KBP CONSULTING, INC.

May 4, 2018

Ginny Stones, Esq. Oropeza Stones Cardenas 221 Simonton Street Key West, Florida 33040

Re: Ratcliff Site – Key West Conditional Use Application – Traffic Statement

Dear Ginny:

The Ratcliff Welding site is an existing welding and fabrication facility located at 1105 Simonton Street in Key West, Monroe County, Florida. Until recently, this site also had an area for bicycle and small electric vehicle storage. In addition, this had an approved conditional use for small scooter and electric vehicle sales and rentals. A new conditional use application has been submitted to the City of Key West for the purposes of allowing an indoor dining area with 30 seats and 499 square feet of outdoor restaurant consumption area (or, the equivalent of 33 seats) on this property. The total seating capacity will be 63 seats. The purpose of this traffic statement is to document the anticipated traffic impacts associated with this proposed indoor and outdoor consumption area.

Traffic Impacts

In accordance with Section 18-358 of the City's Code of Ordinances, the traffic impacts associated with the proposed indoor and outdoor consumption area must be addressed. More specifically, insignificant (or, "de minimis") impacts are defined as those that constitute an impact of less than three percent (3%) on the local transportation network.

Based upon the location of the subject restaurant, it is expected that their patrons will arrive and depart via the City's extensive street grid network in a variety of directions as to minimize their impacts to any single roadway or intersection. However, for the purposes of this analysis, our focus is on the segment of Simonton Street between Amelia Street and Virginia Street. Given the site's entry and exit point along Simonton Street, the surrounding roadway network, and nearby destinations, it is estimated that 60% of the project traffic will arrive from and depart to the northwest on Simonton Street and 40% of the project traffic will arrive from and depart to the southeast on Simonton Street.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) maintains a traffic count station (#908112) on Simonton Street approximately 200 feet to the southeast of Petronia Street which is approximately 1,000 feet to the northwest of the Ratcliff site. The most recent annual traffic counts for this station indicate that there are approximately 5,300 vehicles on this roadway segment on a daily basis. The peak hour traffic counts at this location indicate that the peak hour occurs in the mid-afternoon (2:30 PM) and the volume is 506 vehicles. This data is presented in Attachment A to this memorandum.

KBP CONSULTING, INC.

According to the Florida Department of Transportation's (FDOT's) Quality / Level of Service Handbook, in urbanized areas two-lane undivided, class II (35 miles per hour or slower posted speed limit), non-state roadways without exclusive turn lanes have a daily capacity of approximately 10,360 vehicles and a peak hour capacity of approximately 930 vehicles. (Please see Attachment B for the referenced level of service thresholds.) Given that the existing daily and peak hour volumes on this segment of Simonton Street are consuming slightly more than 50% of the roadway's capacity, it is evident that this roadway is currently operating at an acceptable level of service.

Concerning the impact of the proposed conditional use (i.e. indoor and outdoor consumption area) at the subject site, a 3% impact would equate to 310 daily vehicle trips and 28 peak hour vehicle trips in either direction from the site on Simonton Street. Given the previously referenced 60% / 40% traffic split to and from the site (i.e. 60% to the northwest on Simonton Street and 40% to the southeast on Simonton Street), the maximum vehicle trips to be generated by the site would be approximately 517 daily trips and 47 peak hour trips.

Trip Generation Analysis

The trip generation for this project was determined utilizing the trip generation rates and equations contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual* (10^{th} Edition). Based upon this information, the daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trip generation rates for the proposed restaurant consumption area are as follows:

High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant – ITE Land Use #932

| Daily Trip Generation Rate: where $T = number$ of trips and $X = num$ | T = 4.37 (X) <i>nber of seats</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| AM Peak Hour Trip Generation Rate: | T = 0.48 (X) (52% in / 48% out) |
| PM Peak Hour Trip Generation Rate: | T = 0.42 (X) (57% in / 43% out) |
| Pass-by Rate = 43% | |

The resulting trip generation for the proposed conditional use is presented in Table 1 below.

| Table 1 Ratcliff Site Restaurant Trip Generation Analysis Key West, Florida | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|----|----|-----|
| Land Use | Daily Trips | AM I In | Peak Hour Out | Trips Total | PM Peak Hour Trips In Out Total | | | |
| Proposed | | | | | | | | |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant | 63 Seats | 275 | 16 | 14 | 30 | 15 | 11 | 26 |
| - Pass-by (43%) | | -118 | -7 | -6 | -13 | -6 | -5 | -11 |
| Total 157 9 8 17 9 6 15 | | | | | | | | |

Compiled by: KBP Consulting, Inc. (May 2018).

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition).

KBP CONSULTING, INC.

As indicated by the foregoing trip generation analysis, the proposed indoor / outdoor consumption area is estimated to generate approximately 157 net new daily vehicle trips, 17 net new AM peak hour vehicle trips, and 15 net new PM peak hour vehicle trips. It should also be noted that, given the location of the subject site, many of the patrons of this proposed use are likely to arrive and depart via alternative modes of transportation such as walking, bicycling, scooters, etc. Even without this additional reduction in traffic to be generated by the subject outdoor consumption area, the projected daily and peak hour vehicle trips are substantially less than the 3% significance thresholds (i.e. 517 daily vehicle trips and 47 peak hour trips) and, therefore, will not constitute a significant impact on the local street network.

Summary

Based upon the foregoing analysis and assessment of the traffic operations associated with the proposed conditional use (i.e. indoor / outdoor restaurant consumption area) at the Ratcliff Welding site, it is evident that the proposed indoor dining area with 30 seats and the 499 square feet of outdoor restaurant consumption area (or, the equivalent of 33 seats) can be accommodated well within the City's 3% traffic impact threshold on local streets. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

KBP CONSULTING, INC.

Karl B. Peterson, P.E. Florida Registration Number 49897 Engineering Business Number 29939

Attachment A

FDOT Traffic Count Data

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2016 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

COUNTY: 90 - MONROE

SITE: 8112 - SIMONTON ST, 200' SOUTH OFPETRONIA ST (2011 OFF SYSTEM CYCLE)

| YEAR | AADT | DIH | RECTION 1 | DII | RECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR |
|------|--------|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| 2016 | 5300 C | N | 2700 | S | 2600 | 9.00 | 54.90 | 8.80 |
| 2015 | 6600 T | | 0 | | 0 | 9.00 | 54.30 | 8.10 |
| 2014 | 6300 S | | | | | 9.00 | 55.20 | 3.80 |
| 2013 | 6200 F | | 0 | | 0 | 9.00 | 54.80 | 7.30 |
| 2012 | 6100 C | N | 0 | S | 0 | 9.00 | 55.00 | 8.20 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SIXTH YEAR ESTIMATE; X = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES COUNTY:

STATION:

DESCRIPTION: SIMONTON ST, 200' SOUTH OF?PETRONIA ST (2011 OFF S

START DATE: 05/17/2016

START TIME: 0000

_____ DIRECTION: N DIRECTION: S COMBINED TIME 1ST 2ND 3RD 4TH TOTAL 1ST 2ND 3RD 4TH TOTAL TOTAL _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _____ _____ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 8 2 9 5 24 | 11 13 1 9 9 | 17 | 2 9 1 2 3 10 4 7 5 3 9 12 10 9 12 15 10 24 17 43 45 42 45 30 42 46 35 20
 31
 23
 25
 111

 30
 44
 44
 167
 20 14 19 18 71 32 38 21 14 105 28 15 13 15 71 34 16 20 95 17 9 14 9 49 20 17 16 6 _____ 24-HOUR TOTALS: _____ PEAK VOLUME INFORMATION DIRECTION: NDIRECTION: SCOMBINED DIRECTIONSHOURVOLUMEHOURVOLUMEHOURVOLUME815201845128845320144526816152601430506144526816152601430506 A.M. P.M. DAILY

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.49P

Attachment B

FDOT Level of Service Tables

Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas

| | ADLL I | | | | Uri | | |
|--------|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--|--|
| | INTERR | UPTED F | LOW FAC | ILITIES | | | |
| | STATE SI | GNALI | ZED ART | FERIALS | s | | |
| | Class I (40 m | | | | - | | |
| Lanes | Median | B | C | D | E | | |
| 2 | Undivided | * | 16,800 | 17,700 | ** | | |
| 4 | Divided | * | 37,900 | 39,800 | ** | | |
| 6 | Divided | * | 58,400 | 59,900 | ** | | |
| 8 | Divided | * | 78,800 | 80,100 | ** | | |
| | Class II (35 n | nph or slo | | speed lim | | | |
| Lanes | Median | B * | C | D | E | | |
| 2 | Undivided | * | 7,300 | 14,800 | 15,600 | | |
| 4 | Divided | * | 14,500 | · · · | 33,800 | | |
| 6 | Divided | * | 23,300 | · · · | 50,900 | | |
| 8 | Divided | * | 32,000 | 67,300 | 68,100 | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Non-State Sig | | Roadway A ing state volu | | nts | | |
| | t | by the indica | ted percent.) | | | | |
| | Non-State | Signalized | Roadways | - 10% | | | |
| | Median | | Lane Adjus | | 1 | | |
| Lanes | Median | Exclusive Left Lane | | | djustment Factors | | |
| 2 | Divided | Yes | No. | | +5% | | |
| 2 | Undivided | No | N | | -20% | | |
| Multi | Undivided | Yes | Ne | No | | | |
| Multi | Undivided | No | Ne | | -25% | | |
| _ | - | _ | Ye | S | + 5% | | |
| | One-V | Vay Facil | ity Adjust | ment | | | |
| | Multiply th | he correspo | nding two-di is table by 0. | rectional | | | |
| | | | | 0 | | | |
| | | | E MODE ² | -1 | 1f | | |
| | ultiply motorized ctional roadway l | | | | | | |
| | D 1 | volu | mes.) | | | | |
| | Paved lder/Bicycle | | | | | | |
| | e Coverage | В | С | D | Е | | |
| | 0-49% | * | 2,900 | 7,600 | 19,700 | | |
| | 50-84% | 2,100 | 6,700 | 19,700 | >19,700 | | |
| 8: | 5-100% | 9,300 | 19,700 | >19,700 | ** | | |
| | | | AN MODI | | | | |
| | ultiply motorized | | | | | | |
| dire | ctional roadway l | | mine two-wa | y maximum | service | | |
| Sidewa | alk Coverage | В | С | D | Е | | |
| (| 0-49% | * | * | 2,800 | 9,500 | | |
| | 0-84% | * | 1,600 | 8,700 | 15,800 | | |
| 8: | 5-100% | 3,800 | 10,700 | 17,400 | >19,700 | | |
| | BUS MOI | | duled Fixe r in peak dire | | | | |
| 0.1 | | - | | _ | Г | | |
| | alk Coverage | B > 5 | C > 4 | D > 3 | E > 2 | | |

| | | | | | 12/18/12 | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| UNINTERRUPTED FLOW FACILITIES | | | | | | | | | | |
| FREEWAYS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Core Urbanized | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lanes | В | Core Uri | Damzeu | D | Е | | | | | |
| 4 | 47,400 | 64,00 | 0 7 | 7,900 | 84,600 | | | | | |
| 6 | 69,900 | 95,20 | | 6,600 | 130,600 | | | | | |
| 8 | 92,500 | 126,40 | | 4,300 | 176,600 | | | | | |
| 10 | 115,100 | 159,70 | | 4,500 | 222,700 | | | | | |
| 12 | 162,400 | 216,70 | | 6,600 | 268,900 | | | | | |
| Urbanized | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lanes | В | С | | D | Е | | | | | |
| 4 | 45,800 | 61,50 | 0 74 | 4,400 | 79,900 | | | | | |
| 6 | 68,100 | 93,00 | 0 11 | 1,800 | 123,300 | | | | | |
| 8 | 91,500 | 123,50 | | 8,700 | 166,800 | | | | | |
| 10 | 114,800 | 156,00 | 0 18 | 7,100 | 210,300 | | | | | |
| | Б | | | ~ | | | | | | |
| | Auxiliary Lan | reeway Ad | ijustment | s Ramp | | | | | | |
| Pres | ent in Both Dir | | | Meterin | | | | | | |
| | + 20,000 | | | + 5% | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JNINTERR | | | | | | | | | |
| Lanes | | B | C | D | E 22 200 | | | | | |
| 24 | Undivided | 8,600 | 17,000 | 24,20 | · · · | | | | | |
| 6 | Divided Divided | 36,700 | 51,800 | 65,60 | · · · | | | | | |
| 0 | Divided | 55,000 | 77,700 | 98,30 | 0 108,800 | | | | | |
| | Uninterrupt | ted Flow H | ighway A | djustm | ents | | | | | |
| Lanes | Median | Exclusive | | | ment factors | | | | | |
| 2 | Divided | Ye | es | | +5% | | | | | |
| Multi | Undivided | Ye | es | | -5% | | | | | |
| Multi | Undivided | N | 0 | -25% | | | | | | |
| ¹ Values shown are presented as two-way annual average daily volumes for levels of service and are for the automobile/truck modes unless specifically stated. This table does not constitute a standard and should be used only for general planning applications. The computer models from which this table is derived should be used for more specific planning applications. The table and deriving computer models should not be used for corridor or intersection design, where more refined techniques exist. Calculations are based on planning applications of the Highway Capacity Manual and the Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual. | | | | | | | | | | |
| ² Level of service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this table is based on number of motorized vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the facility. | | | | | | | | | | |
| ³ Buses per hour shown are only for the peak hour in the single direction of the higher traffic flow. | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. | | | | | | | | | | |
| ** Not applicable for that level of service letter grade. For the automobile mode, volumes greater than level of service D become F because intersection capacities have been reached. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (including F) is not achievable because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using table input value defaults. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Source: | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Florida Department of Transportation Systems Planning Office www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/systems/sm/los/default.shtm

 ≥ 2

 ≥ 1

 ≥ 3

 ≥ 2

> 5

>4

 ≥ 4

 ≥ 3

0-84%

85-100%

Generalized **Peak Hour Two-Way** Volumes for Florida's **Urbanized Areas**¹

| | | | | | | | | | | | 12/18/12 |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | INTERR | UPTED FLO | OW FACIL | LITIES | | | UNINTER | RUPTED | Flow Fa | | 12/ 10/ 12 |
| | STATE SI | GNALIZI | ED ART | ERIALS | | | FREEV | VAYS | | | |
| Lanes 2 4 6 8 Lanes 2 4 6 8 | b | B * * * * mph or slow B * * * * * * | C 1,510 3,420 5,250 7,090 er posted sj C 660 1,310 2,090 2,880 Dadway A g state volum I percent.) | D 1,600 3,580 5,390 7,210 peed limit) D 1,330 2,920 4,500 6,060 djustmen | E 1,410 3,040 4,590 6,130 | Lanes 4 6 8 10 12 Pres | B 4,120 6,130 8,230 10,330 14,450 F Auxiliary Land ent in Both Dird + 1,800 | | 10 10 10 13 10 16 10 22 | 5,390 5,840 2,030 | E 7,190 11,100 15,010 18,930 22,860 |
| Lanes 2 2 Multi — | Median Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided – One-W Multiply th | Signalized Ro & Turn La Exclusive Left Lanes Yes No Yes No - Way Facility ne correspond | ne Adjust Exclus Right La No No No Yes y Adjustn ing two-dire | ive A anes nent | djustment Factors +5% -20% -5% -25% + 5% | Lanes 2 4 6 Lanes 2 Multi | UNINTERR Median Undivided Divided Divided Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided | B 770 3,300 4,950 | C 1,530 4,660 6,990 (ighway A left lanes | D 2,170 5,900 8,840 | E 2,990 6,530 9,790 s nt factors |
| Paved La | volumes in this table by 0.6 BICY CLE MODE ² (Multiply motorized vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 260 680 1,770 50-84% 190 600 1,770 >1,770 85-100% 830 1,770 >1,770 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply motorized vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service | | | | | | Undivided shown are presented te automobile/truck e a standard and sho r models from whici applications. The ta or intersection desig planning application and Quality of Serv- of service for the bic ized vehicles, not m er hour shown are on of the achieved using pplicable for that let | N l as peak hour t modes unless s build be used on h this table is d able and derivin gn, where more ns of the Highw vice Manual. ycle and pedest umber of bicycl ly for the peak h table input value vel of service le | o wo-way volum pecifically state y for general p g computer more refined techniq vay Capacity M rian modes in t ists or pedestri- our in the single the defaults. | -25 es for levels of s ed. This table do lanning applicat e used for more dels should not ues exist. Calcu fanual and the T his table is based ans using the fac direction of the h | % ervice and es not ions. The specific be used for lations are rans it d on number ility. igher traffic mode, |
| | walk Coverage 0-49% 50-84% 85-100% BUS MODI (Buses) walk Coverage 0-84% 85-100% | * 340 E (Schedu in peak hour in | | $E \\ 850 \\ 1,420 \\ >1,770 \\ 3^{3} \\ E \\ \ge 2 \\ \ge 1$ | been read achievab value de Source: Florida I Systems | greater than level o ched. For the bicyck le because there is r faults. Department of Trans Planning Office t.state.fl.us/planning | e mode, the lev to maximum ve | el of service let | ter grade (includ | ling F) is not | |