

Route 10 Sub-Committee - Meeting #1
Simsbury Town Hall, Board of Education Meeting Room
Report of Meeting - May 17, 2011 – 7:00 PM

ATTENDEES:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company*</u>
	Mary Glassman	First Selectman – SC
	Rick Wagner	Representing local business in corridor – SC
	Mike Fish	Representing local business in corridor – SC
	Allan Needham	Resident – SC
	Kirsten Griebel	Resident – SC
	Emil Dahlquist	Design Review Board – SC
	Emily Moos	CRCOG – PT
	Ted DeSantos	F&O – PT
	Jennifer Nelson	F&O – PT
	Hiram Peck	Town of Simsbury - PT

Members of the Public:

Sue Benardczyk	Resident
Mike Paine	Resident

* SC = Steering Committee
PT = Project Team

Welcome and Business

Mary Glassman opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, and turned the floor over to Emily Moos. Ms. Moos explained that the objective of this meeting is to address questions relating to the suitability, land use & transportation analysis tool, and to be able to recommend to the larger steering committee a scenario to input into the CRCOG Regional Travel Demand Model (TDM) for further analysis and refinement of recommendations. Ms. Moos further explained that having reviewed sub-committee questions ahead of time, the consultant team had made some preliminary modifications to the Suitability, Land Use & Transportation Analysis Tool and had also run five different buildout scenarios through this tool which they would go over during this meeting.

Modeling Tool Overview (F&O Team)

Ted DeSantos began going through the Analysis Tool with the subcommittee. As before, there are three basic steps: 1) Land Suitability and Buildout Data, 2) Overall Trip Generation by geography and land use / development form, and 3) Transportation Analysis at Critical Intersections. For this meeting, the tool had been updated to include six scenarios describing various combinations of land use, development locations, open space, and architectural massing. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) category was also made clearer by depicting building footprint coverage and average height as opposed.

**REPORT OF MEETING
MAY 17, 2011
ROUTE 10 SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING #1
PAGE 2 OF 4**

Mr. DeSantos started by going through the spreadsheet column by column. He compared and contrasted this effort with the CRCOG Route 305 Corridor Study's Land Use and Transportation Analysis for Windsor and Bloomfield which used a similar approach. A primary difference is that the Simsbury Route 10 tool includes predicted trip generation and critical intersection analysis, whereas the Route 305 tool (Step 1) does not. Several questions were raised regarding whether Level of Service is a valid measure for gauging the success of potential alternatives for RT 10. Mr. DeSantos stated that the intent of this study is to "right-size" the corridor's future infrastructure plan; i.e., provide enough roadway capacity for a safe, efficient, two-lane RT 10 that preserves and enhances community character. The tool indicates when the RT 10 roadway system approaches an automobile Level of Service E/F threshold (where the roadway would no longer be safe nor efficient), corresponding to overall average intersection delay, in recognition of the need to balance Level of Service for intersection users of all modes.

As Mr. DeSantos went through the Analysis Tool spreadsheet, members of the Sub-Committee asked questions on each step and on underlying assumptions. Jennifer Nelson discussed how multimodal trip generation works and how it is affected by different types of land uses as well as the character of the built environment. Ms. Nelson stated that suburban-style strip mall development has a much greater vehicular traffic impact on the corridor than residential uses or more compact and walkable mixed use blocks. "Mixed Use" is defined as having a variety of destinations (residential, retail, office, civic, etc.) within the same building and/or block. The "mixed use" category also includes assumptions regarding the form of development which ultimately affect traffic impact. These include assumptions about right-of-way coverage, block size and street connectivity. Within the Analysis Tool, a mix of uses in this category is utilized for traffic analysis purposes which consists of 60% mixed residential (including multi-family units and some lodging), 30% office / civic, and 10% retail uses. Non-residential uses are primarily on the ground-floor, while residential uses are primarily on upper floors, though exceptions are possible.

Ms. Nelson stated that no matter the density of a place, there are commonalities in streets and sidewalk or right-of-way (ROW) coverage that determine whether that place is walkable. For example, the perimeters of walkable blocks are typically no more than 1800-2000'. The length of a single block face should be no more than 500-600', though there are typically mid-block pedestrian cut-throughs when the length is over 300'. Because of the fairly tight resolution of a walkable grid, the total ROW footprint in the geography will be 25 – 35% of the land coverage. (A number of Low Impact Design techniques can be used to reduce impervious surfaces.) In the Analysis Tool, 25% ROW (5% existing + 20% new) is used in conjunction with the "Mixed Use" land use when it is applied to different scenarios.

The first scenario discussed depicted potential buildout amounts and transportation corridor implications according to current zoning (i.e. primarily I-1 in North and South Gateway, B1 and R-40 in Weatogue, and the Town Center Code & physical plan). At 50% potential buildout

REPORT OF MEETING
MAY 17, 2011
ROUTE 10 SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING #1
PAGE 3 OF 4

under this scenario, Route 10 reaches the threshold of capacity at Level of Service E/F. Scenarios 2 and 3 illustrated a partial buildout according to visions in the POCD for uses and current zoning in the gateway areas. These scenarios also exceeded the threshold of capacity for Route 10 at critical intersections, though the latter scenario was slightly better due to assumed vehicular trip reduction associated with compact, mixed-use development styles and lower allowable building heights.

Scenario 4 described the effects of concentrating all future development in Town Center. Assuming that the vast majority of new square footage in the geography was compact and Mixed Use (i.e. walkable), the Analysis Tool indicates that a full buildout of Town Center to match the physical plan from the Town Center charrette does not exceed the threshold capacity of Route 10, although intersection operational improvements on or off-corridor may need to be examined for safety and operational efficiency.

Scenario 5 is a professionally recommended scenario which was developed to closely represent the vision of the Simsbury POCD. This scenario concentrated 2/3 of all new into the Town Center and Weatogue Village areas and then placed the rest in the North and South Gateway Areas. The majority of new development (77%) was listed as Mixed Use, with additional suburban residential and commercial components. Generous open space factors (from 20 – 40%) were applied to increase active and passive public recreation opportunities and reduce habitat fragmentation and watershed impact.

The Steering Committee began to discuss Scenario 5 and generate a Scenario 6 which retained open space (20% in Town Center and Weatogue, 30% in North Gateway, and 40% in South Gateway) and redistributed some of the land uses described in Scenario 5. In each geography, a walkable grid ($\approx 25\%$ ROW) was assumed as a basis for any new development. The final iteration of Scenario 6 resulted in 25% buildout in the North Gateway ($\approx 500,000$ SF), 50% buildout in Town Center ($\approx 700,000$ SF), 80% in Weatogue Village ($\approx 60,000$ SF), and 20% buildout in South Gateway ($\approx 155,000$ SF). Within Town Center and Weatogue, the bulk of new development is programmed as Mixed Use, while the North and South Gateway areas have 50-60% mixed use areas. In North Gateway, the remainder was suburban residential and commercial (as shown in the Dorset Crossing site plan) and in South Gateway, half of the potential new square footage is designated as “Light Industrial”.

The subcommittee meeting concluded with a motion to endorse the Suitability, Land Use and Transportation Analysis Tool as a valid planning tool for the RT 10 Corridor Study and to endorse the agreed upon buildout Scenario 6 to be presented to the full RT 10 Steering Committee and to be used for planning purposes in the CROCOG transportation model. Alan Needham made a motion which Kirsten Griebel seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:10 PM.

**REPORT OF MEETING
MAY 17, 2011
ROUTE 10 SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING #1
PAGE 4 OF 4**

Next Steps:

- The RT 10 Sub-Committee will report on this motion to the RT 10 Steering Committee for vote at the May 19, 2011 Meeting.

Step 1: Suitability and Buildout Data Based on POCD (DRAFT)

NOTE: THIS BUILDOUT AND TRIP GENERATION ANALYSIS CONTAINS METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS SPECIFIC TO THE ROUTE 10 CORRIDOR STUDY. IT IS NOT VALID OR INTENDED TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER STUDY, GEOGRAPHY, OR TIMEFRAME.

CROG Developable Land Analysis Model													
Corridor Area	Gross Land Area Susceptible to New or Redevelopment (acres)	Net Usable Land Area		Land Reduction Factors				Net Buildable Area (acres) Column C - (D2 + E2)	Architectural Massing		Gross Potential Floor Area [sq. ft] Column (F x G x H) x 43,560	Estimated Existing Building Area [sq. ft] Measured from GIS and field data	Net Potential Floor Area [sq. ft] Column (I - J)
		Wetlands, 100yr Flood, Steep Slopes > 10%, Existing ROW, (acres)	Net Usable Land Area (acres) Column (A - B)	Open Space Factor (%) % of Column B	Open Space (acres)	Future Road R.O.W. (%) % of Column D	Future Road R.O.W. (acres)		Percent of Buildable Land Covered by Building Footprint (Does not include parking, pathways, landscaping, etc)	Average Building Height in Stories (Future, Max)			
North Gateway (1)	250	27	223	30%	75	20%	45	103	25.0%	2.00	2,246,000	141,000	2,105,000
Town Center (2)*	150	34	116	20%	30	20%	23	62	33.0%	3.00	2,694,000	1,319,000	1,375,000
Weatogue (3)	50	26	24	20%	10	20%	5	9	25.0%	2.00	195,000	118,000	77,000
South Gateway (4)	100	5	95	40%	40	15%	14	41	25.0%	2.00	888,000	113,000	775,000
Totals	550	93	457	-	155	-	23	279	-	-	6,023,000	1,691,000	4,332,000

* The Town Center Code and Physical Plan was used to estimate its gross potential floor area (Col. I). Including Dyno Nobel properties, the overall gross potential floor area is approximately 2.7M GSF. The Building Footprint percentage (Column G) for Town Center was derived from this number.... Under Existing Zoning (I-1), there is a maximum of 40% lot coverage of impervious surface (building + parking footprint). The Net Buildable Area (Col F) should equal ~40% of the Gross (Col A) for South Gateway where this is an alternative in the POCD.

**Step 2: 2030 Land Use Analysis based on POCD and Community Input
With Resulting Trip Generation (DRAFT)**

NOTE: THIS BUILDOUT AND TRIP GENERATION ANALYSIS CONTAINS METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS SPECIFIC TO THE ROUTE 10 CORRIDOR STUDY. IT IS NOT VALID OR INTENDED TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER STUDY, GEOGRAPHY, OR TIMEFRAME.

Corridor Area	Absorption (Buildout) Rate % Developed by Year 2030	Absorption (Buildout) Area [sq. ft] Land Developed by Year 2030 Column (K x L)	Based on POCD Assumptions (#1-5) or Community-Led Scenario (#6)							
			Land Use Mix for Net Build-Out Area, 2030 [%]				Approx. Net Build-out Area, 2030 [sq. ft]			
			Residential (Suburban)	Commercial Office and Non-Office (Suburban)	Mixed-Use (Compact, Walkable)	Light Industrial (Simsbury Zoning)	Residential (Suburban) Column (M x N)	Commercial Office and Non-Office (Suburban) Column (M x O)	Mixed-Use (Compact, Walkable) Column (M x P)	Light Industrial (Simsbury Zoning) Column (M x Q)
North Gateway (1)	25.0%	526,000	15%	25%	60%	0%	79,000	132,000	316,000	0
Town Center (2)	50.0%	688,000	15%	0%	85%	0%	103,000	0	584,000	0
Weatogue (3)	80.0%	62,000	0%	0%	100%	0%	0	0	62,000	0
South Gateway (4)	20.0%	155,000	0%	0%	50%	50%	0	0	78,000	78,000
Totals	33%	1,431,000	13%	9%	73%	5%	182,000	132,000	1,040,000	78,000

From Transportation Analysis		
Daily Trip Generation* by Geography		
Gross Average Daily Traffic (Vehicles per Day)	Net Average Daily Traffic (Vehicles Per Day)	% Vehicular Trip Reduction due to Smart Growth and TDM Strategies
9,852	7,356	25%
6,610	3,882	41%
660	374	43%
1,299	916	29%
18,421	12,527	32%

Land Use	Pass-by Traffic	Vehicle Trip Reduction Assumptions**					Daily Trip Generation* By Land Use		
		Assumed Trip Reduction for Smart Growth and TDM Strategies				Total % Reduction V1+ [(1-V1)* Sum(V2+V3+V4+V5)]	Gross Average Daily Traffic (Vehicles per Day)	Total Trip Reduction Column (V x W)	Net Average Daily Traffic (Vehicles Per Day) Column (W - X)
		A: Mixed Use Development	B: Compact or Transit Oriented Development	C: Improved Transit & Non-motorized Travel	D: Travel Demand Management (TDM)				
Residential	0%	0%	2%	2%	5%	9%	725	65	659
Commercial	5%	0%	5%	2%	5%	16%	6,152	1,009	5,143
Mixed Use	10%	25%	5%	2%	5%	43%	11,076	4,796	6,280
Industrial	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	468	23	445
							18,421	5,894	12,528

* Average Daily Traffic (ADT) and Trip Generation Rates are based on published ITE Rates (2008) for corresponding land uses.

** Trip reduction assumptions are based on published ITE Trip Generation Rates (Mixed Use), peer-reviewed research, observations, and case studies.

2030 ADT is predicted to be 16-17,500 vehicles per day along the corridor. The new dev. scenario may cause a...

80% increase in traffic

Step 3: Transportation Analysis at Critical Intersections (DRAFT)

NOTE: THIS BUILDOUT AND TRIP GENERATION ANALYSIS CONTAINS METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS SPECIFIC TO THE ROUTE 10 CORRIDOR STUDY. IT IS NOT VALID OR INTENDED TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER STUDY, GEOGRAPHY, OR TIMEFRAME.

AA BB CC DD EE FF GG HH II									
Transportation Analysis									
Peak Hour Capacity (Bi-Directional) at Key Intersections									
Corridor Area	Critical Intersection in Geography	Total Capacity* (vph) at Level of Service E Traffic Analysis		Existing Volume (vph) 2030 CRCOG Regional Model		New Trips (vph) 2030 Traffic Analysis		Surplus Capacity (vph) or failure at LOS E BB-(DD+FF) and CC-(EE+GG)	
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
		North Gateway (1)	Tarriffville Road	1,598	1,924	898	1,124	270	526
Town Center (2)	West Street	1,450	1,695	750	995	415	709	285	(9)
Weatogue (3)	Hartford Road (185)	909	1,357	409	757	240	413	260	187
South Gateway (4)	The Hartford Driveway	2,046	1,559	1,246	1,259	264	442	536	(142)

*Determination of maximum through capacity is based on methodology from the Highway Capacity Manual (2000)