

DAVID PLUMMER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

TRANSPORTATION • CIVIL • STRUCTURAL • ENVIRONMENTAL

Memorandum

To: Wayne Arnold
From: Deven Long
Date: November 22, 2016
RE: **Pelican Landing CPD/RPD Amendment TIS - #15534**
Response to Village of Estero Transportation Comments
cc: Neale Montgomery; Sharon Umpenhour; Barry Ernst; Stephen Leung

DPA is in receipt of Village of Estero Development Review comments dated September 14, 2016 (refer to Attachment A of this memorandum) for the above referenced Project. In the process of reviewing comments provided by the City of Bonita Springs and the Village of Estero, DPA deemed that adjustments to the traffic analysis are warranted. Several area specific developments within the Pelican Landing DRI boundaries were classified as future background traffic rather than future Pelican Landing traffic. The revised traffic study dated November 22, 2016 has addressed this issue and features minor modifications to traffic volumes and distribution that were subsequent to the correction. Please note that there are no changes to the conclusions found in the original study.

DPA would like to offer the following response to the Village of Estero review comments.

Comment #1

The Traffic Impact Statement uses a 20% internal capture rate to Pelican Landing. Please explain how this percentage was determined since Pelican Landing is a gated community and Raptor Bay is outside of these gates.

Response:

There are other land uses beyond the gated community within the Pelican Landing DRI which includes un-gated residential and commercial developments. The 20% capture rate was applied to acknowledge that there will be trips going to and from the various residential and commercial uses. Please note these trips were considered external trips since they would still have to use Coconut Road to reach the other land uses. In other words, 100% of the Project trip generation is assigned to Coconut Road regardless of the assumed Pelican Landing DRI capture rate.

Comment #2

5) Directional Splits. The TIS must contain a drawing showing the percentage, number of trips, and direction of travel for trips entering and exiting the project at each proposed access point. [AC-13-17]

5a) The distribution of traffic must be reasonably distributed to the project entrances. A graphical depiction of all turning movements at each of the project entrances/ access points must be provided. [AC-13-17]

Item 5) and 5a) Percentage trip information was not provided graphically. Number of trips and direction of trips provided as required.

Response:

The required drawing showing the percentage of travel for trips entering and exiting the project at each proposed access point is depicted in Exhibit 17 of the revised traffic study dated November 22, 2016.

Comment #3

7) Level of Service Analysis. The TIS for projects generating more than 100 net new trips during the A.M. or P.M. peak hour of the adjacent street must contain an analysis of the Level of Service for all links within the area of influence. [AC-13-17]

7a) The TIS must contain an analysis of the Level of Service for each of the projects access points and all intersections within one-quarter mile of the project. The analysis must follow the methods established in the most current edition of the HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL for either signalized or unsignalized intersections. [AC-13-17]

Item 7) information provided as required. Link analysis data should be based on county accepted values for evaluation purposes and not consultant derived values.

Item 7a) information provided as required.

Response:

All segments in the traffic study used data based on county accepted values except for Coconut Road west of US 41. Segment volumes on Coconut Road west of US 41 were derived from 2016 turning movement counts and were used in lieu of the 2015 Lee County Concurrency Report. The segment volume given in the Concurrency Report is not supported by any recent count data and it is noted no counts since 2007. As a result, the derived values are arguably more reliable while also being more

conservative.

Since the 2016 count derived volumes are greater than Lee County's values, the conclusions of the traffic study would not change unfavorably if the link analysis data was to reference the Concurrency Report. Therefore, no changes will be made to the study to address this comment.

Comment #4

9) Necessary Improvements. When the Level of Service analysis for any project shows that the LOS on links or at any intersection fall below the minimums adopted in THE LEE PLAN (e.g. Village of Estero Interim Comprehensive Plan), the TIS must contain recommendation & analysis of the improvements necessary to offset the added traffic impacts to restore/meet/exceed the prescribed LOS standards. [AC-13-17]

Item 9) information provided as required. Improvement recommendations (pg. 33) make sense (signal at US 41/ Pelican Colony Blvd when warranted; intersection improvements at US 41/ Coconut Rd; and roundabout feasibility study. TIS references to impact fees to pay for mitigation in the amount of \$2.5 million. Is that in fact the case, or were these prepaid, or otherwise vested and no actual funds to be realized by the City of Bonita Springs for applicable recommended improvements? Is a mechanism in place to insure site related improvements are following through (pg. 34 of TIS-Signal warrant study and installation if warranted, roundabout feasibility study)?

Response:

The regulations concerning the collection and use of roads impact fees are outlined in the Bonita Springs Land Development Code. The fee payer must pay the road impact fees required to the building official prior to the issuance of any building permit development order for which the fee is imposed. Funds collected from roads impact fees must be used for the purpose of capital improvements to approved roads. Such improvements must be of the type made necessary by the new development [Bonita Springs Land Development Code. Chapter 2. Article VI. Division 2. Sec. 2-194. (a)].