



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Elizabeth Nijkamp, Engineer Review Manager, El Paso County

**FROM:** Melanie Bishop and Paul Brown, FHU

**DATE:** 12/30/21

**SUBJECT:** **On-Call Contract #17-067H-1; PO # 8113073**  
**Traffic Impact Study Reviews**  
**Task Order #3: Grand Reserve TIA Review**








This memorandum provides a list of comments on the Grandview Reserve TIA based on requirements provided in the County's Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), Appendix B.

### Comments


Comments on the TIA are divided into general requirements to conform to ECM TIA report requirements and technical and report specific comments that request further clarification or missing information.

#### General Comments

The following are general requirements that need to be met in the TIA to meet ECM requirements:

1. Please provide a brief "Project Description" with following:
  - a. Type of land uses
  - b. Size of proposed project
  - c. Phasing expectations
2. The ECM requires a safety/accident analysis. Please provide a safety review or a brief statement that a safety review is not appropriate.
3. In the total traffic operation results, discuss whether unacceptable LOS is a result from traffic generated by the proposed development.
4. Clearly state in the narrative what the ADT/AADT is on the roads for all analysis scenarios (info provided in figures).
5. State heavy vehicles percentage used in the report text.
6. Previous Grandview Reserve studies have included a level of service summary table. Please include here to simplify comparisons between versions.
7. State whether or not any improvements affected by the project are reimbursable under the current MTCF.

#### Technical Report Comments

Comments on the technical report can be found in the Grandview Reserve TIS PDF document in Bluebeam.

### Conclusions









Based on the comments above, we feel that the subject TIA should be updated and resubmitted. The revised study should clarify analysis years / scenarios, factors and adjustments applied, and better define the resulting project commitments.

# LSC Responses to Traffic Review Consultant Letter Comments

---

Page: 1

---

	Number: 1	Author: kdferrin	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 3/4/2022 19:16:49
	LSC Response: The Land Use section on page 2 of the report has been expanded to included the additional requested information			
	Number: 2	Author: kdferrin	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 3/7/2022 15:16:21
	LSC Response: Safety/accident analysis has been added to the updated TIS as requested.			
	Number: 3	Author: kdferrin	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 3/4/2022 20:54:41
	LSC Response: The additional information has been provided as requested.			
	Number: 4	Author: kdferrin	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 3/4/2022 20:29:03
	LSC Response: The additional information has been included in the text as requested.			
	Number: 5	Author: kdferrin	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 3/4/2022 19:29:33
	LSC Response: The additional information has been included in the report text as requested			
	Number: 6	Author: kdferrin	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 3/4/2022 19:29:57
	LSC Response: Level of Service tables have been included in the updated TIS as requested			
	Number: 7	Author: kdferrin	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 3/8/2022 15:08:12
	<b>LSC Response: A section has been added to the report to address this comment.</b>			
	Number: 8	Author: kdferrin	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 3/4/2022 19:30:32
	LSC Response: See our responses in that document			