

SECOND PRELIMINARY COMPLETENESS MEMORANDUM

TO: David J. Turiano, P.E.
Village of Briarcliff Manor

FROM: Brian Dempsey, P.E., PTOE, RSP1
Danny Cuya, EIT

DATE: April 12, 2022

RE: Traffic Review and
Site Plan Review
For Completeness
Yeshivath Viznitz
235 Elm Road

Introduction and Proposed Program Updates

DTS Provident Design Engineering, LLP (DTS Provident), formerly Provident Design Engineering (PDE), on behalf of the Village of Briarcliff Manor, has reviewed the information provided to date for the proposed Yeshivath Viznitz to be located at 235 Elm Road, the former Briarcliff Manor Pace University Campus from a Vehicular and Pedestrian Traffic standpoint as well as from a general Site Plan standpoint. DTS Provident's original Traffic Completeness Review was summarized in a December 21, 2021 Memo. To conduct the initial Completeness Review, DTS Provident reviewed various documents, primarily the Special Permit Application (including the Site Plans) dated December 9, 2021, prepared by Cuddy & Feder, and the Traffic Impact Study dated December 6, 2021, prepared by Colliers Engineering & Design. The previous memo is included in grey text and the still pertinent comments and the latest Applicant's comments are shown in black text with *DTS Provident's new comments dated April 2022 and shown in black text with italics*. This current Review and the subsequent comments are for Completeness only in response to the latest submission from the Applicant, dated March 16, 2022. A full Technical Review will be performed at a later date.

The Site is served by an unsignalized driveway along Elm Road opposite Birch Road, approximately 350 feet east of Tuttle Road. (There is also a smaller driveway just to the east of this driveway and a third driveway at the curve on Elm Road, which, based upon the latest submission, is now proposed to be the Main Site Driveway and the other two driveways will be limited to Emergency Access). There are approximately 223 striped parking spaces as well as some un-striped parking areas.

It was initially proposed that the Site will become a private religious education institution now for approximately 250 male students (these amounts have since been updated in the August 20th Submission, as discussed below) between the ages of 17 and 20. Approximately 220-230 of the students would reside on campus in dormitories. The other 20-30 students would be commuting. There will also be approximately 40 faculty and staff members per shift commuting to/from the campus. Although faculty and staff are not expected to permanently

reside on campus, it is PDE's opinion that there would likely be Resident Assistants or other staff members staying in the dormitories. Short-term temporary housing accommodations will be available for certain faculty and guests. The Applicant states that no students and only minimal staff are expected to enter and exit the Site by personal vehicle. The commuting students and staff are proposed to travel by bus or shuttle and the Applicant projects 2-3 busses entering and exiting the Site each day along with approximately 4 shuttles/mini-vans per day. The Applicant projects that some staff will travel on their own but no more than 10 at any one time. The educational and worship activities for the resident students are proposed to occur between 6:00 AM and 9:00 PM daily (Sunday through Thursday) and between 10:00 AM and 7:00 PM for commuting students. There are no studies Friday and Saturday. There are approximately 40 staff per shift which occur from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM and 4:00 PM to 10:00 PM. Meals will be served on-site. The public are only expected at limited times such as special events and occasional other times.

The Applicant's Traffic Consultant has since updated their initial Traffic Narrative in response to PDE's comments. The number of initial residential students has increased from 200-220 to 220-230. 20-30 students would be commuting, which is a decrease from the previously projected 30-50, with the total number being slightly higher than previously referenced at 260. There will be various staff arriving and leaving the site at different hours of the day/evening.

The Applicant is now expecting a growth of approximately 3% per year for the first 10 years of expansion which will increase the expected occupancy to approximately 350 students after 10 years. Corresponding increases in staff and buses will also occur. Each bus utilized will result in four vehicles trips as the buses will not stay on campus. Thus, the bus will enter the Site in the morning to drop off students/staff, then leave the Site and return later to pick-up and leave the Site.

This review is solely based upon the Traffic-related aspects of the Project such as traffic impacts, access, parking, pedestrian and vehicular safety, and site circulation. The following are PDE's original comments and a summary of the Applicant's responses as well as PDE's latest additional Traffic Comments.

As it has been several years since the Site has been occupied and generated traffic, as well as that the background traffic has since changed, a Traffic Study should be performed. Although there was a prior educational use at this Site, there has been no meaningful traffic generated by the Site for several years or currently, thus it should be analyzed as a new project to consider the potential traffic impacts. The Traffic Study should analyze:

- the opening year
- the projected 10 years of growth
- a large special event

The Study Intersections should consist of:

- Pleasantville Road and South State Road
- Pleasantville Road and North State Road
- South State Road and Elm Road
- Elm Road and the Site Driveway(s)

Previous Site Traffic/Parking History

As per the Resolution of the Briarcliff Campus of Pace University dated July 20 and September 7, 1978, the Site was previously occupied by Briarcliff College which, in 1968, had its maximum number of students enrolled at 688 students and operated as a primarily residential school. At that time, only seniors and select other students were allowed automobiles on campus, thus only 188 parking spaces were permitted. When enrollment dropped by more than half to 325 students, all students who wanted to have an automobile on campus were permitted to.

When Pace University occupied the Site, many of the students resided on the Briarcliff Campus but did not necessarily attend classes there, thus utilizing other Pace campuses for classes. Based upon the 1978 Resolution, certain caps were placed on Pace including a maximum number of parking spaces of 324, with conditions of where the parking could be located. Off-campus parking in the immediate area of the campus was prohibited. The maximum number of resident students was 700. The cumulative number of non-resident students attending classes at the Briarcliff Campus on any calendar day could not exceed 400, except during up to 12 special events a year.

Around 1995, portions of the property were sold off and became single family homes. Pace stopped utilizing the campus around 2015.

Traffic Opinion Letter/Traffic Impact Study

A Traffic Opinion Letter, dated June 17, 2021, prepared by Colliers Engineering & Design (Colliers) was included in the original submission comparing the traffic impacts of the Proposed Use to that of the previous Pace University. Colliers (as John Collins Engineers at the time) had previously conducted traffic counts at the Site Driveway in 2010 when there were approximately 590 students residing on campus (along with approximately 160 administration staff). The students at that time were traveling between the Briarcliff and Mount Pleasant campuses via University shuttles or personal cars. These traffic counts by Colliers indicated that Pace University at the time generated 174 trips (102 entering and 72 exiting) during the 8:00 – 9:00 AM Peak AM Hour and 202 trips (59 entering and 143 exiting) during the 4:30 – 5:30 PM Peak PM Hour. Lesser traffic entered and exited the Pace Site Driveway during the other hours of the day. These Peak Hour volumes are higher than what is currently projected for the proposed Project and thus, the Applicant states that there will not be a significant impact resulting from the traffic. It should be noted that due to the times of the commuting student activities (10:00 AM to 7:00 PM), the traffic from the proposed Project's commuting students will occur later than the previous AM Peak Hour as well as later than the previous PM Peak Hour.

A Traffic Impact Study dated December 6, 2021, prepared by Colliers Engineering & Design (Colliers) was included in the December submission providing a traffic analysis of the Proposed Use. In addition, special events, accident data, sight distance, and turning movement analysis were also considered in the Traffic Impact Study. The background information provided in the Traffic Opinion Letter, dated June 17, 2021, prepared by Colliers Engineering & Design still remains essentially the same.

Additional Comments/Questions from PDE June 30th Memo

In PDE's June 30th Memo, the following items/additional information (*in italics*) were requested to be addressed by the Applicant and their consultants. The Applicant has responded to these comments, some of which need further addressing. The below discusses the Applicant's response and PDE's follow-up:

- *Are the resident students permitted off-campus during the day/night or on weekends? There are limited sidewalks in the area although the Village is considering potential future sidewalks.*

Applicant Response: The resident students are not permitted off-campus.

DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

- *Are the resident students permitted to have personal automobiles, bicycles, or other forms of transportation on campus?*

Applicant Response: The resident students are not permitted to have any form of transportation on campus.

DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

- *If full size buses are to be utilized, what are their origin locations, and their proposed routes should be provided. Buses are not permitted on the Taconic State Parkway or the Saw Mill River Parkway. In addition, vehicles from northbound NY Route 9A are not permitted to turn left onto Pleasantville Road. For the proposed routes, for any locations in the vicinity of the Site where there are tight turns, a turning maneuver diagram should be illustrated for a full-size bus including, but not necessarily limited to, the Site Driveway, the intersection of Elm Road/South State Road (depending upon the direction of travel), the left turn from Pleasantville Road onto the southbound Route 9A Ramp, and the U-turn ramp just prior to entering onto southbound Route 9A. Also, it should be confirmed that the school bus can travel under the Route 9A bridge under Pleasantville Road.*

Applicant Response: In the Traffic Response from the Applicant, a specific bus that is proposed to be utilized by the Applicant is illustrated. Although there are bigger buses, it is a full size "coach"-style bus which seats 46 passengers in addition to the driver. The bus proposed to be utilized is approximately 11'5" high while Route 9A has vertical clearance under the Pleasantville Road bridge of 10'10" in the right lane and 13'6" in the left lane in the northbound direction and 11'1" in the right lane and 13'5" in the left lane in the southbound direction. Thus, the bus can make it under the Pleasantville Road but only if traveling in the left lane in both directions.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: The Applicant should state the vertical clearance for the bottom of the bus in case the Village installs raised crosswalks on Pleasantville Road as part of its project currently under design.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: The Applicant should also clarify the Site Driveway(s) to be utilized. Based upon the diagrams provided, it appears that the buses will now enter and exit from the easternmost driveway on Elm Road. The right turn entering movement carries over into the exiting lane. However, Figure 2 of 3 shows a different exiting pattern than Figure 3 of 3. Also, on Figure 3 of 3, the bus is shown exiting from the left side of the road and thus would be in the entering lane to exit the Site. The bus also must cross over the edge of the internal roadway. There also appears some difference between the aerial utilized and the Site Plan regarding a striped area that PDE will discuss with the Applicant's Traffic Consultant. It should also be shown where students and staff are being dropped off and picked up on the campus and will there be any cover during bad weather? There is an approximate location for the drop-off area on the Site Plan but this should be clarified and more information should be provided such as where the students and staff waiting to take the bus would be located.

March 2022 Applicant Response: School Bus turning tracks have been updated at main access to demonstrate the geometric required (widening) to accomplish simultaneous entry/exit bus maneuvers. The updated School Bus turning tracks are contained in Exhibit F.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: The Applicant should also perform the School Bus turning tracks on the proposed Site Plan as there are differences on the Site Plan compared to the Aerial photo utilized. The Site Plan does not include the proposed curb line and widening on the western side of the Main Entrance that is illustrated on the aerial. This should be clarified. There are also concerns with the parked vehicles that are east of Dow Hall and shown on the aerial that are conflicting with the turning tracks. It should be clarified if vehicles will be allowed to park in these areas and does this then impact the overall parking count. More information should be provided whether there will be any bus shelter provided. Also, it would be better if the bus traveled in the counterclockwise direction so passengers would load and unload from the curb and not have to cross in front of the bus. In addition, the School Bus turning tracks at the intersection of Pleasantville Road and North State Road should also include the proposed Briarcliff Manor Mobility Enhancements, since these modifications will change the curb line at the intersection. Also, Sheet 3 of 3 of the Bus Turning Movements is included in two different locations, was another Drawing supposed to be included here?

One item of note is because of the left turn restriction on northbound Route 9A onto Pleasantville Road, as well as the U-turn ramp just prior to entering southbound Route 9A from Pleasantville Road, the Applicant is now proposing to have the buses destined to the Site travel northbound on Route 9A, pass underneath Pleasantville Road, and turn left onto North State Road, and then turn left onto southbound Pleasantville Road, which then requires them to travel through the central business district. Buses leaving the Site will take this reverse route, traveling northbound on Pleasantville Road, turn right onto North State Road and then turn right onto Route 9A southbound.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: The exiting movement at the proposed Main Driveway still is a concern. It is recommended that the proposed curb line be modified to help provide the space for buses coming in opposite directions to maneuver past each other.

March 2022 Applicant Response: See Response above.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: The Applicant is now showing a modified/widened Site Driveway on the Turning Maneuver Diagrams which illustrates better turning maneuvers, as described in the Response above. However, this modification is not completely shown on the Site Plan, as discussed. Also, there are still sightline issues at this location. These items are discussed further later in this Memo.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: The Applicant has provided a Site Plan and a Signage Plan; however, the Applicant should provide more details on the Site Plan of the location for the drop-off/pick-up area. In the area of the proposed bus drop-off area, the Site Plan and Signage Plan do not match. The proposed signage and striping should be clarified. Also, one of the plans should show circulation arrows to show what is one-way and what is two-way. Also, the number of existing parking spaces is provided, however, the future number of spaces should also be provided.

March 2022 Applicant Response: Please find enclosed Site Plans and Signage Plan prepared by Hudson Design Engineering dated March 14, 2022, Page C-2 which have been revised to provide more detail for the bus drop-off/pick-up area. The Signage Plan has also been revised to show the circulation arrows of each driveway and drive aisle. The Site Plans also reflect the existing number of parking spaces (314) and the proposed number of parking spaces (309).

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: The Applicant has modified the Plans but some additional information still needs to be provided including the circulation arrows, whether the busses will be dropping off/picking up riders on the side the bus door is on or will riders need to cross in front of the bus, and will the number of future parking spaces change due to the bus circulation as the turning maneuvers illustrate the bus traveling through existing parking spaces..

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: The Applicant has provided the school bus turning movements for buses traveling on NYS Route 9A, using North State Road and then Pleasantville Road to South State Street to Elm Road to reach the Site, and the reverse route to exit the Site. The Applicant should also consider potential alternate routes for the school buses so that they are not traveling through the Village Center. DTS Provident has had discussions with the County and the potential use of the NYS Route 9A Ramp and will further coordinate with the Applicant's Traffic Consultant.

March 2022 Applicant Response: The current proposal utilizes Route 9A/North State Road for access to the site. The Applicant is willing to work with the Village and State to seek an alternate to the above arrival pattern, i.e., perhaps the utilization of Exit 6 Pleasantville Road from the Taconic State Parkway. This requires the completion of a "Restricted Vehicle Application" and submission of same to the NYSDOT for approval. If this alternate is deemed the preferred route, the Applicant will prepare and file the above-mentioned application. Notwithstanding the above, as determined through our evaluation, the currently proposed routing to the site has little to no impact on the area roadways and intersections.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: The Applicant should also discuss how many buses will be required for the students to attend off-site events in Rockland County.

March 2022 Applicant Response: The number of buses needed for students to attend off-site events will depend on the event and number of students attending. The Applicant notes that each bus has capacity for 46 passengers.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: As per Village requirements, the Applicant should also discuss ways to provide measures to enhance public transit to and from the site.

March 2022 Applicant Response: The site location does not readily lend itself to public transit as the roadway on the immediate site environs are local (not county, not state). As such, services by public transit would require Westchester County Bee-Line service to utilize local roads for access to the campus. Furthermore, the proposed use does not utilize public transportation.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

- *Due to the shift times, an approximate hourly volume summary (entering and exiting) should be provided for the typical weekday school day as well as for the weekend.*

Applicant Response: The Applicant did not provide a Volume Table Summary but did discuss the amounts in its updated narrative stating that there will be minimal traffic generation during the other hours.

DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

- *How will the main drop-off and pick-up days including at the beginning and end of the school year be handled, i.e., by personal vehicles or by bus and how often would they occur?*

Applicant Response: The Applicant states that these days would occur between 8 and 10 times a year, would generally be by full-size bus, while sometimes possibly by shuttle/vans. The number of buses should be provided.

DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

- *How often are special events to be held and what would be the potential attendance?*

Applicant Response: The Applicant states that there would be between 5 and 10 special events a year. Between 5 and 7 of these would be smaller events of 20-25 outside guests attending and between 3 and 5 larger events of 100-125 outside guests. The Applicant expects 75% of the outside guests to arrive by bus and 25% to arrive by passenger cars.

DTS Provident Comment: In the report it is stated that the vehicle occupancy rate used was 2.5 persons/vehicle. Further justification of this value should be provided. Some additional detail on the traffic operation of the large special events should be provided.

March 2021 Applicant Response: Based on information provided by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), “A vehicle occupancy factor of 2.5 persons per vehicle represents a common assumption.” This value falls between 2.2 to 2.8 depending on local conditions.

As outlined in the Traffic Impact Study, a detailed description has been provided with the following, types of events, occurrence of events, anticipated attendance and anticipated passenger vehicles and buses typically expected for an event.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: The vehicle occupancy factor of 2.5 from the source utilized is heavily influenced by large events, such as major sporting events and festivals. It is recommended that the Applicant use a vehicle occupancy of between 1.7 and 2.0, which is the average vehicle occupancy for all cars, also provided by the FHWA. Using a vehicle occupancy factor for very large events may not fully represent the events at the school, since students will already be on campus.

- *How many additional staff/faculty will there be aside from the two 40-person shifts and how and when will they enter and exit the Site?*

Applicant Response: The Applicant discussed the additional staff/faculty in the new Traffic Narrative and stated that their arrival times will be dispersed through different times of the day.

DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

- *If the other portions of the campus are eventually to be utilized, the traffic impacts of those uses should be considered, which the Applicant states that they will do.*

Applicant Response: The Applicant now states that the occupancy is expected to grow approximately 3% a year for the first 10 years bringing the expected occupancy up to 350 students in 10 years (thus an increase in more than 30%) in addition to the corresponding increase in staff and buses. The Applicant states that additional traffic studies would be performed if the amount of students increases further.

DTS Provident Comment: The synchro analysis for the future expansion has been provided.

- *Will only the driveway opposite Birch Road be utilized or will the other curb cuts remain such as for emergency access?*

Applicant Response: The Applicant now plans to use the eastern-most driveway as the primary access while the two western driveways, including the driveway opposite Birch Road, are now being considered for emergency access only.

DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

- *Will the driveways be gated and will they be manned or controlled remotely?*

Applicant Response: All three site driveways will be gated. The eastern driveway, now the main driveway, will utilize a remote controllable gate. The Application should state or illustrate whether an island would be installed at this driveway to separate the entrance and exit movements/gates (without interfering with the turning maneuvers for buses). There will be coordination with the Village's Emergency Services regarding the access system.

DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

- *The final Site Plan should illustrate ADA parking spaces, as necessary.*

Applicant Response: The Site Plan has been updated to illustrate the ADA spaces. The Applicant should state the number of ADA spaces and overall parking spaces per lot to ensure ADA parking regulations are met.

DTS Provident Comment: The Site Plan has been updated. Additional Site Plan comments were referenced above.

- *The Fire Department and other Emergency Services should review the Site Plans for Site access, building access, and circulation.*

Applicant Response: The Applicant is corresponding with the Village's Emergency Services.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: Further correspondence with the Village's Emergency Services is still required. Fire truck circulation should be illustrated.

March 2022 Applicant Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Village Fire Department for comments on the proposed application as indicated in the Applicant's August 20, 2021, submission to the Board of Trustees. Please see revised Municipal Services Impact Study (Exhibit D). Fire truck circulation has been provided by Colliers Engineering & Design and are contained in Exhibit F.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: The fire truck size should be an aerial 47-feet long fire truck. DTS Provident can provide a template to the Applicant's Traffic Engineer. The fire truck utilized is 40-feet long, which is typically a pumper fire truck. In addition, on Sheet 1 a fire truck would be arriving from the east on Elm Road since that is the direction where the nearest fire station is located. Likewise, on Sheet 2 the fire truck is exiting left (towards the west), while the nearest fire station is located towards the east. As the Scarborough Fire Station would likely use the western driveway, the fire apparatus should be shown to be able to enter and exit in both directions at each of the driveways. Any gate houses should be accounted for in the turns. These turning maneuvers should be revised and reviewed by the Fire Department after the Completeness stage. Lastly, the fire truck turning templates should be shown on the proposed Site Plan, as there are some discrepancies between the aerial and the Site Plan.

- *Sanitation pick-up plans should be discussed.*

Applicant Response: The Applicant is proposing to use a private carting service. The response stated the location is shown on the Site Plan and similar to the previous location but this was not found on the Plan. The location should be added/noted on the Site Plan and whether there will be multiple locations as well as the size of the vehicle and number of trips a week.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: Turning Movement figures of a sanitation truck circulating the site including to its pick-up location(s) should be provided.

March 2022 Applicant Response: Please see enclosed Turning Movement Diagrams prepared by Colliers Engineering and Design (Exhibit F) showing turning movements for sanitation truck circulating the site including at the pick-up location.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: The Truck Turning template utilized for the sanitation truck is 25-feet long, however a typical sanitation truck is approximately 35-feet long while the Village's sanitation truck is approximately 45-feet long. It is acknowledged that the site is a private facility, and that a smaller truck may be used. The dimensions of the anticipated sanitation truck that will service the facility should be confirmed and provided, especially if there is only one pickup every 10 days. The sanitation truck circulation should be shown on the proposed Site Plan due to the discrepancies between the aerial and the Site Plan.

- *The sight distance at the Site Driveway should be reviewed prior to construction and opening to determine if any vegetation needs to be cleared.*

Applicant Response: The Applicant provided some sight distance information for the easternmost driveway along Elm Road. It appears that the minimum sight distance will be met at this intersection. It is noted that the Applicant does state that clearance of vegetation will be needed along the Village right-of-way. However, there will need to be some sight distance technical items clarified between PDE and the Applicant's Traffic Consultant or Site Engineer such as eye height and object height. There should also be a sight diagram or distance provided for a vehicle turning left into the site driveway to be able to see an oncoming vehicle on Elm Road. Also, sight distance information should also be provided for the other sight driveways in the event that they are eventually utilized.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: Sight Distance diagrams have been provided for all driveways. However, there is still a concern for vehicles turning left from Elm Road into the proposed main Site Driveway due to the sight distance limitations and vegetation. Based on field observations performed by DTS Provident, the sightlines shown run through the location of the existing hedges. Therefore, additional information should be provided for this movement or consideration be given to utilizing the other Site Driveways.

March 2021 Applicant Response: The sight lines shown on Figure SD-1 by Hudson Engineering, enclosed with the Applicant's August 20,2021 submission, indicates ample sight distance is provided subject to clearing of vegetation within the right-of-way.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: For the profile of the "Vehicle Approaching from North", the object elevation should be 2-feet and not the 4-feet shown. For the profile of the "Vehicle Exiting Property", the

object elevation should be 3.5-feet and not 4.3-feet. These object heights should be updated. Based on field visits, there are still concerns for a vehicle making a southbound left into the Site. The vegetation should be shown on the plan to confirm that it is not an obstruction to the driver's sight line. The right-of-way should be shown as well as the location of the bushes to determine what can be cleared and what is needed to be cleared. In addition, since the speed limit is 30 mph, the design speed considered should be 35 mph to be conservative. Sight distances for all entering and exiting movements should be provided for each of the Site Driveways.

Additional New Comments/Questions from PDE

In addition to the open questions above that require additional responses, the following are additional new comments/questions:

- Since it has been several years since the Site has been occupied and generated meaningful traffic, as well as that the background traffic has since changed, a Traffic Study should be performed analyzing:
 - the opening year
 - the projected 10 years of growth
 - a large special event

The Study Intersections should consist of:

- Pleasantville Road and South State Road
- Pleasantville Road and North State Road
- South State Road and Elm Road
- Elm Road and the Site Driveway(s)

DTS Provident Comment: A Traffic Impact Study has been provided.

- On the Site Plan/Signage Plan, there should be appropriate crosswalk signage at the key crosswalk locations on-site. This should be added to the Site Plans.

DTS Provident Comment: The provided Site Plans show the potential crosswalk locations. These will be further evaluated during the technical review.

- On the Site Plan/Signage Plan, there should be internal signage to alert drivers not to turn onto the Emergency Access Driveways (except during an emergency) to try to exit the Site as there is limited ability to turn around.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: The recommended internal signage at the Emergency Access Driveways is not shown on the plans.

March 2021 Applicant Response: Please find enclosed Signage Plan prepared by Hudson Design Engineering dated February 14, 2022, S-1 which now includes internal "Emergency Access" and "Do Not Enter" signage at the emergency access driveways.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: It should be noted that all signs, especially regulatory and pedestrian crossing signs, should meet current MUTCD standards, including retro reflectivity. The following are some preliminary Technical comments on the signage (not needed for Completeness):

- All the “Park At Your Own Risk” signs should be removed from the Site, as they are not appropriate.
- Sign 4 “Yield”, should be reviewed as it seems it does not apply in this scenario.
- Sign 27 “Do Not Enter”, should be reviewed as it seems it does not apply.
- Sign 39 “Handicap Symbol”, should have 2 asterisks since the parking space is being removed
- Signs 58, 63, F, and G are not shown on the plans.
- All pedestrian crossing signs (Signs 5 and H) should be on both sides of the post to face both directions.
- Sign H of the Signage Field Report Table has the word “pedestrian” spelled incorrectly.

- The number of deliveries, including food, linens, sanitation, etc., as well as the size of the vehicles and loading areas, should be discussed.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: Details on the operation of how deliveries and sanitation will be dealt with is not provided. Based on the Signage Plan there is a loading area at the Macadam Parking Lot just north of Dow Hall.

March 2022 Applicant Response: Comment is noted. Regarding the sanitation operations, the Applicant proposes a 30-yard container for recyclables and a compactor for trash located at the south-eastern side of the Dow Hall Main Building adjacent to the Dow Hall Wing C. Trash and recyclables will be brought from the other buildings and trash receptacles to this central location for pickup. Pickups will be scheduled on an as-needed basis but will typically occur once every 10 days for trash and once every 3 weeks for recyclables.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: As previously mentioned, the dimensions of the sanitation truck that will be utilized should be confirmed. It should also be stated whether there will be other locations utilized as the projected growth of the Site population increases. A Technical comment is that pickup of trash only every 10 days does not appear appropriate, especially with the number of students residing and eating on the campus each day.

- The Village could consider requiring monitoring of the Site Driveways after opening to confirm the Site’s actual trip generation. The Applicant suggested something similar, but for only if additional expansion is projected after 10 years.

December 2021 DTS Provident Comment: A potential Traffic Monitoring Program should be suggested by the Applicant.

March 2021 Applicant Response: If the Village requires a Traffic Monitoring Program, the Applicant can conduct a post-occupancy study to consist of counting the site driveway(s) to determine actual trip generation

(including number of school buses) and trip distribution. Surveys of the site driveway(s) during a “special event” can also be conducted. This data would be compared to the anticipated trip generation analyzed in the Traffic Impact Study. The results of these traffic counts would be submitted to the Village for their review.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: No further response needed for Completeness.

Site Plan Completeness Comments

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: A Site Lighting Plan should be provided.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: There are some discrepancies between the turning maneuver diagrams and the Site Plan that need to be clarified including the potential widening at the proposed Main Entrance and the area/parking near the bus drop off/pick-up. Also, with the circulation pattern that is shown, the drop off and pick up is on the wrong side of the road, thus requiring riders to walk in front of the bus.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: The Sightline for a vehicle/bus turning left from Elm Road into the Sight Driveway should be provided. There are significant concerns with this sight distance. The diagram should show the location of the right-of-way and the bushes at the corner.

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: Sightlines for all entering and exiting movements should also be provided for all of the Site Driveways including those located to the west on Elm Road.

New Additional Comments

April 2022 DTS Provident Comment: The latest submission now states that there will be Elementary, Middle and High School students attending while the previous submissions stated that there would only be High School age students (starting with 250 male students of which 220-230 of the students would reside on campus). This will need to be clarified and additional information will be required such as number of students from each level, will they be living on campus, the amount of additional staff, where they will be attending class, etc. This could impact many aspects including traffic generation and parking.

This memo reflects DTS Provident’s Professional Review and Comments but may not reflect those of the Village.