



MEMORANDUM

TO: Gilbert LaForce, Senior Engineer, El Paso County
Elizabeth Nijkamp, Engineer Review Manager, El Paso County

FROM: Paul Brown, FHU

DATE: October 25, 2022

SUBJECT: **On-Call Contract #17-067H-1; PO # 8115428**
Traffic Impact Study Reviews
Task Order #2: Crossroads North TIA – Second Review (SP207)

This memorandum provides a list of comments on the July 2022 Crossroads North Traffic Impact Study (TIS) 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.

As background, FHU reviewed the January 2022 Crossroads North TIS earlier this year and attended a preliminary review meeting on October 19, 2022. References to these efforts are included here where appropriate.

General Comments

The following are general requirements that need to be met in the Crossroads North TIS to meet ECM requirements:

1. ECM Section B.8 requires the inclusion of an Engineer's Certification" and a "Developer's Statement". Neither of these are included in the current TIS.
2. ECM Section B.8 also requires the inclusion of impact fees. These are not included in the current TIS, although they were calculated for the January 2022 version.
3. ECM Section B3.1 requires that roadways in the County be evaluated to determine roadway classification in accordance with Table B-1. These classifications are not included in the current TIS, although they were provided in the January 2022 version.
4. The previous version of this TIS identified several design deficiencies on internal site roadways. These deficiencies are not included in the current TIS. Has the internal roadway network been updated, or do these design deficiencies remain?
5. ECM Section B.5.4 requires that mitigation measures be physically feasible. The TIS relies on 6-lane cross-sections for US 24 and Marksheffel Road but does not indicate if the applicant is dedicating sufficient ROW for these cross-sections. The TIS should outline these commitments if needed.
6. ECM Section B.4.1.C requires adequate bicycle and pedestrian amenities. The TIS does not identify pedestrian amenities along the Marksheffel Road (arterial) site frontage. We acknowledge that project-specific amenities would not be reasonable along CDOT category EX facilities. The TIS should document proposed pedestrian amenities (if any) along the arterial and within the site.

7. ECM Section B.4.1.C also requires bicycle / pedestrian links to attractions within ¼ mile of the project. The TIS does not identify connections to the secondary regional trail along SH 94 shown in the MTCP. The TIS should document a proposed connection (if any) to this regional trail.
8. ECM Section B.4.1.B requires that all access points be evaluated. The northernmost parcel shown on the site plan does not appear to have a defined access location, with no connections to US 24, SH 94, Marksheffel Road, or internal site roadways. The TIS should define access for this parcel.

Technical Report Comments

Comments on the technical report can be found in the Crossroads North TIS PDF document in Bluebeam.

Conclusions

Although there are numerous minor items that need to be addressed in the TIS, the overall analyses and conclusions are consistent with previous analyses. Many of the minor items (such as back-to-back turn bay lengths and provision of bicycle / pedestrian amenities) can be addressed during the final plat process for the site. However, several key comments remain, including provision of the Engineer's Certification and the Developer's Statement, omission of access to the northernmost parcel within the site, and clarity around roadway classifications and impact fees. Hence, we believe that the TIS should be revised and resubmitted.