

UCTC City of Kingston Intermodal Facility Facility Site Location & Conceptual Design Analysis

Final Report

SITE DESIGN CONCEPTS

Concept Site Plan Studies for Selected Sites

As described in Section VI Location Analysis, based on GIS information, input from the TAC, operators and site visits, a total of five sites were identified for further study at the conclusion of the Location Analysis task. The TAC and Wendel Duchscherer worked together to create site development plans for each, in some cases revisiting the sites to incorporate new information collected from the committee and public meetings.

These sites were:

1. S1: Existing terminal with Utility Platers
2. S1A: Combination of sites S1 and S2
3. S2: Former Sheriff's Office
4. S9: Existing Visitor Center
5. S11: Hannaford Plaza

Section VI Location Analysis contains a detailed description of the concept design development of each of these sites, as their location had a significant impact on their individual design. Refer to Section VI Location Analysis for the drawings of the site development options.

Once the major scoring criteria were defined, each TAC member was allotted one hundred points to distribute among the criteria based on a given criterion's importance to that particular member. The points could be distributed in any combination, but had to add up to one hundred points across all the fields. Once completed, point totals were averaged for each field, generating a set of weighted criteria. Wendel Duchscherer then evaluated the sites for each criterion using a range of five points. One point meant it did not fit the criterion well, five points meant it fulfilled the criterion in all regards. The average points, multiplied by each criterion's weight, generated the overall score for each field. Total points were calculated for each site, and a ranking was established; the more points a site received, the higher the site's ranking. Refer to the Appendix for the list of Evaluation Criteria and their order of importance, as well as the Comprehensive Alternatives Evaluation Matrix that shows the ranking of the most viable sites.

Matrix of Opportunities and Constraints

The following is a brief commentary on the transportation pros and cons of each proposed site concept, as well as a general rating of each site from a transportation perspective. The evaluation considered such factors as:

- Vehicle and bus safety
- Vehicle access

UCTC City of Kingston Intermodal Facility Facility Site Location & Conceptual Design Analysis

Final Report

- Bus access
- Pedestrian circulation and safety
- Conflicts between cars, buses, and pedestrians
- Impacts to adjacent roadways
- Convenience of access
- Proximity of parking to station

S1: Washington Avenue and Front Street Site

Pros:

- Renovate Utility Platers' site
- Prominent street presence
- Terminal located on corner to promote urban design and feel
- Kiss-and-ride conveniently located
- Good separation of buses and vehicles
- Good 'walkability' to and from the Stocakade district

Cons:

- Grade change will require re-grading and retaining walls
- Not enough automobile parking
- Becomes completely reliant on Frog Alley access

Site 1A: Washington Avenue and Front Street Site

Pros:

- Prominent street presence
- Local bus bays have saw tooth configuration
- No direct impact to Washington Street (i.e. no curb cuts)
- Terminal located on corner to promote urban design and feel

Cons:

- Grade change will require re-grading and retaining walls
- Completely remote automobile parking, pedestrians required to cross Frog Alley
- Becomes completely reliant on Frog Alley access.
- Kiss-and-Ride and taxis are remote

S2: Schwenk Drive Site

Pros:

- All automobile parking can be at grade
- Site is relatively flat

UCTC City of Kingston Intermodal Facility Facility Site Location & Conceptual Design Analysis

Final Report

- Prominent street presence
- Excellent pedestrian circulation and minimal conflicts with buses and vehicles
- Good separation of buses and vehicles
- Parking is located within good proximity to the terminal

Cons:

- Schwenk Drive requires median gap for automobile traffic
- Access from Frog Alley for buses is difficult given geometrics of Frog Alley

S9: Washington Avenue Site

Pros:

- Overflow parking for Park-and-Ride
- Good vehicle/bus separation
- Good pedestrian safety and separation from site operations; pedestrian/vehicle conflicts would be kept to a minimum

Cons:

- Requires two traffic lights
- Requires retaining walls or significant amount of imported fill
- Poor pedestrian access across Washington Avenue
- High speeds on Washington Avenue raise safety concerns for vehicle access and egress; particularly at Northern Drive where no signal is possible

S11: Hannaford Plaza Site

Pros:

- Opportunities for community space integration (i.e. baseball diamond/potential park and shopping center)
- Reuse existing parking lots
- Great proximity to the I-587
- Good pedestrian circulation and safety, and separation from site operations; pedestrian/vehicle conflicts would be kept to a minimum
- Good separation of buses and vehicles

Cons:

- This site becomes unviable if Interstate 587 is not converted to a boulevard with bus signalization or dedicated access and exit ramps to I-587 are not constructed.
- Significant time and expense associated with constructing dedicated access and exit ramps to I-587, including extensive environmental analysis
- Site now considered in a flood plain

UCTC City of Kingston Intermodal Facility Facility Site Location & Conceptual Design Analysis

Final Report

Identification of Preferred Sites

Based on the site selection studies and analysis, sites S1 and S8 were chosen for further refinement and three-dimensional building concept designs. Site S8 re-entered at this phase because the property, which was initially off the market, became available for development. Site S11, though a strong candidate, was not selected for three-dimensional building concept design due to concerns regarding the significant costs and time involved with constructing dedicated access and exit ramps to I-587. Refer to the end of Section VIII Facility Recommended Plan for the final design schemes for sites S1 and S8.