

Mr. Tim Wales, PE
City Engineer
City of Saratoga Springs
474 Broadway Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

June 4, 2018

Delivered via email: timothy.wales@saratoga-springs.org

Re: City Designated Engineer Services for SEQRA/TIS review – 1st submittal
Lake Local Waterfront Redevelopment
550 Union Avenue
City of Saratoga Springs, Saratoga County, New York
Chazen Project No. 31804.09
City Project No. 16.045

Dear Tim:

The Chazen Companies (Chazen) have completed our review of the following materials received:

- Project Narrative, prepared by Phinney Design Group, dated April 20, 2018.
- Inspiration Images and Massing Study
- Proposed/Draft Schedule, prepared by Phinney Design Group, dated April 17, 2018
- SEQRA Full Environmental Assessment Form, unsigned/dated
- Geotechnical Evaluation, prepared by Dente Engineering dated June 2106.
- ZBA Variances drawing PH-1, prepared by The LA Group, last revised April 20, 2018
- Special Use Permit drawing SUP-1, prepared by The LA Group, last revised April 20, 2018
- Traffic Impact Evaluation, prepared by Creighton Manning Engineering LLP, dated March 2, 2018.

Following are our observations / comments as they relate to the Traffic Impact Evaluation:

A. Traffic Demand

1. The traffic assessment presented conditions representative of potential impacts for the peak weekday AM and PM commuter hours and midday Saturday conditions. Based on the existing and proposed uses of the site it can be expected that the peak conditions of the site would be Friday/Saturday/Sunday evenings as well as Saturday mornings. An assessment of these conditions should be prepared.
2. The traffic assessment includes 95 boat slips and a 420- seat restaurant. The Project Narrative includes 139 boat slips and a 444-seat restaurant. The discrepancies should be clarified. Also, there is a canoe/kayak rental facility that appears separate from the marina operations such that it would have its own trip generation characteristics. Further, this facility is proposed to include a small convenience store and deli shop to attract additional patrons. It should be included in the traffic estimates.
3. The use of land use code Quality Restaurant is questionable as it appears that the restaurant is more of a High-Turnover Sit-Down restaurant serving pub fare, sandwiches, and salads with shorter stay times than

the Quality Restaurant. There are significant differences in trip generation between these two types of restaurants.

4. The *Trip Generation* pass-by credit is for weekday PM commuter hour but it was also applied to the Saturday condition. It can be expected that for the site's actual peak conditions noted above that the pass-by credits would be much lower than the 40% used in the assessment.
 5. A new outdoor band stand is proposed that will also attract patrons and should be included in the traffic estimates. These facilities typically attract visitors as standing-room only crowds in addition to the number of seats the facility may have. Daytime and evening event estimates should be provided. The operational controls to be implemented to restrict the total number of patrons should be outlined on the site plans and included in the traffic evaluation since the exterior dining area does not fall under an occupancy limit under the building code.
 6. Will the boat launch be open to the public for day use? If so, the traffic assessment and the site plans should be revised to reflect this. An estimate of the number of vehicles using the boat launch and parking for the trailer and tow vehicle should be shown.
 7. Traffic volume data collected for the assessment was gathered in January/February 2018. Route 9P is considered a highly-seasonal roadway and any assessment of traffic conditions should be made representative of the peak season conditions. Additionally, there are a number of boat launch facilities near-by, including directly across from the site, that contribute to the vastly different conditions on Route 9P from the winter volumes presented. It is also our understanding that the existing restaurant was not open during this period so, if the responses to the comments presented herein warrant a detailed traffic analysis seasonal data should be collected and an analysis performed.
- B. Parking and Circulation
1. The site currently has boat trailers stored on-site. An estimate should be provided of the number of parking spots that will be dedicated for the storage of trailers and their location depicted on the plans
 2. Will boats be stored onsite during the off-season? If so, the locations should be identified on the plans.
 3. Circulation plans should be provided showing how vehicles with trailers will maneuver through the site. A change in access is proposed for the project and the boat launch area is near Route 9P such that the maneuvers could impact the mainline and vehicles entering the eastern end of the site. Additionally, islands are proposed for the ends of the parking aisles and could also impact the circulation.
 4. As noted in A above, the band stand will attract visitors as standing-room only crowds. An estimate of the number of vehicles for events, how often they will occur, and the parking needs should be provided. Will off-site parking areas need to be provided to accommodate the event crowds, what will be the traffic control needed for on- and off-site parking, will shuttles be utilized, and how will pedestrians be accommodated along Route 9P?
 5. The Project Narrative includes the addition of a crosswalk across Route 9P at the eastern driveway that isn't identified in the traffic assessment or included on the plan. The Narrative also includes an expectation that the number of pedestrians will increase. There is a sidewalk only along the north side of

Route 9P and there is only one street light on this section of Route 9P that is located west of the proposed crosswalk location. Improvements to Route 9P for pedestrians should be addressed.

In summary, a clear understanding of the site's vehicular and pedestrian traffic activity and impacts to Route 9P during the peak season, as well as the site's parking and circulation, is needed.

In order to expedite and simplify the review of revised materials we would appreciate if the next submission be accompanied by a response letter that describes the revised materials and how our comments were/were not integrated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James J. Connors". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

James J. Connors, P.E., Principal
Sr. Director, Engineering Services

cc: Tom Johnson, PE, Chazen
File