The purpose of this memo is to provide a response to the technical memorandum made by Fuss and O’Neill (F&O) and the DRI review made by Daniel Glissman. FPES offers the following responses:

(1) The latest estimate of trips per day in one direction is an average of six peak hour weekday trips (seven on weekend) while ITE estimates 14 peak hour weekday trips (22 on weekend). The cut down trip generation rate, provided by the proponent using a single dispensary data is not considered as acceptable because of the following reasons:
   a. The survey is conducted in a local dispensary and the result from one sample data is not as reliable and comprehensive as ITE’s data with 41 sample.
   b. The projected trip rate happened in a short period of time and is not a representation of peak periods and seasons.
   c. We should not consider the competition effect on the newly produced trip rate while we don’t have an exact estimate of demand.

Figures 1 and 2 below illustrate the result of trip generation and number of samples used in the model by ITE.
The site plan representation of the proposed vehicle access is not complete because of these reasons:

a. The parking plan's turning radii is incomplete since it does not show a complete circulation wheel path.

b. The type of design vehicles is not provided (is it an emergency vehicle? etc.).

c. No legend exists on the plan showing what the symbols represent.

d. No proposed egress plan is shown.

e. Plan calls for field investigation, hence it may be a paper compilation.

f. No official response from Fire / Emergency on the proposed build up.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions that you may have about our assessment.
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Kurt A. Fraser P.E.  
Maaza Mekuria PHD, PE, PTOE

President - FPES  
Senior Transportation Engineer - FPES