

March 16, 2022

Suzanne Cahill  
Planning Director  
City of Kingston  
420 Broadway  
Kingston, NY 12401

**Re: Golden View Traffic Impact Study Review  
Golden Hill Drive, City of Kingston, Ulster County, NY**

Dear Ms. Cahill:

Greenman-Pedersen Inc. (GPI) has performed a technical review of the above referenced traffic impact study on behalf of the City. The report was well written and comprehensive, but there were some items we would like addressed before we can validate the report conclusions. GPI's comments detailing the findings of our initial review and outlining the additional information necessary to complete our final review is as follows:

1. The Golden View development is proposed to be a 164-unit low-rise housing development, with 80 units reserved for senior housing, and a daycare for 30 students. The development is located off of Golden Hill Drive, within the City of Kingston. This development is being constructed on the site of an existing vacant building, which will be demolished, and the study does not attempt to take credit for any previously approved trips that may have been generated by that existing building, making the study's analysis reasonably conservative. The project is expected to be complete by 2024.
2. The traffic count data was reviewed and the time frames of the counts are reasonable, as is the 18% traffic adjustment to account for the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on current traffic volumes and the 2% annual background traffic growth.
3. The traffic study states that there are no sidewalks along Boulevard or crosswalks at the Boulevard and Golden Hill Dr intersection. This statement is incorrect as the recent Empire State Trail construction added some of these elements. Text should be updated to reflect current configuration.
4. The most significant crash type in the study area is animal hits, and no other crash pattern was documented. The crash history does not appear to indicate a safety issue at the Boulevard at Golden Hill Dr intersection; however, it should be noted that this data does not capture near miss incidents that may have occurred (as a result of limited sight distance), or the potential for future crash types that involve pedestrian and bicycle activity, which is expected to increase with the new development.
5. Trip generation for the site was based on 84 units of low-rise multi-family housing, 80 units of senior adult multi-family housing and a 30 student daycare. The trip generation looks accurate for that land use breakdown. However, the senior housing land use generates significantly fewer trips than the standard low-rise multi-family. Are there assurances in place that would require 80 units of the complex to be senior housing? To be conservative, we would like to see the trip generation and analysis conducted for all 164 units being low-rise multi-family housing, or have documentation submitted that guarantees the senior housing portion couldn't be converted to something else. The trip generation calculations include a 20% internal capture credit, what is the justification for that percentage? It is agreed that 20% is likely reasonable, given the land uses on-site, but a justification should be referenced if possible.
6. The level of service for the existing and build conditions appears accurate for the current trip generation and the reported levels of service are within acceptable levels. However, new analysis with trip generation as discussed in Comment 4 above should be submitted for verification.

7. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile travel speed along Boulevard (NY Route 32) is reported to be 42 mph based on NYSDOT data (no specific location or other information provided). Given that this speed is significantly above the posted speed limit of 30 mph, and it is used to identify sight distance requirements and warranting conditions, this speed should be verified per direction through radar speed study at the intersection before it is validated. Speed study should include speed readings (minimum of 30 readings per direction per timeframe) during both the AM and PM timeframes on two separate days (total of 4 separate data sets per direction). Only vehicles at free-flow speed should be included (no vehicles within platoons or slowing down to turn) and readings should only be taken on good weather days.
8. Available sight distance appears generally consistent with a review performed using Google Street View photography; however, NYSDOT Drawings for 8EST.04 suggests that there may only be 233 feet of sight distance to the south, instead of the 275' noted. It is requested that the exact sight distance be reexamined and confirmed in the field. Sight distance looking north is more than adequate, but sight distance to the south is at least 50 feet less than the required stopping sight distance for 42 mph, which makes verification of the travel speeds even more important. It is believed that an "intersection ahead" warning sign on the northbound approach would not be sufficient to lower speeds and reduce the crash potential at the intersection. Other options should be considered to improve sight distance and reduce crash risk. These options could include traffic calming measures (possibly a speed feedback sign) to reduce travel speeds, or geometric improvements (possibly cutting down adjacent hill) to increase available sight distance. The crash analysis does not indicate a current safety issue resulting from the limited sight distance, but increased traffic and pedestrian activity at the intersection does make it a concern.
9. For the traffic signal warrant analysis conducted for Boulevard and Golden Hill Dr, it is unclear where the 16-hour traffic volume data was obtained. This data should be provided. Additionally, the results of the analysis are highly dependent on travel speed information, so results cannot be verified without that data.
10. Concerning the Glen Street connection closure analysis, the origin-destination data to estimate the traffic diversions was confusing and did not appear to match the number of diverted trips used in the analysis. This data should be clarified and re-analysis should be performed, as needed. The status of this connection is an important issue that should be resolved before SEQR approval is granted.
11. Because of sight distance concerns at the Boulevard and Golden Hill Dr intersection, there is a significant public concern that traffic from the new development will utilize Glen Street, even if travel time is a little longer. Further discussion and analysis should be included to address this concern.
12. Pedestrian and bicycle activity is expected to increase with the addition of this development and the expanded bus depot. More discussion should be provided concerning pedestrian & bicycle traffic, especially at the Boulevard and Golden Hill Dr intersection. There is a bus stop opposite the Golden Hill Dr approach and with increased traffic from the new development and limited sight distance, pedestrian crossings at this location is a concern and should be addressed.

Once the additional information listed above is provided or clarified, GPI will be able to provide a final assessment of the traffic study. If you have any questions, please call me (518) 898-9554 or at [mwieszchowski@qpinet.com](mailto:mwieszchowski@qpinet.com).

Best Regards,

**GPI | GREENMAN-PEDERSEN INC.**



Michael R. Wieszchowski, P.E., PTOE  
Vice President | Director of Traffic Engineering

c. John Schultheis, City Engineer