous station data, demonstrating that the weekday midday peak volumes are 68% of the weekday AM peak hour and 78% of the weekday PM peak hour.

N+P Comment 3: The existing traffic counts were conducted in June 2024, with future conditions analyzed for 2025, both with and without project completion. The estimated time of completion, however, appears too short. If this project is expected to be completed within a year, provide justification in the report for using this one-year timeframe for the No-build and Build analysis.

Kimley Horn Response: *The Traffic Study has been revised to indicate that the one-year timeframe is related to the request to simply permit the proposed usage of the existing buildings, as is, for a public facing hotel and conference center. This is expected to occur by 2025 if not before.*

N+P Additional Comment 3: Please update the Traffic Study to incorporate the statement provided above, as it was not found in the current version of the report. A one-year timeframe for developing the Build condition is acceptable, provided there are no significant changes to the site. However, if major construction is planned in the future, a more realistic Build Year will need to be established, which may necessitate conducting a new traffic study to accurately assess potential traffic impacts.

N+P Comment 4: The existing traffic volumes have been projected to the year 2025 using a 1% annual growth factor. The report states that this growth factor is based on NYSDOT historical traffic growth rates for roadways of similar classification in Westchester County. Provide historical data and spreadsheet calculations supporting the 1% annual growth rate.

Kimley Horn Response: See NYSDOT Average Annual Growth Rate Data for 2023 through 2050.

N+P Additional Comment 4: We concur with the use of the 1% annual growth factor. We have no further comments on this.

N+P Comment 5: In the project description section of the report, it is stated, " *This traffic impact study evaluates the prospective use of the current facility to a 300-room hotel and conference center, as well as a conference center with 300 senior living residential units or some combination thereof, where the combined hotel rooms and senior living units does not exceed 300.*" However, the report does not include a traffic impact analysis for the 300 senior living residential units and the combination of both hotel rooms and senior living residential units at the study intersections, or at least a trip generation comparison of the potential development options was not conducted to ensure the worst-case scenario was analyzed. The report should be updated to include an analysis of all three scenarios discussed in the project description section.

Kimley Horn Response: A trip generation comparison has been included in the Traffic Study for the potential senior living development options. A comparison of these two options to the proposed public facing hotel and conference center revealed that the hotel and conference option is the worst-case scenario. Therefore, the hotel conference center was evaluated in the Traffic Impact Study.

N+P Additional Comment 5: We have reviewed the trip generation comparison for various scenarios in the revised traffic study. The comparison indicates that among the anticipated uses, the hotel with meeting/event traffic (Table 6) generates the highest number of trips. From a traffic impact analysis perspective, it would be more appropriate to base the study on the worst-case scenario, as noted in the response of Kimley Horn. However, the Trip Assignment in Figure 9 of the report shows that the Build Traffic volumes were developed using the anticipated trip generation from Table 3 (Hotel), which reflects lower anticipated trips than the hotel with meeting/event traffic (Table 6 of the revised report). To ensure a comprehensive analysis, we recommend that the traffic impact analysis be based on the worst-case scenario volumes provided in Table 6, and the Build condition analysis should reflect these volumes.

N+P Comment 6: As stated in the report, the anticipated traffic generated by the proposed development was determined using data from the ITE publication, 11th Edition, for a Hotel (LUC 310). While the trip generation source is acceptable, the trips used to anticipate the potential impact of the proposed project are inappropriate. The ITE trips used to project the site volume were based on the lower numbers of the Average Rate, whereas the Fitted Curve equation indicates higher trip numbers. For example, the applicant used 138 trips (based on the Average Rate) for the weekday AM peak hour, while the ITE Fitted Curve indicates 143 total trips. Similarly, the applicant used 177 trips for the weekday PM peak hour,

while the ITE Fitted Curve indicates 194 total trips. To ensure a conservative analysis, the applicant should revise the Build condition analysis using the highest anticipated trips from the ITE.

Kimley Horn Response: *The Traffic Study has been revised to reflect the 143 and 194 trips.*

N+P Additional Comment 6: No further comment

N+P Comment 7: As stated in the parking analyses, it is highly likely for the hotel to operate independent of the conference facilities, restaurants and other amenities that will be open to patrons that are not guests of the hotel. Hence on a day that a major conference or banquet event occurs on site, the anticipated trip generation of the use including the hotel rooms would be significantly higher than the trips estimated from ITE LUC 300 (hotel). A more comprehensive trip generation analyses taking these scenarios (as presented in the parking analyses) into consideration should be conducted.

Kimley Horn Response: *A more comprehensive trip generation analysis taking into consideration event days at the hotel conference center, has been included in the revised Traffic Impact Study. A sensitivity analysis has been provided showing the potential impacts on these days.*

N+P Additional Comment 7: The comprehensive trip generation analysis is acknowledged. However, as stated in the N+P Additional Comment 5, the Trip Assignment in Figure 9 of the report shows that the Build Traffic volumes were developed using the anticipated trip generation from Table 3 (Hotel), which reflects lower anticipated trips than the hotel with meeting/event traffic (Table 6 of the revised report). To ensure a comprehensive analysis, we recommend that the traffic impact analysis be based on the worst-case scenario volumes provided in Table 6, and the Build condition analysis should reflect these volumes.

N+P Comment 8: Based on the Trip Distribution and Assignment, it is anticipated that 10% of the site traffic will use the northbound Old Albany Post Road, while 15% is expected to utilize the southbound Albany Post Road (US Route 9). The projected 10% traffic volume on northbound Old Albany Post Road may be high given that this is a local street with a curved horizontal alignment and is surrounded primarily by residential land uses. However, South Albany Post Road (US Route 9) is a principal arterial road directly connecting to downtown Ossining, which features numerous public attractions, a train station, and the Ossining-Haverstraw Ferry Port. Given these factors, South Albany Post Road is likely to experience higher traffic volumes than the 15% projected in the study. Please provide justification for the 15% allocation to South Albany Post Road and the reasoning for the 10% allocation to North Old Albany Post Road.

Kimley Horn Response: *Although not known by many, Old Albany Post Road connects to NYS 129 which connects to the Taconic Parkway. Based on the possibility that a travel app might direct a motorist to use this route, it was originally assumed that 10% of project traffic might use Old Albany Post Road.*

Since the Croton-Harmon train station is considerably closer to the site than the Ossining train station, and because there are considerably more trains at Croton- Harmon than Ossining, it was determined that most, if not all, visitors or employees to the site, who took the train, would use the Croton-Harmon

station and not the Ossining Station. Also, based on our familiarity of the roadways in the area, the majority of north- south traffic beyond the Village of Sleepy Hollow use Route 9A instead of Route 9 (which has multiple village traffic signals). For these reasons it was originally assumed that only 15% of south-bound traffic would use Route 9.

To provide a conservative analysis, the revised Traffic Study assumes only 5% of project traffic would use Old Albany Post Road to and from the north, and that 20% of project traffic would use Route 9 to and from the south.

N+P Additional Comment 8: The assumption that 5% of project traffic would use Old Albany Post Road to and from the north, and that 20% would use Route 9 to and from the south, is acceptable. However, upon reviewing the traffic volume figures, it was noted that the volumes in Figure 7 (Forecasted 2025 No-Build Traffic Volumes) and Figure 9 (Trip Assignment) do not align correctly when calculating the Forecasted 2025 Build Event Traffic Volumes in Figure 10. For example, during the weekday AM peak hour at the intersection of Shady Lane Farm Road and NY 9A WB off-ramp, the northbound right-turn volumes are listed as 13 in Figure 7 and 24 in Figure 9. When added, this should total 37 vehicles, but Figure 11 shows 41 northbound right-turning vehicles at this intersection. This discrepancy in the calculated Build volumes suggests that the Build Synchro analysis may not accurately reflect the correct traffic conditions due to errors in the volume data. Figure 11 should be updated, along with the corresponding Synchro analysis, to ensure accuracy.

N+P Comment 9: The intersection of Albany Post Road (US Route 9) at Old Albany Post Road/Mystic Drive is controlled by a traffic signal and includes pedestrian facilities such as crosswalks, ramps, pedestrian signal heads with countdown timers, and push buttons. Mystic Drive serves as the main access to a large residential community, which includes playgrounds, St. Augustine School, and St. Augustine Roman Catholic Church. These factors contribute to significant pedestrian activity at this intersection. However, the traffic impact analysis conducted did not include pedestrian counts or analyze their effects in the Synchro models. To ensure pedestrian safety and accurately assess the intersection's operation, it is crucial to incorporate pedestrian counts into the analysis. It is recommended that the Synchro models be updated to reflect existing and future pedestrian traffic in order to better quantify the intersection's performance and any associated delays.

Kimley Horn Response: Pedestrian activity has been included in the revised Traffic Study. Pedestrian traffic counts are included in the traffic study appendix.

N+P Additional Comment 9: As stated in the above response, pedestrian activity has been accurately accounted for in the revised traffic study. We have no further comments on this.

N+P Comment 10: In the descriptive summary of the Synchro analysis for the intersection of Albany Post Road (US Route 9) at Old Albany Post Road/Mystic Drive, it is stated that under the No-Build condition, the intersection will continue operate at LOS C during the weekday AM peak hour. However, the existing condition shows the intersection operating at LOS B during the same period. The change in delay from

LOS B to LOS C indicates an increase in overall intersection delay. It is important to accurately describe this change in delay. Update the report to state correct change in delay.

Kimley Horn Response: *Comment noted, Traffic Study has been updated and issue has been addressed appropriately.*

N+P Additional Comment 10: This comment has not been adequately addressed. Page 38 of the revised report still indicates that under the No-Build condition, the intersection will continue operate at LOS C during the weekday AM peak hour. The change in delay from LOS B to LOS C indicates an increase in overall intersection delay. It is important to accurately describe this change in delay. Update the report to state correct change in delay.

N+P Comment 11: The Existing 2024 Traffic Volume figure does not accurately reflect the traffic volumes compared to the Synchro model for the intersection of Shady Lane Farm Road and the NY 9A WB Off-Ramp. The figure incorrectly shows the northbound through traffic as “0” during the weekday PM peak hour, while the Synchro report indicates “1” vehicle for the same period. Update the Synchro model and report to ensure the traffic volumes are correctly represented.

Kimley Horn Response: *The correct value was 0 however if you enter 0 the analysis encounters an error, possibly a dividing by 0 error and fails to provide a result. If you enter 1, the analysis provides a result.*

N+P Additional Comment 11: We agree with the rationale for adding “1” vehicle instead of “0”. We have no further comments on this.

N+P Comment 12: From the review of the parking analyses memorandum, the ITE parking generation numbers presented are significantly lower than what is contained in the ITE Parking Generation Handbook for the Land Use codes. Please provide us with the ITE parking generation worksheets supporting the parking numbers in the memorandum.

Kimley Horn Response: *The ITE Parking Generation worksheet supporting the parking generation numbers have been provided in the revised parking memorandum.*

N+P Additional Comment 12: We have no further comments on this.

N+P Comment 13: The parking demand calculation was based on the average rates. The parking study should be updated to reflect parking demand based on the 85th percentile parking demand.

Kimley Horn Response: *As indicated in the updated parking memo, event parking has been based on a detailed review of the highest parking generation data points, the median and the standard deviation, and effectively reflects the 85th percentile values.*

N+P Additional Comment 13: We have no further comments on this.

N+P Comment 14: The proposed parking supply will not meet the peak parking demand. A more detailed parking management plan showing how the applicant intends to meet the peak parking demand should be provided.

Kimley Horn Response: *A more detailed Parking Management Plan, showing how the applicant intends to meet the peak parking demand, has been provided.*

N+P Additional Comment 14: We have no further comments on this.