

**From:** [cathy\\_powersnetwork.com](mailto:cathy_powersnetwork.com)  
**To:** [Bridget Kean](#)  
**Subject:** April 1, 2005 Board Meeting  
**Date:** Friday, March 28, 2025 1:15:49 PM  
**Attachments:** [Planning and Zoning Questions.docx](#)

---

Hello,

I have attached my concerns and question regarding the upcoming 7<sup>th</sup> amendment to the tradition DRI P22-093. If you would be so kind to address these questions, I would be most grateful. There are many items that I believe need to be more thoroughly thought through before moving forward with the amendments. As an elected Supervisor to the Tradition Community Development District Board of Supervisors, I look forward to hearing from you.

Respectfully,

Cathy Powers, EdD  
Supervisor Tradition CDD, District 5.  
954.298.5094

## Port St Lucie Planning and Zoning Agenda

### Amendment to Tradition DRI P22-093

#### Questions

1. Under the traffic study on p.175, “*The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and 2010 in Alberta ...*” Why use these time frames for surveying? Why not use more up-to-date ones for better accuracy?
2. Vehicle Pass-By Rates by Land Use chart stated the Florida survey year as 1990. Why use this outdated survey and not a newer one?
3. On p.2 of 7 it states, “The proposed changes are as follows:
  - a. Increase multi-family dwelling units from 1,000 to 1,568
  - b. Increase assisted living facilities from 300 to 420 dwelling units.
  - c. Why is there a reduction in Warehouse trips when the Sq Ft increase to 277,046 from 90,000?
  - d. Why increase the number of dwellings that will only add to the traffic problems in tradition?
4. When will the traffic study for Community Blvd. and Tradition Parkway be done in 2025?
5. Who is responsible for the cost of the conversion from 1-lane to 2-lane roundabout on Community Blvd and Tradition Parkway? Who is responsible for paying the cost of the future traffic study and signal?
6. On p.14, it states at the bottom, “*the AADT is projected from historical traffic counts if the last count year is older than the year of the report.*” In the Traffic Counts and Level of Service Report for 2024 for Community Blvd to Village PKWY it states the Last Physical Count was done in 2021. Does this mean it is from historical reports? If so, when will an updated report be made?
7. On p.7 showing Significance, it states, “Table 9. Project **Impacts (Significance)**” it shows 9 road intersections will be significantly impacted. How can this be avoided before the impacts are felt by residents?
8. On p.33, it states, “The overall changes in use will **not** affect the needed transportation improvements...” Therefore, significant additional improvements are not needed by the applicant.” How can this be?

Public Comment 4/01/2025



## Engineering & Planning, Inc.

1172 SW 30<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 500 • Palm City • Florida • 34990

(772) 286-8030 • [www.mackenzieengineeringinc.com](http://www.mackenzieengineeringinc.com)

---

April 1, 2025

Port St Lucie Planning and Zoning Agenda

Re: **Tradition DRI (Project #: P22-093)**

We offer the following responses to comments dated March 28, 2025 regarding the Traffic Impact Study.

### Response to Comments

1. Under the traffic study on p.175, *"The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and 2010 in Alberta ..."* Why use these time frames for surveying? Why not use more up-to-date ones for better accuracy?

**Response: The trip generation follows the methodology required by City code. The traffic study used the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) manual, *Trip Generation (11th Edition)*, which is the most current version. ITE's manual is widely accepted by the industry and is required by Code.**

2. Vehicle Pass-By Rates by Land Use chart stated the Florida survey year as 1990. Why use this outdated survey and not a newer one?

**Response: The pass-by rates follow the methodology required by City code. The pass-by rates are based on the ITE's manual, *Trip Generation (11th Edition)*, which is the most current version available. ITE's pass-by rates is widely accepted by the industry as a reliable source and is accepted as a reliable source in the Code.**

3. On p.2of 7 it states, "The proposed changes are as follows:
  - a. Increase multi-family dwelling units from 1,000 to 1,568
  - b. Increase assisted living facilities from 300 to 420 dwelling units.
  - c. Why is there a reduction in Warehouse trips when the Sq Ft increase to 277,046 from 90,000?
  - d. Why increase the number of dwellings that will only add to the traffic problems in tradition?

**Response: The trip generation is updated to the most current version, which is required by City code. The trip generation used the most current version of the ITE's manual, *Trip Generation (11th Edition)*. The trips were updated to the newest version of ITE's trip generation equations. In some cases the trips increased and other cases the trip decreased based on using the updated trip generation formulas.**

4. When will the traffic study for Community Blvd. and Tradition Parkway be done in 2025?

**Response: The traffic study will be included in the biennial report per Resolution 25-R12. The traffic study for these changes included detailed analysis of the roundabout in existing and projections of future conditions.**

5. Who is responsible for the cost of the conversion from 1-lane to 2-lane roundabout on Community Blvd and Tradition Parkway? Who is responsible for paying the cost of the future traffic study and signal?

**Response: The developer of Tradition has the fiscal responsibility for future studies and improvements to the Community Boulevard & Tradition Parking roundabout.**

6. On p.14, it states at the bottom, *“the AADT is projected from historical traffic counts if the last count year is older than the year of the report.”* In the Traffic Counts and Level of Service Report for 2024 for Community Blvd to Village PKWY it states the Last Physical Count was done in 2021. Does this mean it is from historical reports? If so, when will an updated report be made?

**Response: St. Lucie County TPO releases the Traffic Counts and Level of Service Report annually. The traffic counts within the report are updated periodically based on the St. Lucie TPO’s count schedule and resources.**

7. On p.7 showing Significance, it states, *“Table 9. Project Impacts (Significance)”* it shows 9 road intersections will be significantly impacted. How can this be avoided before the impacts are felt by residents?

**Response: A significantly impacted roadway segment does NOT indicate roadway failure. A significantly impacted roadway segment is defined as using 1% or more of a roadway’s estimated capacity. Then the those road segments are analyzed to determine if the roadway segments are projected to operate acceptably.**

8. On p.33, it states, *“The overall changes in use will **not** affect the needed transportation improvements...”* Therefore, significant additional improvements are not needed by the applicant.” How can this be?

**Response:**

- 1. The applicant has entitlements to construct or is in the process of constructing a regional park, 548 additional single family homes, 422 multi-family homes, 22 assisted living beds, 2 hotel rooms 515,571 SF of office use and 231,607 SF of retail use.**
- 2. No additional transportation infrastructure beyond Tradition’s existing and completed obligations are required by the applicant to construct the above uses because these are approved entitlements.**
- 3. The applicant proposes to reduce some of the uses (retail uses and office uses), which will reduce trips to and from Tradition while increasing some of the uses (residential and**

**assisted living) which will increase trips. The net change in trips (increases in trips minus the reductions in trips) is projected to have negligible impacts to the roadway network and overall transportation needs of the roadway network.**

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Shaun Mackenzie at (772) 834-8909.

Sincerely,



Shaun G. MacKenzie, P.E.

Transportation Engineer

Florida Registration Number 61751

Engineering Business Number 29013

**From:** [Colt Schwerdt](#)  
**To:** [Kok Wan Mah](#); [Mary Savage-Dunham](#); [Clyde Cuffy](#); [Diana Spriggs](#); [Elizabeth Hertz](#)  
**Cc:** [Bridget Kean](#); [Colt Schwerdt](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Tradition DRI amendment - response to comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 1, 2025 5:07:06 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)  
[image007.png](#)  
[image008.png](#)  
[image009.png](#)

---

Thank you so very much for getting this done!!!



**Colt Schwerdt, P.E.**  
**Director & City Engineer**  
**Public Works Department**  
o. 772-344-4363  
c. 772-812-6627

**City of Port St. Lucie | Heart of the Treasure Coast**

121 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd., Port St. Lucie, FL 34984



---

**From:** Kok Wan Mah <[kmah@kittelson.com](mailto:kmah@kittelson.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 1, 2025 1:43 PM  
**To:** Colt Schwerdt <[CSchwerdt@cityofpsl.com](mailto:CSchwerdt@cityofpsl.com)>; Mary Savage-Dunham <[mdunham@cityofpsl.com](mailto:mdunham@cityofpsl.com)>; Clyde Cuffy <[CCuffy@cityofpsl.com](mailto:CCuffy@cityofpsl.com)>; Diana Spriggs <[DSpriggs@cityofpsl.com](mailto:DSpriggs@cityofpsl.com)>; Elizabeth Hertz <[ehertz@cityofpsl.com](mailto:ehertz@cityofpsl.com)>  
**Cc:** Bridget Kean <[BKean@cityofpsl.com](mailto:BKean@cityofpsl.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Tradition DRI amendment - response to comments

My **commentary** on the comments and response memo dated April 1, 2025 is provided for your consideration below:

It should be noted that it could not be determined what version of the study the comments reference with the page numbers. The page numbers referenced are not consistent with the March 2025 traffic analysis submitted by MacKenzie Engineering and Planning. Therefore, my responses are based on the content of the comment that the Applicant's response.

1. Under the traffic study on p.175, "*The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and 2010 in Alberta ...*" Why use these time frames for surveying? Why not use more up-to-date ones for better accuracy?

**Response: The trip generation follows the methodology required by City code. The traffic study used the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) manual, *Trip Generation (11th Edition)*, which is the most current version. ITE's manual is widely accepted by the industry and is required by Code.**

**City consultant response: The study follows acceptable methods and practices for the calculation of trips generated by the site. The Trip Generation Manual is published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and includes hundreds of different land uses based on surveys conducted all over the country. With each new edition, ITE may add additional land uses and more recent surveys to make the rates and**

**formulas more applicable. The response provided is acceptable. The alternative would be to conduct surveys at comparable sites, which would result in increased variability of rates, a much smaller sample size, and much lower confidence interval.**

2. Vehicle Pass-By Rates by Land Use chart stated the Florida survey year as 1990. Why use this outdated survey and not a newer one?

**Response: The pass-by rates follow the methodology required by City code. The pass-by rates are based on the ITE's manual, *Trip Generation (11th Edition)*, which is the most current version available. ITE's pass-by rates is widely accepted by the industry as a reliable source and is accepted as a reliable source in the Code.**

**City consultant response: The use of pass-by reduction follows accepted practices and the SLCTPO TIA Methodology Guidelines. The pass-by reduction of 19% applied to the commercial use is considerably less than the 34% average listed in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition), therefore, the net external trips are higher than if the 34% pass-by rate was used. The response provided is acceptable.**

3. On p.2of 7 it states, "The proposed changes are as follows:
- Increase multi-family dwelling units from 1,000 to 1,568
  - Increase assisted living facilities from 300 to 420 dwelling units.
  - Why is there a reduction in Warehouse trips when the Sq Ft increase to 277,046 from 90,000?
  - Why increase the number of dwellings that will only add to the traffic problems in tradition?

**Response: The trip generation is updated to the most current version, which is required by City code. The trip generation used the most current version of the ITE's manual, *Trip Generation (11th Edition)*. The trips were updated to the newest version of ITE's trip generation equations. In some cases the trips increased and other cases the trip decreased based on using the updated trip generation formulas.**

**City consultant response: The original comment focuses on the increase in the development program and fails to mention that the overall trip generation also accounts for a decrease of 16,500 sf of commercial and 160,000 sf of office, both high peak-hour generators. Overall, this is not expected to result in greater net impacts. The use of the exchange matrix between land use types has been adopted in the Tradition DRI Agreement.**

4. When will the traffic study for Community Blvd. and Tradition Parkway be done in 2025?

**Response: The traffic study will be included in the biennial report per Resolution 25-R12. The traffic study for these changes included detailed analysis of the roundabout in existing and projections of future conditions.**

**City consultant response: No additional commentary needed.**

5. Who is responsible for the cost of the conversion from 1-lane to 2-lane roundabout on Community Blvd and Tradition Parkway? Who is responsible for paying the cost of the future traffic study and signal?

**Response: The developer of Tradition has the fiscal responsibility for future studies and improvements to the Community Boulevard & Tradition Parking roundabout.**

**City consultant response: No additional commentary needed.**

6. On p.14, it states at the bottom, "*the AADT is projected from historical traffic counts if the last count year is older than the year of the report.*" In the Traffic Counts and Level of Service Report for 2024 for Community Blvd to Village PKWY it states the Last Physical Count was done in 2021. Does this mean it is from historical reports? If so, when will an updated report be made?

**Response: St. Lucie County TPO releases the Traffic Counts and Level of Service Report annually. The traffic counts within the report are updated periodically based on the St. Lucie TPO's count schedule and resources.**

**City consultant response: The latest traffic count report from the TPO is dated 2024. Tables 8 and 10 use the most recent counts available. No additional commentary needed.**

7. On p.7 showing Significance, it states, “Table 9. Project **Impacts (Significance)**” it shows 9 road intersections will be significantly impacted. How can this be avoided before the impacts are felt by residents?

**Response: A significantly impacted roadway segment does NOT indicate roadway failure. A significantly impacted roadway segment is defined as using 1% or more of a roadway’s estimated capacity. Then the those road segments are analyzed to determine if the roadway segments are projected to operate acceptably.**

**City consultant response: The Applicant’s response is correct; however, it fails to address the intent of the original comment. In the conclusions, no roadway segments are found to be deficient beyond the Developer’s obligations provided under the adopted Development Order Agreement. Additionally, improvements have been identified for intersections which include the timing of the improvements.**

8. On p.33, it states, “The overall changes in use will **not** affect the needed transportation improvements...” Therefore, significant additional improvements are not needed by the applicant.” How can this be?

**Response:**

**1. The applicant has entitlements to construct or is in the process of constructing a regional park, 548 additional single family homes, 422 multi-family homes, 22 assisted living beds, 2 hotel rooms 515,571 SF of office use and 231,607 SF of retail use.**

**2. No additional transportation infrastructure beyond Tradition’s existing and completed obligations are required by the applicant to construct the above uses because these are approved entitlements.**

**3. The applicant proposes to reduce some of the uses (retail uses and office uses), which will reduce trips to and from Tradition while increasing some of the uses (residential and assisted living) which will increase trips. The net change in trips (increases in trips minus the reductions in trips) is projected to have negligible impacts to the roadway network and overall transportation needs of the roadway network.**

**City consultant response: Each of the three points listed in the Applicant’s response is correct. This is not to say that there won’t be deficiencies; instead, the Developer has identified their obligations which are listed in the Development Order conditions. The needed intersection improvements are bulleted out in the recommendations section of the traffic analysis.**

**It should be noted that the Applicant has followed the permitted rates to exchange land uses under the adopted Development Order. In most cases, nothing more than a traffic statement showing the comparison of trip generation is needed. Should the Applicant decide to increase land uses or intensities beyond what is entitled and approved, then the City can and should request a new, updated traffic study.**

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,  
Kok Wan

Kok Wan Mah  
Principal Transportation Engineer  
[Kittelsohn & Associates, Inc.](mailto:Kittelsohn@kittelsohn.com)  
Transportation Engineering / Planning  
407.373.1127 (direct)

---

**From:** Colt Schwerdt <[CSchwerdt@cityofpsl.com](mailto:CSchwerdt@cityofpsl.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 1, 2025 12:13 PM

**To:** Mary Savage-Dunham <[mdunham@cityofpsl.com](mailto:mdunham@cityofpsl.com)>; Clyde Cuffy <[CCuffy@cityofpsl.com](mailto:CCuffy@cityofpsl.com)>; Diana Spriggs <[DSpriggs@cityofpsl.com](mailto:DSpriggs@cityofpsl.com)>; Elizabeth Hertz <[ehertz@cityofpsl.com](mailto:ehertz@cityofpsl.com)>; Kok Wan Mah <[kmah@kittelton.com](mailto:kmah@kittelton.com)>  
**Cc:** Bridget Kean <[BKean@cityofpsl.com](mailto:BKean@cityofpsl.com)>; Colt Schwerdt <[CSchwerdt@cityofpsl.com](mailto:CSchwerdt@cityofpsl.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Tradition DRI amendment - response to comments  
**Importance:** High

[External Sender]

Kok Wan:

Please see attached. This is for the Tradition DRI amendment that you helped us review, and the attached is the responses from the Applicant's Traffic Consultant for public comments. This is going to the P&Z Board meeting tonight. Can you review and see if the City should provide any additional insight on this public comments/questions?

Thanks,



**Colt Schwerdt, P.E.**  
*Director & City Engineer*  
**Public Works Department**  
o. 772-344-4363  
c. 772-812-6627

**City of Port St. Lucie | Heart of the Treasure Coast**

121 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd., Port St. Lucie, FL 34984



---

**From:** Mary Savage-Dunham <[mdunham@cityofpsl.com](mailto:mdunham@cityofpsl.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 1, 2025 12:03 PM  
**To:** Clyde Cuffy <[CCuffy@cityofpsl.com](mailto:CCuffy@cityofpsl.com)>; Colt Schwerdt <[CSchwerdt@cityofpsl.com](mailto:CSchwerdt@cityofpsl.com)>; Diana Spriggs <[DSpriggs@cityofpsl.com](mailto:DSpriggs@cityofpsl.com)>; Elizabeth Hertz <[ehertz@cityofpsl.com](mailto:ehertz@cityofpsl.com)>  
**Cc:** Bridget Kean <[BKean@cityofpsl.com](mailto:BKean@cityofpsl.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: Tradition DRI amendment - response to comments



[www.CityofPSL.com](http://www.CityofPSL.com)

**Mary F. Savage-Dunham, AICP, CFM**  
*Director*  
**Planning & Zoning Department**

o. 772-873-6350      c. 772-259-1515  
a. 121 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd., Port St. Lucie,  
FL 34984



---

**From:** Karl Albertson <[Karl.Albertson@mattamycorp.com](mailto:Karl.Albertson@mattamycorp.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 1, 2025 11:40 AM  
**To:** Dr. Cathy Powers ([cathy@powersnetwork.com](mailto:cathy@powersnetwork.com)) <[cathy@powersnetwork.com](mailto:cathy@powersnetwork.com)>  
**Cc:** Bridget Kean <[BKean@cityofpsl.com](mailto:BKean@cityofpsl.com)>; Mary Savage-Dunham <[mdunham@cityofpsl.com](mailto:mdunham@cityofpsl.com)>; Steve Garrett <[sgarrett@lucidodesign.com](mailto:sgarrett@lucidodesign.com)>; Eric Sexauer <[Eric.Sexauer@mattamycorp.com](mailto:Eric.Sexauer@mattamycorp.com)>  
**Subject:** Tradition DRI amendment

Good Morning Dr. Powers,

Attached are responses to your questions submitted to the City on the DRI Amendment. Steve Garrett, Eric Sexauer and myself will be at P&Z early if you have additional questions on the application.

Karl



K. Karl Albertson, Jr.

**V.P. of Land Acquisition and Entitlement | Southeast Florida Division**

**O:** (561) 413-6096

**M:** (754) 264-1535

[karl.albertson@mattamycorp.com](mailto:karl.albertson@mattamycorp.com)

**Mattamy Homes USA**

Division Office: 2500 Quantum Lakes Drive, Suite 215, Boynton Beach, FL 33426

Connect with us: