



SM ROCHA, LLC

TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING

April 17, 2026

Maria Lancto
El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

**RE: Review Comment Responses / 12057 Highway 24 Multifamily Rezone
El Paso County, Colorado**

Dear Maria,

SM ROCHA, LLC is pleased to provide comment response information for the proposed development entitled 12057 Highway 24 Multifamily Rezone. This development is located to the northeast corner of U.S. Highway 24 and Meridian Road in El Paso County, Colorado.

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the County Staff review comments (1st Review). We have provided detailed responses to the review comments and made revisions to the Traffic Impact Study. We remain available to discuss further if needed. The following is a summary of comment responses:

County Comment 1: revise to Master traffic Impact Study

Comment Response: Title not updated, per Section B.1.1.A of El Paso County's ECM, this development doesn't meet the definition of a Master TIS and instead meets the definition of an Individual Site TIS and Full TIS.

County Comment 2: Insert "PCD Number P264".

Comment Response: PCD File Number added to the report.

County Comment 3: Please clarify from whom?

Comment Response: Clarification Added.

County Comment 4: Use "Urban - Minor Arterial DIVIDED"

Comment Response: Discussion updated, please know that divided is not part of the roadway classification. Instead text has been updated to indicate the roadway is divided.

County Comment 5: Include classification "Urban - Principal Arterial".

Comment Response: Please verify review comment, within the study area, the El Paso County MTCP indicates that E Woodmen Road provides an expressway classification.

County Comment 6: identify why Meridian and woodmen and Rolling Thunder/Meridian Road where not included in the study area. If thresholds per criteria are not met, then please state that.

Comment Response: The Meridian Road intersections with Rolling Thunder Way and Woodmen Road were not included as this development is not expected to affect these intersections by 10 percent or greater. Discussion added to the report.

County Comment 7: This appears low in comparison to other traffic studies in the area. Please be sure to account for other developments in the area specifically Falcon Field development at Woodmen/Hwy 24 (PCD File No. SP232, SF2435). Update the analysis as necessary.

Comment Response: Falcon Field development added, please know that due to EDARP limitations it is difficult to find every study within a certain development area. If further traffic studies are requested to be considered, please provide where necessary.

County Comment 8: this will be a 4 leg intersection with the falcon field project. Revise accordingly

Comment Response: Study updated to match the Falcon Fields traffic study.

County Comment 9: please also include Hwy 24/Old Meridian intersection.

Comment Response: As discussed on Page 7 this intersection operates as a free-flow movement and is not expected to experience any delay. Nonetheless, this intersection has been added to all Intersection Capacity tables.

County Comment 10: identify if acceleration lanes are required.

Comment Response: Discussion updated.

County Comment 11: The analysis shows that they are needed. This TIS is setting the stage for the future traffic studies and recommended improvements are needed. The conceptual nature is understood and the TIS will need to be updated with more specifics as the the development progresses.

Comment Response: Comment acknowledged.

County Comment 12: include the Hwy 24/old meridian road intersection in your analysis.

Comment Response: As discussed on Page 7 this intersection operates as a free-flow movement and is not expected to experience any delay. Nonetheless, this intersection has been added to all Intersection Capacity tables.

County Comment 13: include the north eastbound right turn from Hwy 24 into the development.

Comment Response: This movement is a free-flow movement and does not experience any delay. Nonetheless, movement added.

County Comment 14: Appendix B.8. If an intersection does not meet LOS D or better, discuss what steps can be taken to bring the intersection to a satisfactory level. Please provide the steps that can be taken to bring the intersection to a satisfactory level.

Comment Response: Mitigation provided, however considering the conceptual nature of the development, as noted, no mitigations are recommended at this time

County Comment 15: please update based on the added background of the area developments.

Comment Response: Report updated as necessary.