(719) 633-2868

FAX (719) 633-5430
E-mail: Isc@lsctrans.com
Website: http://www.Isctrans.com

ACCEPTED for FILE
Engineering Review
03/29/2023 2:41:32 PM
Elizabeth Nijkamp, PE
EPC Department of Public Works

# Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9 Traffic Impact Analysis PCD File No. SF-21-36 <br> (LSC \#S214500) <br> September 21, 2022 

## Traffic Engineer's Statement

This traffic report and supporting information were prepared under my responsible charge and they comport with the standard of care. So far as is consistent with the standard of care, said report was prepared in general conformance with the criteria established by the County for traffic reports.


## Developer's Statement

I, the Developer, have read and will comply with all commitments made on my behalf within this report.

, Manager
9/22/22
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LSC TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS, INC.
2504 East Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
(719) 633-2868

FAX (719) 633-5430
E-mail: Isc@Isctrans.com
Website: http://www.Isctrans.com

September 21, 2022
BRJM c/o
Mr. Robert C. Irwin
P.O. Box 60069

Colorado Springs, CO 80960-0069

Dear Mr. Irwin:

In response to your request, LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has prepared this traffic impact analysis for the proposed Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9. As shown in Figure 1, the site is located generally southwest of the intersection of Eastonville Road and Latigo Boulevard in El Paso County, Colorado.

## REPORT CONTENTS

This report is being prepared as part of a submittal to El Paso County. The report identifies the traffic impacts of the proposed residential development and presents recommendations for the transportation system. The report contains the following:

- The existing roadway and traffic conditions in the site's vicinity, including the roadway widths, lane geometries, and traffic controls, etc.;
- The peak-hour turning-movement traffic counts at key intersections in the vicinity of the site;
- The average week-day and peak-hour vehicle trips to be generated by the site;
- The assignment of these trips to the area streets, roadways, and intersections;
- Projections of long-term background traffic volumes;
- Resulting total traffic volumes on the area roadways;
- The projected levels of service at key intersections the vicinity of the site; and
- The recommended transportation system, including functional classification of streets and roadways, number of lanes, intersection lane geometry/auxiliary turn lanes, and intersection traffic control.


## PREVIOUS TRAFFIC REPORTS COMPLETED IN THE AREA

Appendix Table 1 contains a list of other traffic studies in the study area completed within the past five years (that LSC is aware of). This study accounts for the land use, trip generation, and the roadway network included in these studies.

## LAND USE AND ACCESS

## Land Use and Access

Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9 is planned to each be developed with 39 lots for single-family homes. Initially, access is proposed to Latigo Boulevard at the intersections of Oregon Wagon Trail, Lonesome Pine Trail, and Ponca Canyon Trail via the existing road system. In the future, a more direct connection to Eastonville Road would be available through the future development areas located east of the currently-proposed filing to an intersection (Conestoga Trail South) about 5,080 feet south of Latigo Boulevard and about 3,020 feet north of the future alignment of Rex Road. Figure 2 shows the site context map with the proposed Filing No. 9 lot layout.

## Sight Distance

The entering sight distance at the future intersection of Conestoga Trail South/Eastonville was measured to be greater than 1,000 feet to the north and about 410 feet to the south. Based on the criteria contained in Table 2-21 of the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) and the design speed of 50 miles per hour ( mph ) (posted speed limit of 45 mph ), the required intersection sight distance is 555 feet. Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority (PPRTA)-funded improvements are anticipated on this section of Eastonville Road. The sight distance to the south is currently restricted by the existing vertical profile of Eastonville Road. It is anticipated that with the PPRTA improvements, the sight distance would meet ECM standards, provided vegetation, landscaping, fencing, walls, etc. are kept clear of the corner sight distance.

## Pedestrian Access

There is a planned 30 -foot pedestrian facility extending north/south through the development, which will extend to the property's south boundary and be connected to the Meridian Ranch pedestrian circulation system to provide access to the schools. Sidewalks are not required within Latigo Trails as the roadways are "rural" rather than "urban."

Regarding pedestrian facilities planned within the adjacent Meridian Ranch development to the south, school pedestrian plans were provided with the adjacent Estates at Rolling Hills Ranch and Rolling Hills Ranch at Meridian Ranch Filing Nos. 1 through 3. As preliminary plans/final plats are prepared in the neighboring Meridian Ranch Sketch Plan amendment areas, LSC anticipates that pedestrian connectively will be addressed. Note: it is our understanding that sidewalks will be provided adjacent to all local streets within the future development areas within Meridian Ranch
to the south and on both the north and south sides of Rex Road between Estates Ridge Drive and Eastonville Road.

## ROADWAY AND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

## Area Roadways

The major area roadways within and adjacent to Meridian Ranch are described below. Copies of the 2016 El Paso County Major Transportation Corridors Plan (MTCP) 2040 Roadway Plan and 2016 MTCP 2060 Corridor Preservation Plan with the site location identified on them have been attached to this report.

Meridian Road extends north from South Blaney Road to County Line Road. The posted speed limit on Meridian Road in the vicinity of Latigo Boulevard is 55 miles per hour (mph). Meridian Road is shown on the EI Paso County MTCP as a four-lane Principal Arterial south of Rex Road, a four-lane Minor Arterial north of Rex Road, and a two-lane Minor Arterial north of Murphy Road.

Latigo Boulevard is a two-lane Collector extending east from Meridian Road to Elbert Road. The posted speed limit is 45 mph .

Eastonville Road is a two-lane roadway extending northeast from Meridian Road past Hodgen Road. It has a gravel surface and a posted speed limit of 45 mph north of Londonderry Drive. Eastonville Road is shown as a two-lane Minor Arterial on the MTCP. The section north of Stapleton Drive has been identified as a two-lane Rural Minor Arterial on the 2016 MTCP. The Conceptual Design Report Eastonville Road Project prepared by Wilson \& Company Inc. in April 2021 shows a future urban cross section (curb \& gutter) with one through lane in each direction, painted center median for left-turn lanes at intersections, and six-foot paved outside shoulders between Meridian Road and Latigo Boulevard. The segment between Rex Road and Latigo Boulevard is identified as part of Phase 2 of the project. Phase 1 of the project is currently in the planning and preliminary design stage.

## Existing Traffic Volumes

Figure 3 shows the peak-hour traffic volumes at the study-area intersections from the attached traffic counts conducted by LSC in June 2021.

## Existing Levels of Service

Level of service (LOS) is a quantitative measure of the level of delay at an intersection. Level of service is indicated on a scale from "A" to "F." LOS A represents control delay of less than 10 seconds for unsignalized and signalized intersections. LOS F represents control delay of more than 50 seconds for unsignalized intersections and more than 80 seconds for signalized intersections. Table 1 shows the level of service delay ranges.

Table 1: Level of Service Delay Ranges

| Level of Service | Signalized Intersections | Unsignalized Intersections |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Control Delay <br> (seconds per vehicle) | Average Control Delay <br> (seconds per vehicle) ${ }^{(\mathbf{1})}$ |
| A | 10.0 sec or less | 10.0 sec or less |
| B | $10.1-20.0 \mathrm{sec}$ | $10.1-15.0 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| C | $20.1-35.0 \mathrm{sec}$ | $15.1-25.0 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| D | $35.1-55.0 \mathrm{sec}$ | $25.1-35.0 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| E | $55.1-80.0 \mathrm{sec}$ | $35.1-50.0 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| F | 80.1 sec or more | 50.1 sec or more |

(1) For unsignalized intersections, if $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio is greater than 1.0 the level of service is LOS F, regardless of the projected average control delay per vehicle.

Figure 3 presents the results of the existing intersection level of service analysis. The levels of service are based on the unsignalized method of analysis procedures from the Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition by the Transportation Research Board. The level of service reports are attached.

The intersections of Latigo/Oregon Wagon, Latigo/Lonesome Pine, Latigo/Ponca Canyon, and Latigo/Eastonville are currently two-way, stop-sign controlled. All movements at these intersections are currently operating at LOS A during the morning peak hour and LOS B during the afternoon peak hour.

## BACKGROUND TRAFFIC

Background traffic is the traffic estimated to be on the study-area streets without consideration of the land uses within the Amendment area. It includes through traffic and traffic generated by adjacent/nearby developments, including future Latigo filings shown in Figure 2. An appendix trip-generation table (attached) shows the estimated future trips to be generated by these future Latigo filings, which have been included in the future background traffic volumes.

Figure 4 shows the projected 2041 background traffic volumes. The 2041 background traffic volumes assume buildout of the Latigo Preserve, Meridian Ranch, Grandview Reserve, and Waterbury developments but assume no traffic generated by the currently-proposed Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9. Appendix Table 2 shows trip-generation estimate due to future Latigo Preserve filings. As shown in Appendix Table 2, 138 additional single-family homes beyond those currently proposed for Filing No. 9 are planned within the Latigo Preserve development. The 2041 background traffic volumes also assume the parcels located north of Rex Road and east of Eastonville Road are developed with $21 / 2$ acre lots similar to those currently proposed for Latigo Preserve. The 2041 background volumes may be conservative as there are currently no known plans for these parcels and the El Paso County 2016 Major Transportation Corridors Plan Update only shows 400 vehicles per day on Latigo Boulevard east of Eastonville Road by 2040.

## TRIP GENERATION

The trip-generation estimates for Filing No. 9 are based on nationally published trip-generation rates from Trip Generation, 11th Edition, 2021 by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Table 2 shows the results of the trip-generation estimates.

Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9 is expected to generate about 368 vehicle trips on the average weekday, with about half entering and half exiting the site during a 24 -hour period. During the morning peak hour, which generally occurs for one hour between 6:30 a.m. and 8:30 a.m., about 7 vehicles would enter and 20 vehicles would exit the site. During the afternoon peak hour, which generally occurs for one hour between $4: 15$ p.m. and 6:15 p.m., about 23 vehicles would enter and 14 vehicles would exit the site.

## TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

## Trip Distribution

The directional distribution of the traffic volumes to be generated by the site on the area roadways is an important factor in determining the traffic impacts. Figure 5 shows the directional-distribution estimate for the trips estimated to be generated by the site. The estimates were based on the following factors: the location of the site with respect to nearby residential, employment, commercial, and activity centers and the balance of the Colorado Springs metropolitan area; the land-use types; the internal/external street and roadway system serving the site; and the existing traffic counts.

The short-term distribution estimate is based on the existing road network and the long-term distribution assumes buildout of the area road network, including the extension of Rex Road from its existing terminus to US Highway 24.

## Assignment of Site-Generated Trips

When the estimated Filing No. 9 site trips (from Table 2) are directionally distributed according to the LSC-estimated percentages shown in Figure 5 and assigned/routed on the internal and area road network (according to LSC estimates), the resulting projected site-generated traffic volumes can be determined.

Figure 6 shows the projected short-term traffic volumes at the key area intersections due to Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9. The short-term estimates assume Latigo Preserve will only have access to the intersections of Latigo/Oregon Wagon, Latigo/Lonesome Pine, and Latigo/Ponca Canyon via the existing road network.

Figure 7 shows the projected long-term traffic volumes at the key area intersections due to Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9. The long-term estimates assume Latigo Preserve will have access through the future filing areas to the south and east to Eastonville Road.

## TOTAL TRAFFIC

Figure 8 shows the sum of the existing traffic volumes (from Figure 3) and the short-term amendment-area-generated traffic volumes (from Figure 6).

Figure 9 shows the projected 2041 total traffic volumes at the area intersections. These volumes are the sum of the 2041 background traffic volumes (from Figure 4) and the long-term site-generated traffic volumes (from Figure 7).

## PROJECTED LEVELS OF SERVICE

The key area intersections and access points were analyzed to determine the projected levels of service for the existing-plus-site-generated and 2041 background and total traffic volumes, based on the unsignalized-intersection analysis procedures from the Highway Capacity Manual and the signalized-intersection analysis procedures from the Synchro computer program. Figures 4, 8, and 9 show the level of service analysis results. The level of service reports are attached.

## Eastonville Road/Latigo Boulevard

The intersection of Latigo/Meridian is currently two-way, stop-sign controlled. All movements at this intersection are projected to continue to operate at LOS A during peak hours with the addition of site-generated traffic. By 2041, it was assumed that Eastonville Road would be improved to a Minor Arterial cross section and that northbound and southbound left-turn lanes would be constructed approaching Latigo Boulevard. Based on the 2041 traffic volumes and lane geometry shown in Figure 9, all movements at this intersection are projected to operate at LOS B or better during the peak hours.

## Latigo Boulevard Access Points

The intersections of Latigo/Oregon Wagon, Latigo/Lonesome Pine, and Latigo/Ponca Canyon are currently two-way, stop-sign controlled. All movements at these intersections are projected to continue to operate at LOS A during the peak hours with the addition of site-generated traffic. By 2041, all movements at these intersections are projected to operate at LOS B or better during the peak hours.

## Eastonville Road/Conestoga Trail South Intersection (Future)

The future intersection of Eastonville Road/Conestoga Trail South is projected to operate at LOS B or better during the peak hours for all movements, based on the projected 2041 total traffic volumes and lane geometry shown in Figure 8.

## FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS

Figure 10 shows the recommended functional classifications for the roadways within the site and in the vicinity. The functional classifications are consistent with the current El Paso County MTCP, with the exception of the potential urban cross section for Eastonville.

## ROAD IMPROVEMENT FEE PROGRAM

This project will be required to participate in the El Paso County Road Improvement Fee Program. Latigo Preserve Filings No. 9 will join the ten-mil PID. The ten-mil PID building permit fee portion associated with this option is $\$ 1,221$ per single-family dwelling unit. The total building permit fee would be $\$ 47,619$ for the 39 lots within Filing No. 9.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9 is expected to generate about 368 vehicle trips on the average weekday, with about half entering and half exiting the site during a 24 -hour period. During the morning peak hour, about 7 vehicles would enter and 20 vehicles would exit the site. During the afternoon peak hour, about 23 vehicles would enter and 14 vehicles would exit the site.
- All of the study-area intersections are projected to operate at a satisfactory level of service (LOS D or better) through 2041 as two-way, stop-sign-controlled intersections.
- Table 3 presents an updated version of the roadway improvements table.
- Based on the traffic volumes shown in Figure 8, no additional auxiliary lane improvements are anticipated to be required with the addition of site-generated traffic (short-term total traffic). Figure 9 shows (for reference and for purposes of the LOS analysis) assumed potential future auxiliary turn lanes at the intersection of Eastonville Road/Latigo Boulevard. Laneage at this intersection will likely be addressed with Phase 2 of the PPRTA Eastonville project or with future area development (as applicable). Figure 9 also shows a potential future northbound left-turn lane at the Eastonville/Conestoga Trail intersection (future), the need and timing of which will be addressed with the future filing which will be to the east of Filing 9.
- Eastonville Road is currently non-paved (gravel) north of Londonderry Drive. Based on the estimated existing average weekday traffic volume of 480 vehicles per day south of Latigo Boulevard and the criteria contained in the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), this roadway currently exceeds the County ECM threshold for roadway paving. The section of Eastonville Road between Rex Road (future) and Latigo Boulevard was identified as Phase 2 in the Eastonville Road Project Conceptual Design Report by Wilson \& Company, dated April 2021. That report recommended, for Phases 1 and 2, a proposed Urban cross section including one through lane in each direction, a striped center median for left turns, six-foot outside shoulders and a detached sidewalk. However, as the segment between Rex Road and Latigo Boulevard is identified as part of Phase 2 (future) of the project. El Paso County staff in the review comments indicated a requirement to pave Eastonville Road (please refer to comments for details). Please refer to the attached
revised Table 3 and the responses to the staff comments (separate document). Also, please refer to the attached letters by BRJM, LLC and Flynn\& Wright, LLC.

$$
* \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad *
$$

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this report.
Sincerely,
LSC TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS, INC.
By Jeffrey C. Hodsdon, P.E. Principal

JCH/KDF:jas
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Table 2 and 3


| Table 3 <br> Roadway Improvements Table Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hem \# | Improvement | SegmentAdaditional Details | Trigger | Timing | Responsibility |
| Roadway Segment Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Eastonville Road <br> Upgrade to Urban Minor Arterial w/custom cross section. | Snaflie Bit Road to Rex Road | Average daily traffic > 200 vehicles per day (for the gravel portion)(ECM); >300* vpd (fee study trigger) | Under Design | PPRTA/EI Paso County; and/or others as per any agreements with EI Paso County. |
| 2 | Eastonville Road Roadway Paving | Rex Road to Latigo Boulevard | Average daily traffic > 200 vehicles per day (ECM); $>300^{*}$ vpd (fee study trigger) | existing deficiency | The applicant/owner response: Applicant is seeking approval for a final plat on Filing 9 only. Therefore, only improvements concerning Filing 9 will be addressed in this Traffic Impact Study. Future improvements must be addressed at the time of future final plat submittals and <br> Applicant is under no obligation to provide any cross section [for an interim paved roadway] and will not provide one. <br> LSC Response with Suggested Possible Solution: Filing 9 cannot possibly complete a paved, two-lane Eastonville road from Rex north to Latigo Boulevard. LSC will suggest to the owner, a potential fair-share cost sharing option(s) for its consideration. This would likely be in the form of a proposed fair share escrow amount for Filing No. 9 only. We could potentially calculate fair share percentage for initial paving of Eastonville (this item) or a share of the final upgraded urban minor arterial roadway (Item 3). |
| 3 | Eastonville Road - <br> upgrade to Urban Minor Arteria (Future phase of Eastonville PPRTA Project) | Rex Road to Latigo Boulevard | 6,000* vpd | TBD | The applicant/owner response: Applicant is under no legal obligation to pave or improve Eastonville. Filing 9 does not directly access Eastonville and sufficient access exits to accommodate Filing 9's traffic. <br> LSC Response with Suggested Possible Solution: Filing 9 cannot possibly complete an improved Eastonville to the ultimate Urban Minor Arterial cross section from Rex north to Latigo Boulevard (in order to obtain fee program credit). LSC will suggest to the owner, a potential pro-rata cost sharing option(s) for its consideration. This would likely be in the form of a possible fair share escrow amount for Filing No. 9 only. We could potentially calculate fair share percentage for initial paving of Eastonville (ltem 2) or a share of the final upgraded urban minor arterial roadway (this item). |
| 4 | Lonesome Pine Trail, Conestoga Trail N and other unpaved segments of roadway within the overall subdivision. | Unpaved Segments | Once average daily traffic $>200$ vehicles per day; (ECM); $>300^{*}$ vpd (fee study trigger) | existing deficiency | The applicant/owner response: Applicant is seeking approval for a final plat on Filing 9 only. Therefore, only improvements concerning Filing 9 will be addressed in this Traffic Impact Study. Future improvements must be addressed at the time of future final plat submittals. <br> Applicant is under no legal obligation to pave any internal roads outside of Filing 9. Existing unpaved roads were designed to accommodate an equestrian use, and Applicant will not frustrate that purpose. <br> LSC Suggested Possible Solution: LSC has discussed these improvements briefly with EPC staff (Mr. Laforce). LSC will review the paving policy in the ECM suggest to the owner, a potential fair-share cost sharing option(s) for internal roadway paving for its consideration. This would likely be in the form of a possible fair share escrow amount for Filing No. 9 only. OR it could involve actual paving of a portion/individial segment of existing road at an equivalent fair share cost. |
| Latigo Boulevard/Eastonville Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Auxiliary Turn Lane Improvement/ Participation in Future Improvements | Auxiliary turn lanes as required in the future based on ECM Criteria | Left Turns >25 vph; <br> Right Turns $>50 \mathrm{vph}$ | Future | The applicant/owner response: Applicant is seeking approval for a final plat on Filing 9 only. Therefore, only improvements concerning Filing 9 will be addressed in this Traffic Impact Study. Future improvements must be addressed at the time of future final plat submittals. <br> LSC Response with Suggested Possible Solution: It would be reasonable to defer any consideration of overall Latigo Trails participation in or construction of future turn lanes at this intersection to Filings beyond Filing 9 . The rationalle is that this filing is situated in the southwest corner of the development, such that the majority of site-generated traffic would not pass through the Eastonville/Latigo intersection given the existing street connections north to Latigo Boulevard and the planned future Conestoga Trail street connection to Eastonville Road. <br> Notes: Regarding future auxiliary turn lanes at this intersection, future improvements are planned to be included with a PPRTA project as the proposed cross section identified in the Eastonville Road Project Conceptual Design Report by Wilson \& Company, dated April 2021 for this section of Eastonville Road includes a center two- way left-turn lane. However, this section of Eastonville Road is not included in the initial phase of that project. If this improvement is reauired prior to the county PPRTA project, participation or perhaps construction of turn lanes (with the potential for a fee program credit, once constructed, if determined to be an "eligible improvement") may be the responsibility of Latigo Trails (overall) OR future filings may be requred to escrow a pro rata share toward the cost of the improvements if needed in advance of a potential PPRTA funded public project. ALTERNATIVELY, a deviation could potentially be submitted to waive the left turn lane due to low north/south through trafic volumes. |
| Conestoga Trail South/Eastonville Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Auxiliary Turn Lane Improvements/Participation in Future Turn Lane Improvements | Auxiliary Turn lanes, as required, for Construct northbound left-turn lane on astonvilie Rd. approaching Conestoga Trail South | northbound left-turn volume > 25 | With future Latigo Trails Filings making the connection to Eastonville Road | The applicant/owner response: Applicant is seeking approval for a final plat on Filing 9 only. Therefore, only improvements concerning Filing 9 will be addressed in this Traffic Impact Study. Future improvements must be addressed at the time of future final plat submittals. <br> LSC Response with Suggested Possible Resolution: No intersection will be constructed with Filing No. 9. Although Filing No. 9 traffic will use this access in the future, if constructed in the future, this improvement could be part of the approval of the Latigo Trails filings making the connection to Eastonville Road. |
| *These thresholds are utilized in the Fee Study for determination of inclusie Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (September 21, 2022) |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Traffic Counts

## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909

```
719-633-2868
```

File Name : Eastonville Rd - Latigo Blvd AM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/9/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Eastonville Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Westbound |  |  |  |  | Eastonville Rd Northbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | $\mathbf{R}$ | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 06:30 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| 06:45 AM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 10 |
| Total | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 20 |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| 07:30 AM | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| Total | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 13 | 35 |
| 08:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| Grand Total | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 28 | 75 |
| Apprch \% | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0 | 0 |  | 28.6 | 71.4 | 0 | 0 |  | 86.4 | 9.1 | 4.5 | 0 |  | 0 | 21.4 | 78.6 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 2.7 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 9.3 | 25.3 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 0 | 29.3 | 0 | 8 | 29.3 | 0 | 37.3 |  |

## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Eastonville Rd - Latigo Blvd AM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/9/2021
Page No : 3


## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Eastonville Rd - Latigo Blvd PM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/9/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Eastonville Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Westbound |  |  |  |  | Eastonville Rd Northbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start <br> Time | L | T | $\mathbf{R}$ | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| Total | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 48 |
| 05:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 15 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| 05:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| Total | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 55 |
| Grand Total | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 20 | 17 | 9 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 103 |
| Apprch \% | 11.1 | 77.8 | 11.1 | 0 |  | 26.1 | 56.5 | 17.4 | 0 |  | 43.5 | 37 | 19.6 | 0 |  | 0 | 64 | 36 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 1 | 6.8 | 1 | 0 | 8.7 | 5.8 | 12.6 | 3.9 | 0 | 22.3 | 19.4 | 16.5 | 8.7 | 0 | 44.7 | 0 | 15.5 | 8.7 | 0 | 24.3 |  |

## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Eastonville Rd - Latigo Blvd PM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/9/2021
Page No : 3


## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Oregon Wagon Tr - Latigo Blvd AM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/17/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Westbound |  |  |  |  | Oregon Wagon Tr Northbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | $\mathbf{R}$ | U | App. Total | L | T | $\mathbf{R}$ | U | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 06:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| 06:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 14 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 12 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 59 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 15 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 31 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 0 | 32 | 114 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 98 | 0 | 0 |  | 96.9 | 0 | 3.1 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 | 25 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 43.9 | 27.2 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 28.1 | 0 | 21.1 | 7 | 0 | 28.1 |  |

## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Oregon Wagon Tr - Latigo Blvd AM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/17/2021
Page No : 3


## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Oregon Wagon Tr - Latigo Blvd PM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/16/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Westbound |  |  |  |  | Oregon Wagon Tr Northbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 15 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 19 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 20 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 29 | 15 | 0 | 44 | 66 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 20 | 27 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 25 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 29 |
| 05:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 22 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 46 | 20 | 0 | 66 | 103 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 75 | 35 | 0 | 110 | 169 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 90.9 | 0 | 9.1 | 0 |  | 0 | 68.2 | 31.8 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21.9 | 0 | 0 | 21.9 | 11.8 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 44.4 | 20.7 | 0 | 65.1 |  |

## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Oregon Wagon Tr - Latigo Blvd PM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/16/2021
Page No : 3


## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Lonesome Pine Tr - Latigo Blvd AM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/17/2021
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Bank 1


## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Lonesome Pine Tr - Latigo Blvd AM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/17/2021
Page No : 3


## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Lonesome Pine Tr - Latigo Blvd PM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/16/2021
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Bank 1

|  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Westbound |  |  |  |  | Lonesome Pine Tr Northbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | $\mathbf{R}$ | U | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 14 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 05:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 18 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 32 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 87.5 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21.9 | 0 | 3.1 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 75 |  |

## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Lonesome Pine Tr - Latigo Blvd PM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/16/2021
Page No : 3


## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Ponca Canyon Rd - Latigo Blvd AM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/9/2021
Page No : 1

| Groups Printed- Bank 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Westbound |  |  |  |  | Ponca Canyon Tr <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start <br> Time | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 06:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 06:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 32 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 23 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 60 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 59 | 0 | 41 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23.3 | 38.3 | 0 | 26.7 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 11.7 | 0 | 11.7 |  |

## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Ponca Canyon Rd - Latigo Blvd AM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/9/2021
Page No : 3


## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Ponca Canyon Rd - Latigo Blvd PM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/9/2021
Page No : 1

| Groups Printed- Bank 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Westbound |  |  |  |  | Ponca Canyon Rd Northbound |  |  |  |  | Latigo Blvd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start <br> Time | L | T | R | $\mathbf{U}$ | App. Total | L | T | R | U | App. Total | L | T | $\mathbf{R}$ | U | App. Total | L | T | $\mathbf{R}$ | U | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 25 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 05:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 25 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 50 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 58.3 | 0 | 41.7 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 14 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 48 |  |

## LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

2504 E Pikes Peak Ave, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
719-633-2868

File Name : Ponca Canyon Rd - Latigo Blvd PM
Site Code : S214500
Start Date : 6/9/2021
Page No : 3


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $T$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 4 | 1 | 30 | 20 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 4 | 1 | 30 | 20 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 71 | 71 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 5 | 1 | 38 | 28 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $T$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 3 | 1 | 26 | 5 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 3 | 1 | 26 | 5 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 42 | 42 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 4 | 1 | 33 | 12 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | 1 | 个 | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 14 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 14 | 10 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 215 | 225 | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 67 | 67 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 21 | 15 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 46 | 20 | 0 | 22 | 14 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 46 | 20 | 0 | 22 | 14 | 1 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 59 | 26 | 0 | 28 | 18 | 1 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 32 | 15 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 32 | 15 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 41 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 75 | 51 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 51 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 24 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.12 |  | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.218 | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | , | 1544 | - | 928 | 1017 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 971 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 999 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1544 | - | 928 | 1017 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 928 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 971 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 999 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0 |  | 8.9 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL WBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 928 | - | - | 1544 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.004 | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 8.9 | - | - | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | 个 | MF |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 18 | 14 | 10 | 15 | 4 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 18 | 14 | 10 | 15 | 4 | 5 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 215 | 225 | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 67 | 67 | 75 | 75 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 26 | 20 | 15 | 22 | 5 | 7 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 78 | 26 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 26 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 52 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.12 |  | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.218 | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | , | 1562 | - | 925 | 1050 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 997 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 970 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1562 | - | 916 | 1050 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 916 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 997 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 960 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 2.9 |  | 8.7 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL WBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 986 | - | - | 1562 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.012 | - | - | 0.01 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 8.7 | - | - | 7.3 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 10 | 13 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 10 | 13 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 78 | 78 | 78 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 13 | 17 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 27 | 13 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\mathbf{T}$ | MF |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 10 | 7 | 1 | 37 | 30 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 10 | 7 | 1 | 37 | 30 | 1 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 71 | 71 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 9 | 1 | 47 | 42 | 1 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | A | r |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 5 | 1 | 26 | 12 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 5 | 1 | 26 | 12 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 42 | 42 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 8 | 6 | 1 | 33 | 29 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 1 | 个 | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 215 | 225 | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 67 | 67 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 8 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 21 | 21 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 43 | 8 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 8 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 35 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.12 | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | -2.218 | -3.518 | 3.318 |  |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1612 | - | 968 | 1074 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 1015 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 987 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1612 | - | 962 | 1074 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 962 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 1015 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 981 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 2.5 | 8.7 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | A |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1015 | - | -1612 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.041 | - | -0.006 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | - | - | 7.2 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | 0 | - |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | A | r |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 53 | 31 | 2 | 26 | 20 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 53 | 31 | 2 | 26 | 20 | 2 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 78 | 78 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 68 | 40 | 3 | 33 | 26 | 3 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 个 | $\mathbf{r}$ | 1 | 4 | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 19 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 4 | 8 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 19 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 4 | 8 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 215 | 225 | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 67 | 67 | 75 | 75 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 28 | 20 | 22 | 25 | 5 | 11 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 63 | 6 | 1 | 166 | 26 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 63 | 6 | 1 | 166 | 26 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 67 | 6 | 1 | 177 | 28 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 60 | 3 | 1 | 162 | 5 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 60 | 3 | 1 | 162 | 5 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 64 | 3 | 1 | 172 | 5 | 0 |







| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 519 | 331 | 332 | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 331 | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 188 | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.5 | 0.3 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1227 | -679 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.005 | -0.036 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.9 | -10.5 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | 0.1 | - |
| (ven | - |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \& |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 10 | 131 | 40 | 17 | 85 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 6 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 10 | 131 | 40 | 17 | 85 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 6 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | 225 | - | 215 | 225 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 11 | 139 | 43 | 18 | 90 | 6 | 21 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 6 |  |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 724 | 284 | 286 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 284 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 440 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 393 | 755 | 1276 | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 764 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 649 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 387 | 755 | 1276 | - | - | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 492 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 752 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 649 | - | - | - | - | - |  |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.4 | 0.4 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1276 | -682 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.017 | -0.023 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.9 | -10.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | $B$ | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - |
| (ven |  |  |  |  |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 60 | 4 | 1 | 161 | 9 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 60 | 4 | 1 | 161 | 9 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 64 | 4 | 1 | 171 | 10 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | * |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 49 | 7 | 8 | 116 | 2 | 36 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 9 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 49 | 7 | 8 | 116 | 2 | 36 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 9 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | 225 | - | 215 | 225 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 3 | 52 | 7 | 9 | 123 | 2 | 38 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 10 |  |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |












| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 748 | 286 | 290 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 286 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 462 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 380 | 753 | 1272 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 763 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 634 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 371 | 753 | 1272 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 479 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 744 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 634 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.5 |  | 0.6 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBL | NBT EBLn1 |  | SBT | SBR |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1272 | - | 682 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.025 | - | 0.034 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.9 | - | 10.5 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - | - |

## MTCP Maps



Map 14: 2040 Roadway Plan (Classification and Lanes)


## Appendix Table 1

| Appendix Table 1 <br> Area Traffic Impact Studies by LSC Latigo Preserve Fil 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Study | Date |
| Meridian Ranch |  |
| Meridian Ranch Sketch Plan TIA | April 11, 2011 |
| Meridian Ranch Filing 11 Updated TIA | November 26, 2013 |
| Stonebridge at Meridian Ranch Filing No. 1 Updated TIA | April 23, 2014 |
| Stonebridge at Meridian Ranch Transportation Memorandum | July 28, 2015 |
| Meridian Ranch Filing 8 Updated TIA | December 23, 2014 |
| Meridian Ranch Filing 9 Updated TIA | May 21, 2015 |
| Meridian Ranch Sketch Plan 2015 Amendment TIA | July 30, 2015 |
| The Vistas at Meridian Ranch TIA | March 24, 2016 |
| Meridian Ranch Estates Filing No. 2 Transportation Memorandum | August 27, 2015 |
| The Vistas at Meridian Ranch Updated Transportation Memorandum | June 20, 2017 |
| Londonderry Drive Pedestrian Operations and Safety Study | February 8, 2017 |
| Stonebridge Filing 3 at Meridian Ranch Updated TIA | March 20, 2017 |
| Meridian Ranch Sketch Plan 2017 Amendment TIA | October 3, 2017 |
| WindingWalk at Meridian Ranch and The Enclave at Stonebridge at Meridian Ranch Updated Traffic Impact Analysis | May 10, 2018 |
| Rolling Hills Ranch at Meridian Ranch PUDSP Traffic Impact Analysis | June 29, 2020 |
| The Estates at Rolling Hills Ranch Filing No. 1 Traffic Impact Analysis | May 13, 2020 |
| Rolling Hills Ranch at Meridian Ranch Filing No. 1 Traffic Impact Analysis | July 14, 2020 |
| The Estates at Rolling Hills Ranch Filing No. 2 Traffic Impact Study | October 8, 2020 |
| Rolling Hills Ranch at Meridian Ranch Filing No. 2 Transportation Memorandum | December 29, 2020 |
| Rolling Hills Ranch at Meridian Ranch Filing No. 3 Transportation Memorandum | March 22, 2021 |
| Meridian Ranch Sketch Plan 2021 Amendment Traffic Impact Analysis | May 4, 2021 |
| Grandview Reserve |  |
| Grandview Reserve Updated Master TIA | December 5, 2020 |
| Grandview Reserve Phase 1 TIA | August 12, 2021 |
| Waterbury/4-Way Ranch |  |
| Waterbury PUD Development Plan Updated TIA | January 10, 2013 |
| Waterbury Filing Nos. 1 and 2 TIA | September 28, 2021 |
| Meadowlake Ranch |  |
| Meadowlake Ranch Traffic Impact Analysis | May 29, 2019 |
| Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (March 2022) |  |



## BRJM, LLC

17 S. Wahsatch Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

## DELIVERED VIA EMAIL

January 28, 2022
Ms. Elizabeth Nijkamp, P.E.
Mr. Gilbert LaForce, P.E.
El Paso County Development Services
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, CO 80910
RE: Latigo Trails, Filing Numbers 9 and 10, Eastonville Road
Dear Ms. Nijkamp and Mr. LaForce:
In the comments to the submitted Traffic Impact Study by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. dated October 13, 2021, for the above-referenced filings, the County had conditioned approval of the final plats on the construction of a three-lane urban collector on Eastonville Road from Latigo Blvd. to Rex Road (the location of which remains ambiguous). On January 4, 2022, Jeff Hodsdon, LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC), Bryan Law, JR Engineering (JR), Bill Guman and Ed Morgan, Guman \& Associates (Guman), and I, a manager of the developing entity, BRJM, LLC (BRJM), met with you (County) to discuss the condition. At the close of the meeting, the County asked BRJM to propose an alternative.

After the meeting, BRJM tasked LSC and JR to provide BRJM a sketch of a cross section of Eastonville Road and the cost of the segment of the improvement from the future Conestoga Trail South intersection to Rex Road. The approximate cost equaled $\$ 1,432,722.00$ with the Rex Road intersection projected to be located north of the ballpark fields on the west side of Eastonville Road. This estimate would likely need revisions.

As I mentioned in our meeting, I had questioned whether Latigo Trails Filing 9 or 10 had a roughly proportionate impact on Eastonville Road to justify the condition. Once BRJM had the cost information, it requested LSC to determine Latigo Trails Filings 9 and 10's impact on Eastonville Road. Latigo Trails Filing 9's Short-Term impact is 9.2\%, and Latigo Trails Filing 10's Short-Term impact is 10.1\%. The LongTerm impact is even less. The Short-Term impact was calculated assuming the Conestoga Trail South intersection was not constructed while the Long-Term impact was calculated assuming it was built. Please see attached Exhibits A and B.

For a jurisdiction to condition approvals on an exaction of this nature, the project's impact on the public expense must be "roughly proportional" to the cost imposed on the developer. Because our impact is minimal, it does not satisfy the roughly proportional requirement, regardless of cost. Moreover, it is BRJM's understanding that the County Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) was specifically designed and implemented to address these situations. To BRJM's knowledge, Eastonville Road is listed as an improvement for this program (and/or for the Regional Transportation Authority).

BRJM retained Bruce Wright, an attorney with Flynn \& Wright, LLC, and asked him if the County had the legal right to condition Latigo Trails Filing 9 or 10 upon the construction of Eastonville Road. Upon review, Mr. Wright advises us that the County has no legal basis to condition any approval for Latigo Trails Filing 9 or 10 on the construction or improvement of Eastonville Road. Additionally, Mr. Wright advised BRJM that future filings could not be conditioned presently.

Given Latigo Trails Filing 9's or 10's minimal impact on Eastonville Road and per the advice of counsel, BRJM cannot justify the assumption of the responsibility of satisfying the County's request to improve Eastonville Road, regardless of size or nature. Latigo Trails Filings 9 and 10's Traffic Impact Fee covers its fair share.

BRJM will resubmit its applications for Latigo Trails Filings 9 and 10 within weeks. The resubmitted TIS will reference this letter in response to the County's comments on Eastonville Road and will ask the County to contact Bruce Wright with any questions it might have.

If you wish to meet to discuss BRJM's decision, please contact Bill Guman to schedule a time, and we will be pleased to meet with you.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.
Sincerely,


Robert C. Irwin, Manager

CC:
Bruce Wright, Flynn Wright, \& Fredman
Jeff Hodsdon, LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Bryan Law, JR Engineering
Bill Guman, Guman \& Associates
Ed Morgan, Guman \& Associates

| Percent Impacts <br> Eastonville Road South of the future Conestoga Trail Latigo Trails Filings 9 and 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario/ | Average Daily Traffic |  |
| Traffic Source | Vehicles per day | \% of Total |
| Short-Term |  |  |
| Existing Traffic | 480 | 80.7\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 9 (site) | 55 | 9.2\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 10 (site) | 60 | 10.1\% |
| Total | 595 | 100\% |
| Long-Term |  |  |
| Existing Traffic | 480 | 7.2\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 9 (site) | 140 | 2.1\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 10 (site) | 155 | 2.3\% |
| Future Background Traffic | 5850 | 88.3\% |
| Total | 6625 | 100\% |
| Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. |  | 01/25 |


| Percent Impacts <br> Eastonville Road South of Latigo Blvd. Latigo Trails Filings 9 and 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario/ | Average Daily Traffic |  |
| Traffic Source | day | \% of Total |
| Short-Term |  |  |
| Existing Traffic | 480 | 80.7\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 9 (site) | 55 | 9.2\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 10 (site) | 60 | 10.1\% |
| Total | 595 | 100\% |
| Long-Term |  |  |
| Existing Traffic | 480 | 13.1\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 9 (site) | 40 | 1.1\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 10 (site) | 35 | 1.0\% |
| Other Background Traffic | 3110 | 84.9\% |
| Total | 3665 | 100\% |
| Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, |  | 01/2 |

Flynn \& Wright Letter, LLC Letter dated August 31, 2022


TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS, INC.

# FLYNN \& WRIGHT, LLc <br> ATTORNEYS AT LAW 

PLAZA OF THE ROCKIES, SUITE 202
111 SOUTH TEJON
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903

BRUCE M. WRIGHT
(719) 578-8444

August 31, 2022

Via Email and U.S. Mail<br>(KennyHodges@)elpasoco.com)

Kenneth R. Hodges
El Paso County Attorney
200 South Cascade Avenue, Suite 150
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2208
Re: Latigo Preserve / Eastonville Road

## Dear Mr. Hodges:

This office represents BRJM, LLC, which is in the process of platting Latigo Preserve Filing No. 9 (the "Plat"). County Staff is requiring that the developer improve existing Eastonville Road to County standard from the existing Latigo Boulevard to the proposed intersection with Rex Road as a condition of approving the Plat.

The Plat is for 39 single-family residential lots, which will have minimal impact on the existing traffic on Eastonville Road. Enclosed is an analysis by LSC Transportation Consultants of the traffic impact of the Plat (as well as a possible future Filing No. 9, which may or may not be proposed in the future). ${ }^{1}$ As you can see, the Plat is projected to add $10.1 \%$ of the existing Eastonville Road traffic, or 60 trips per day. Eastonville Road currently has an average of 480 trips per day. To put this into perspective, on average, the additional traffic from the development per the Plat will result in one additional car on Eastonville every 24 minutes, a de-minimis impact. Additionally, the County currently classifies Eastonville Road as "deficient." Imposing an obligation to correct an existing deficiency on a development which has such a de-minimis impact is a clear violation of the constitutional "rough proportionality" legal requirement.

This is no trivial matter. The estimated cost for partial construction of the Rural Minor Arterial (including sidewalk) from Latigo Boulevard to the proposed intersection with Rex Road is $\$ 7,200,000$. If the road is fully built, the cost substantially increases. It is fiscally impossible for a 39 lot subdivision to support this kind of off-site cost on top of normal subdivision improvement costs. The possibility of future reimbursement from the County's Road Impact Fee (which is problematic as indicated below) does not alleviate the fiscal impossibility of imposing this kind of obligation on the Plat.

[^0]Kenneth R. Hodges
El Paso County Attorney
August 31, 2022
Page 2

Since reimbursement of disproportionate road costs from the County's Road Impact Fee is discretionary with the BOCC and then is on a "first-in-line basis," and with the current number of larger developments being processed in El Paso County in the Falcon area, there is no certainty as to when reimbursement might be made and, given that reimbursement amounts do not accrue interest, the present value of any potential reimbursement could be substantially less than what is legally required to compensate the excess cost incurred. Additionally, Staff has indicated that reimbursement for a partially built road is discretionary at best.

This is exactly the kind of situation the BOCC intended to alleviate when it enacted the Traffic Impact Fee, as stated in the El Paso County Colorado Road Impact Fee Implementation Document (FINAL 2016), "This Road Impact Fee is simply a method of more fairly and equitably allocating the impact of new development and recovering the cost than individually negotiated developer agreements."

In short, the Plat should be required to pay the existing Traffic Impact Fee which was expressly intended to fairly allocate traffic improvement costs among all new developments in El Pas County.

The purpose of this letter is to give you a "heads-up" that if the County insists on imposing the exaction of improving Eastonville Road on this 39 lot Plat, it will be challenged in court as a constitutional taking.

Obviously, we would prefer that not occur. Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss this situation in greater detail.

Sincerely,
Bruce Wright

BRUCE M. WRIGHT

BMW/gad
Enclosure
cc: Robert Irwin, BRJM, LLC
Jeff Hodsdon, LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Bill Guman, William Guman \& Associates, Ltd.

## Exhibit B

| Percent Impacts <br> Eastonville Road South of Latigo Blvd. Latigo Trails Filings 9 and 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario/ | Average Daily Traffic |  |
| Traffic Source | day | \% of Total |
| Short-Term |  |  |
| Existing Traffic | 480 | 80.7\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 9 (site) | 55 | 9.2\% |
| Latigo Trails filing 10 (site) | 60 | 10.1\% |
| Total | 595 | 100\% |
| Long-Term |  |  |
| Existing Traffic | 480 | 13.1\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 9 (site) | 40 | 1.1\% |
| Latigo Trails Filing 10 (site) | 35 | 1.0\% |
| Other Background Traffic | 3110 | 84.9\% |
| Total | 3665 | 100\% |
| Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. |  | 01/2 |


[^0]:    1 Please note that Filing 10 is now Filing 9 and Filing 9 is now Filing 10, which were changed at County Staff's request.

