

Ref: 10199

August 25, 2026

Jeremy Thompson
Town Planner, Community and Economic Development
Town of Medway
155 Village Street
Medway, MA 02053

Re: Main Street Mixed-Use Development Response to Peer Review Comments
Medway, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Thompson:

Vanasse & Associates, Inc. (VAI) hereby provides responses to the comments that were raised by Chappell Engineering Associates, LLC (Chappell) concerning their review of the December 2025 Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) prepared by VAI in support of the proposed mixed-use development project to be located at 107-119 Main Street (Route 109)) in Medway, Massachusetts (hereafter referred to as the "Project"). Listed below are the comments identified by Chappell, followed by responses prepared on behalf of the Project applicant. Responses to supplemental comments provided in email correspondence dated July 20, 2026, through your office are included, and an Updated TIA dated August 2026 is provided with this response letter.

CHAPPELL ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES
TRAFFIC PEER REVIEW – JUNE 30, 2026

Comment 1: *As noted in the traffic study and in the site plan, the project entails constructing a single residential building with 267 units, a 2,000 square foot bank, a 3,500 square foot fast food restaurant, a 5,400 square foot convenience store and 20 vehicle fuel pumps. Access to the site will be consolidated from the eleven existing curb cuts onto Main Streets to four new curb cuts.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 2: *The traffic study focused on the following intersections:*

- *Main Street at Milford Street and Franklin Street*
- *Main Street at Pond Street and Elm Street*
- *Main Street at the Medway Place driveway and the Project site driveway*
- *Main Street at Holliston Street*

The traffic study area is appropriate for the proposed project and its expected traffic generation.

Response: No response required.

Comment 3: *The study provided a description of the area roadway network. Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) counts were conducted in March 2025 on Main Street to collect weekday and weekend traffic conditions over an extended period. Weekday AM peak period (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM), weekday PM peak period (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM), and Saturday midday peak period (11:00 AM to 2:00 PM) turning movement counts (TMCs) were also conducted in March 2025 at the study area intersections. CEA concurs with the selected time periods used for analysis.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 4: *MassDOT seasonal factors for Urban Groups 3 (other principal arterials) were reviewed and it was determined that March volumes are higher than the annual average-month conditions. Therefore, to provide a conservative assessment, the traffic counts were not seasonally adjusted. CEA also noted that the MassDOT weekday seasonal factors for Urban Groups U4(Minor Arterial), U5 (Major Collector) and U7 (Local Roadway), which are the other roadway types within the study area, also have higher volumes in March in comparison to the annual average-month conditions and therefore no adjustment is necessary. CEA concurs no seasonal adjustment is warranted.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 5: *The study did not make adjustments to the collected data to represent pre-COVID traffic conditions. The new MassDOT Traffic and Safety Engineering 25% Design Submission Guidelines note that traffic volume data collected after March 1, 2022 are no longer subject to any adjustments to represent pre-pandemic traffic volume conditions, except in areas where land use is predominantly office. Therefore, since the traffic volume data were collected in March 2025 and land use in the area is predominantly residential and commercial, COVID adjustments do not need to be applied to the data.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 6: *As previously noted, there are several businesses existing on site utilizing several curb cuts onto Main Street. Traffic count data was not collected at various businesses along Main Street including Select Used Cars (117 Main Street), All Washed Up Auto Wash (115A Main Street), and Herbalife and Dental Office (113 Main Street). To estimate trips associated with those businesses the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual¹ was used. ITE Land Use Codes (LUC) 720 (Medical-Dental Office Building – Stand Alone), LUC 948 (Automated Car Wash), and LUC 841 (Automobile Sales – Used) were used to estimate site traffic. CEA concurs with these assumptions.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 7: *Existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities were inventoried for the study area and depicted in Figure 2 along with roadway lane widths and arrangements. CEA concurs with the field inventory.*

Response: No response required.

¹Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition; Institute of Transportation Engineers; Washington, DC; 2025.



Comment 8: *Existing public transportation services were evaluated. One service is provided near the study area by Greater Attleboro and Taunton Regional Transit Authority (GATRA). GATRA operates the Norfolk T Shuttle fixed-route bus service from the Medway Middle School. VAI noted that schedule information is provided in the Appendix, however, this information is missing from the Appendix. It is suggested that VAI include this information.*

Response: The Appendix has been revised to include the GATRA transit schedules.

Comment 9: *Crash data were reviewed and summarized within the traffic study for the period between 2018 and 2022 at the study area intersections. Crash data were obtained from the MassDOT Safety Management/Traffic Operations Unit.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 10: *The intersection of Main Street and Milford/Franklin Streets experienced 46 collisions over the 5-year period (9.2 collisions per year), with most being rear-end type collisions (27 collisions) resulting in property damage only (36 collisions), as well as a fair amount of angle type collisions (10 collisions). Most collisions occurred during clear and dry conditions during the daytime. The calculated crash rate of 0.95 was found to be significant, as it is higher than the District 3 average for signalized intersections (0.89).*

The intersection of Main Street at Holliston Street experienced 61 collisions over the 5-year period (12.2 collisions per year), with most being rear-end type collisions (36 collisions) resulting in property damage only (41 collisions), as well as a fair amount of angle type collisions (10 collisions) and sideswipe type collisions (9 collisions). Most collisions occurred during clear and dry conditions during the daytime. The calculated crash rate of 1.22 is significantly higher than the District 3 average for signalized intersections. A Road Safety Audit (RSA) was completed for this intersection in January 2014 by Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates. The RSA pointed out inefficiencies in the signal timing and phases, signage and pavement issues, and pedestrian/bicyclists infrastructure. Intersection improvements were performed in 2018 as a part of the Route 109 Transportation Improvement project, including new signal infrastructure, new pedestrian crossings, roadway resurfacing and pavement markings.

No crashes were reported at the intersection of Main Street at the Medway Place Driveway.

*MassDOT have recently updated their crash portal to include 2023 within the verified crash data. **CEA recommends the Applicant update the crash data to include 2023 data.** Additionally, the crash rates at the intersections of Main Street at Milford Street/Franklin Street and Main Street at Holliston Street were found to be higher than district wide average crash rates, indicating that safety issues exist, even after safety improvements were completed at the intersection of Main Street and Holliston Street. **A review of the MassDOT crash-based network screening tool ranks these two intersections among the top 5% statewide for crashes. It is recommended that a Road Safety Audit be conducted at these two intersections to determine any crash trends and identify countermeasures to improve safety.***

Response: VAI has updated the crash data with a newer analysis period of 2019-2023. The updated study also included the intersection of Main Street at Winthrop Street and Evergreen Street. Findings show that the crash rate at this intersection is not considered significant by



statewide and MassDOT District 3-wide crash rates. Overall findings related to crash data have not changed with the updated analysis. The initial TIA suggested preparing a Road Safety Audit at the two locations above. The Applicant is willing to provide the Audits as a condition of project approval.

Comment 11: *Vehicle speed data was collected along Main Street in March 2025. The speed data showed that motorists travel under the posted speed limit of 35 mph on Main Street. The average recorded speeds were found to be 28 mph traveling eastbound and 31 mph traveling westbound. The 85th percentile speeds were found to be slightly lower than the posted speed limit, with 32 mph traveling eastbound and 34 mph traveling westbound. Speeds on Main Street are likely lower as there are traffic signals and multiple curb cuts for businesses along both sides of the roadway.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 12: *A 7-year design horizon was used for the No-Build and Build condition analyses consistent with the MassDOT Transportation Impact Assessment Guidelines. An annual growth rate of 1.0 percent per year was used to project the future No-Build volumes. This growth rate assumption is appropriate and provides conservative growth to volumes in the area. Additionally, three background developments (192 Main Street, 120 Main Street, and 20 Milford Street) were identified within the study area. It was determined that traffic associated with those developments would be minimal and included within the background growth rate.*

*It was noted that the proposed Municipal Complex was captured as part of the background growth rate based on site characteristics and unit count. Based on a review of the most recent Building Committee Presentation from June 22, 2026 for the proposed Municipal Complex, the site will contain the town's police station, town hall and a fire station. **The Applicant should include information regarding the expected trip generation of the complex and, if significant, it should be included within the background growth rate.***

Response: At the time of the traffic study, trip generation for the existing municipal complex was not entirely known. Since then, a separate traffic study for the complex was conducted to analyze these impacts. The revised TIA has incorporated the municipal complex as part of the future conditions.

Comment 13: *Given the sites proximity to both Bellingham and Millis, it is recommended that those municipalities be contacted to determine if there are any developments proposed in the vicinity that would generate a significant volume of traffic through the study area.*

Response: Both towns of Bellingham and Millis were contacted to see if there are any additional background developments to be incorporated into the study. Based on their responses, several projects were identified, but only one was included because of its size and traffic impacts on the surrounding network. This project has been incorporated into the future conditions.

Comment 14: *Based on VAI's discussion with the Town of Medway and MassDOT, no planned roadway improvements were identified within the study area.*

Response: No response required.



Comment 15: *The trip generation of existing uses on site that were recently closed was estimated using the 12th edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual². ITE LUC 720 – Medical-Dental Office Building – Stand Alone, LUC 841 – Automobile Sales (Used), and LUC 948 – Automated Car Wash were used. Additionally, trip generation for the Mobile Gas Station, which was open at the time of the traffic counts, was collected from the Turning Movement Count (TMC) at the intersection with the main Medway Place plaza driveway. Additional weekday daily and Saturday daily traffic volumes for the Mobile Gas Station were calculated using LUC 944 (Gasoline/Service Station).*

There are other recently closed businesses located on site that were not included within the existing site trip generation including Burger King, USPS Post Office and Village Pool and Spa. Including the potential trip generation from these uses would increase the existing site trip generation and show less of an impact with the proposed site redevelopment. As such, the analysis provides a conservative assessment.

Response: No response required.

Comment 16: *The trip generation of the development was also estimated using the ITE Trip Generation Manual using LUC 221 – Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) applied to 267 units, LUC 934 – Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through applied to 3,500 square feet, LUC 912 – Drive-In Bank applied to 2,000 square feet, and LUC 945 – Convenience Store/Gas Station (4-5.5 ksf) applied to 20 vehicle fueling pumps. CEA agrees with the use of these land use codes for the estimated site trip generation.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 17: *The report indicates that not all trips generated by the development will be new to the roadway, also known as pass-by trips. The ITE provides pass-by percentages for a variety of land uses. VAI noted that the ITE data indicates that LUC 934 – Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through experiences a pass-by rate of 50 percent during a typical weekday as well as the weekday AM and Saturday midday peak hours and a 55 percent pass-by rate during the weekday PM peak hour. The ITE data indicates that LUC 912 – Drive-In Bank experiences a pass-by rate of 29 percent during the weekday AM peak hour, 35 percent during the weekday PM peak hour, and 38 percent during the Saturday midday peak hour.*

Lastly, VAI noted that the ITE data indicates that LUC 945 – Convenience Store/Gas Station (4-5.5 ksf) experiences a pass-by rate of 75 percent during both a typical weekday and the weekday PM peak hour. During the weekday AM peak hour a 76 percent pass-by rate is expected, and, on a Saturday, a 64 percent pass-by rate is expected. These percentages were used to estimate the new vehicle trips to the project area.

CEA agrees with the use of the presented pass-by rates for LUC 912 and LUC 934 as well as the weekday AM and PM peak hour rates for LUC 945 but cannot verify the pass-by percentage used for the typical Saturday. Pass-By rates are not provided in the Appendix. Please provide documentation justifying the use of that percentage, along with the other pass-by rates for reference. Additionally, Table 5 shows that LUC 912 has

²Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition; Institute of Transportation Engineers; Washington, DC; 2025.



a 25 percent pass-by rate for a typical weekday and typical Saturday. Please also document where this percentage came from.

Response: LUC 945 utilized a derived pass-by rate based on a comparison between LUC 944 and LUC 945. A ratio between the evening peak and Saturday peak pass-by rate was observed for LUC 944 and applied to the evening peak of LUC 945 to develop the Saturday pass-by rate.

LUC 912 uses a conservative, rounded pass-by rate of 25 percent, rather than applying the peak rate to the daily total. In doing this, more trips are assumed to be new trips. Calculations are provided in the Appendix of the revised TIA.

Additionally, VAI notes that no credit was taken for the potential of internal trips. Given the various types of land uses within the site, there would be a potential for dual-purpose trips between the retail and residential uses. Since no credit is being taken, the analysis can be seen as very conservative in analyzing future traffic impacts.

Comment 18: *With the removal of the pass-by trips from the ITE trip generation data, the project site is expected to generate 3,140 new trips on an average weekday and 4,292 new trips on an average Saturday. Additionally, the project is expected to generate approximately 269 new trips (114 in, 155 out) during the weekday AM peak hour, 274 new trips (154 in, 120 out) during the weekday PM peak hour, and 354 new trips (185 in, 169 out) during the Saturday midday peak hour.*

It should be noted that there appears to be an error in the report, as well as in Table 5. The table shows that the total new trips for the Saturday midday peak hour is 356 trips instead of 354 trips and the total pass-by trips is shown as 354 instead of 356. Regardless of the error, the entering and exiting volumes are correct. As noted in Comment 17, these volumes are subject to change pending the findings of the pass-by rate assumptions.

Response: The numbers in Table 5 have been reviewed and updated accordingly.

Comment 19: *The existing trip generation to the site was compared to the proposed trips (including pass by trips) to evaluate the total impact of the proposed development. As shown in Table 6, the net new trips to the site are expected to be 4,612 daily trips for a typical weekday and 6,820 daily trips for a typical Saturday. Furthermore, the site is expected to generate 533 net new trips during the weekday AM peak hour (244 in, 309 out), 498 net new trips during the weekday PM peak hour (274 in, 274 out) and 516 net new trips during the Saturday midday peak hour (269 in, 247 out). CEA concurs with these estimates.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 20: *Distribution of site generated traffic was determined separately for the commercial uses and the residential use. The distribution of residential traffic was developed using United States Census Bureau employment statistics, identifying employment locations of individuals living within one mile of the project site. The distribution of commercial traffic was developed based on existing travel patterns from the collected traffic counts. CEA concurs with the commercial traffic distribution but would like to see the breakdown for determining the residential traffic distribution, as there is no data from the US Census Bureau included in the Appendix.*



Response: The Appendix has been updated to include the US Census Bureau journey-to-work data.

Comment 21: *Future Build Traffic conditions were compared to the No Build conditions to determine the percent increase at study area intersections during peak periods. The analysis determined that net new site generated traffic would increase traffic volumes at study area intersections by 2.1 to 5.6 percent, or an increase of 18 to 67 vehicles. CEA concurs with these estimates.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 22: *Parking demand was evaluated for the site using both the Town of Medway Zoning Bylaws as well as utilizing the ITE 6th edition Parking Demand Manual³. The town bylaws indicate that the overall parking demand required for the development would be 481 parking spaces, while the ITE rates would indicate a parking demand of 405 parking spaces. The proposed parking supply of 512 would be more than sufficient to accommodate the proposed uses based on the Town Bylaws and ITE data. CEA concurs with this assessment.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 23: *Sight distance analyses were performed at the three exiting site driveway intersections with Main Street (the western residential driveway, the central commercial driveway, and the eastern convenience store/gas station driveway). Based on the 85th percentile speeds, the stopping sight distance and intersection sight distance for Main Street are satisfied, both horizontally and vertically, at all site driveways. CEA concurs with the sight distance analysis, but recommends that any proposed landscaping, fences, walls, or signs in the vicinity of the site driveways be kept low to the ground (less than 2 feet above street level) or set back outside the sight triangles as defined by AASHTO so as not to impede the available sight distance.*

Response: This comment has been incorporated within the study's recommendations.

Comment 24: *The traffic associated with the proposed mixed-use development was overlayed onto the 2032 No-Build scenario to create the 2032 Build scenario. Analysis was performed under Existing, 2032 No-Build and 2032 Build conditions to determine any impacts that site generated traffic may have on the study network.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 25: *Based on analyses, under future Build conditions, the signalized intersections of Main Street at Franklin Street/Milford Street and Main Street at Holliston Street operate at similar conditions when compared to the future No-Build condition. Main Street at Franklin Street/Milford Street operates at an overall LOS C during the weekday PM peak hour and the Saturday midday peak hour and operates at LOC D during the weekday AM peak hour. All movements at this intersection are expected to operate at a LOS E or better, with the exception of the Milford Street left turn movement, which operates at LOS F during both the No-Build and Build conditions. The project is expected to add between 34 and 56 peak hour trips to this movement, which has the greatest impact during the weekday AM peak hour, as the delay increases by over 14 seconds.*

³Parking Demand Manual, 6th Edition; Institute of Transportation Engineers; Washington, DC; 2023.



Response: No response required.

Comment 26: *Main Street at Holliston Street operates at an overall LOS C during all three peak periods. All movements at this intersection are expected to operate at a LOS E or better. It should be noted that the westbound through movement is expected to degrade from LOS D to LOS E under future Build conditions.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 27: *The signalized intersection of Main Street at the Medway Place and the site driveway is expected to operate at an overall LOS C during all three peak hours under the Build condition. All movements independent of the development are expected to operate at LOS E or better under future No-Build conditions. Movements from the site driveway are expected to operate at LOS D during the Saturday MIDDAY peak hour and LOS E during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Overall increases in delay at the intersection due to site traffic are expected to be 11 seconds during the AM peak hour, four seconds during the PM peak hour, and three seconds during the Saturday MIDDAY peak hour.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 28: *Under Existing and No Build conditions, the minor street approaches at the unsignalized intersection of Main Street at Elm Street/Pond Street operate at LOS D and E during the weekday AM Peak hour and LOS C and F during the weekday PM peak and Saturday MIDDAY peak hours. Under Build conditions, the Pond Street approach degrades from LOS E to F during the weekday AM peak hour and the Elm Street approach increases from LOS C to D during the Saturday MIDDAY peak hour. It should be noted that none of the site traffic is expected to use either approach, however the addition of through traffic further limits the ability for side street traffic to exit onto the mainline.*

Response: No response required.

Comment 29: *The western residential driveway is expected to operate at LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour and LOS F during the weekday AM peak and Saturday MIDDAY peak hours, with queues of up to four vehicles. Main Street left turning traffic into the site is expected to operate at LOS B during all peak hours. The central commercial driveway is expected to operate at LOS F during all three peak periods, with queues of up to seven vehicles. Main Street left turning traffic into the site is expected to operate at LOS B during all peak hours. The eastern gas station exit driveway is expected to operate at LOS C during all three peak periods, with queues of up to seven vehicles. Main Street left turning traffic into the site is expected to operate at LOS B during all peak hours, with queues of up to two vehicles. **There appears to be some discrepancy between the data reported in the table and what was written about the individual intersections. The commercial driveway was reported to operate at LOS E or F during peak periods, but the table indicated LOS F during all three periods. It is recommended that the Applicant re-review the analyses results and update the text or tables where appropriate.***

Response: All analysis tables have been reviewed and updated accordingly based on the revised analysis results.



Comment 30: *The Applicant should investigate if any signal timing adjustments are warranted at the intersection of Main Street at Medway Place and Main Street at Holliston Street which would improve operations along Main Street.*

Response: The revised study has incorporated a mitigated conditions analysis that investigated the potential benefits of signal retiming at these locations.

Comment 31: *VAI provided several recommendations related to project access as well as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. TDM measures include the following:*

- *A “welcome packet” will be provided to residents and employees that details available public transportation services, walking alternatives, bicycling facilities, and commuter options.*
- *To encourage the use of public transportation, the property management team will make public transportation schedules available, posting them in a centralized location for residents and employees.*
- *The property management team will provide information on available pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of the Project site. This information will be posted in a centralized location.*

CEA agrees with the recommendations listed within the report.

Response: No response required.

Comment 32: *Both the bank and fast-food restaurant propose drive-throughs. Drive-through queue analyses should be performed for both businesses to ensure that queues don’t impact site access or circulation.*

Response: Drive-through analyses for both the bank and fast-food restaurant have been incorporated into the revised study. Both drive-throughs were shown to meet the predicted maximum vehicle queues without impeding access, circulation, or movement of users.

SUPPLEMENTAL TOWN OF MEDWAY COMMENTS – JULY 20, 2026

Comment 33: Due to the queues observed during peak hours, the intersection of Main Street and Winthrop Street should be included within the study area for analyses.

Response: Additional counts have been conducted to include the intersection of Main Street and Winthrop Street within the study area. Since the counts were conducted in July, no seasonal adjustment was provided. The volumes of Route 109 were balanced between this intersection and the Route 109 at Pond Street intersection, so volumes would be consistent with those in the remainder of the study.

Comment 34: *We also noted a lack of pedestrian accommodations along Main Street. Residents of the new development on the west side of the site are not likely to walk all the way to the east side of the site to cross Main Street to patron businesses across the way. Residents will cross at the most convenient locations to visit Muffin House and Mickey Cassidy’s. This is*



*a safety issue as no pedestrian crossings nearer to the residences are proposed. **The Applicant should investigate providing a safe crossing in this area.***

Response: The conceptual striping plan provided within the Site Plan has been revised to include a new pedestrian accommodation. The crosswalk location is consistent with the easterly ingress and egress to the residential building, providing a more favorable desire path to the businesses on the other side of Main Street. A mid-block crossing is proposed to give pedestrians a median refuge while crossing. Considering the crossing's proximity to the emergency signal, a three-assembly system is proposed, with the third assembly located at the mid-block crossing. By providing an RRFB as opposed to the HAWK signal located in other portions of Route 109, traffic delays would be minimized, and there would not be a concern with emergency signals approaching an active HAWK signal.

Comment 35: *The analysis does show lengthy queues for the Milford Street southbound left turn to Main Street. Field observations confirm this. **We recommend that the Applicant review signal timing optimization corridor wide to improve operations with the addition of the site traffic.***

Response: An optimized analysis is provided in the revised study for all signalized intersections. As noted in the study, optimization was conducted to minimize increases in overall delay while investigating whether Main Street through-movement travel times could be improved. Optimizing the Holliston Street intersection for the southbound left-turn movement would result in even more delays to the Main Street through movements and would likely negate any benefits shown in the analysis provided.

In addition to the comments above, the Applicant notes that they have committed to the following off-site improvements:

- The Applicant will coordinate with the Town to undertake a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the Main Street/Milford Street/Franklin Street and Main Street/Holliston Street intersections in order to identify crash patterns and potential safety enhancements. This information can be used by the Town to apply for a Community One Stop for Growth grant or other appropriate state grant program to implement safety enhancements at these intersections.
- The Applicant will coordinate with the Town to explore the feasibility of an optimal traffic signal timing, phasing, and coordination plan inclusive of the following intersections:
 1. Main Street/Milford Street/Franklin Street
 2. Main Street at Winthrop Street and Evergreen Street
 3. Main Street/Medway Place driveway/Project site driveway
 4. Main Street/Holliston Street
- The Applicant will design and construct a pedestrian crossing of Main Street as shown on Figure C1 that will include the construction of a raised pedestrian refuge island in the center of Main Street and the installation of a pedestrian actuated Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB).
- The Applicant will coordinate with the Town to evaluate the traffic signal equipment and vehicle detection system at the Main Street/Medway Place driveway/Project site driveway and Main



Mr. Jeremy Thompson
August 25, 2026
Page 11 of 11

Street/Holliston Street intersections to determine if the system is capable of dynamic traffic signal control or can be reasonably upgraded to an adaptive traffic control system.

We trust that this information is responsive to the comments that were identified in the June 30, 2026 peer review letter prepared by Chappell Engineering Associates as well as the supplemental comments provided through your office. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our responses in more detail, please feel free to contact either of us.

Sincerely,

VANASSE & ASSOCIATES, INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Scott W. Thornton".

Scott W. Thornton, P.E.
Partner

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Stephan Zaets".

Stephan Zaets, P.E., PTOE
Senior Transportation Engineer

Attachments:

Updated Traffic Impact Assessment

