



December 17, 2019

Mr. Russel Colby
Assistant Director of Community and Economic Development
City of St. Charles
2 E. Main Street
St. Charles, IL 60174

Re: Zen Leaf Dispensary
3714 Illinois Avenue - Unit C
Traffic Assumptions Memorandum

Dear Mr. Colby:

Per your request we reviewed the Traffic Study submitted by Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc. on December 12, 2019 for the referenced project. We offer the following comments and recommendations for your consideration:

Traffic Assumption Comments (Continued from December 12th Memo)

1. Include a note that states ITE cautions the use of the data from Land Use 882 as it is from a small sample size. Typically, it is not recommended to use data from the ITE Trip Generation Manual when there is a note about small sample size as the data extrapolated is not accurate.
2. Existing Traffic Section – Per ITE the “AM” peak period for Land Use 882 is 11:45am-12:45pm. Was midday peak considered to show the traffic projection during this peak?
 - a. Were the signalized intersections of Kirk Road at Main St and 38th Street at Main St. considered for capacity analysis? These are the main signalized intersections within the study area
3. Consider showing/using for total traffic the anticipated trips generated (70% new trips, 30% existing from the Land Use). 30% of those trips already exist so they won't be added to the existing traffic, reduce total trips generated by the dispensary by 30% to show a more accurate number. Projected trips may be overly conservative.
4. Were Pass-By trips considered? ITE has Pass-By percentages for comparative land uses that could be considered for this study.
5. Site Traffic Comparison Section - Consider using different Land Uses for comparison to the dispensary such as Pharmacy without Drive-Thru, Variety Store, Convenience Store, or Apparel Store. These have more of a general retail/medical use and size.
6. Comment 5 from memo submitted by HLR on December 12th was addressed with information provided in the traffic study. See Comment 2 under 'Traffic Assumption Comments (Continued from December 12th Memo)' for additional considerations.

Traffic Study Comments

7. Provide more detail in Conclusion statements.
 - a. Reiterate trip generation and capacity analysis results, similar to the level of detail given for Paragraph 2 regarding the parking analysis results.
8. Exhibit 7, Intersection Capacity and Queue Analysis-
 - a. Column 2 – Total Traffic, should 'Current' be proposed conditions?
 - b. Why does the table just show one Approach Delay for each intersection?
 - c. More justification on the increase in delay/doubled queue length for the approaches?

If you have any questions or need additional information regarding the above comments, please contact HLR at 847-697-6700.

Yours truly,

HAMPTON, LENZINI AND RENWICK, INC.

By: 

Callie Allbright, PE
Traffic Engineer

Amy McSwane, PE, PTOE
Preliminary/Traffic Engineering Manager