



LSC TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS, INC.
2504 East Pikes Peak Avenue, Suite 304
Colorado Springs, CO 80909
(719) 633-2868
FAX (719) 633-5430
E-mail: lsc@lsctrans.com
Website: <http://www.lsctrans.com>

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 6, 2024

TO: Max Rusch, PE, PTOE, Wilson & Company

FROM: Jeffrey C. Hodsdon, P.E. - LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

SUBJECT: Esteban Rodriguez Subdivision Sketch Plan
RE: Traffic Impact Study
Response to Wilson Comments
LSC #S224630

Following are the LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. responses to the Nov 21, 2023 Comment email by Max Rusch regarding comments on the Esteban Rodriguez Subdivision Sketch Plan.

TRAFFIC COMMENTS

1. *Per ECM B.2.2., an existing conditions scenario is required in the study.*

LSC Response: An “existing” scenario has been added to the report, including figures with counts and LOS.

2. *Please detail the methodology used to forecast the future short-term and long-term volumes. Include and provide justification for background growth rate.*

LSC Response: Added to the report as requested.

3. *Provide information regarding volume contributions from each of the nearby proposed future developments that were included in the future volume forecasts. Please include relevant excerpts from their accompanying traffic studies in the appendix.*

LSC Response: The report has been updated to include this information.

4. There are inconsistencies between the Synchro models, figures, and text descriptions for the future roadway geometry. Please revise study to achieve consistency.

LSC Response: Lane geometry and LOS analysis results have been updated in Synchro, the figures, and the report narrative.

5. Intersection #3 is not included in long term analysis. Please include or address why it is left out.

LSC Response: Long-term analysis now includes the intersection of US Hwy 24/Elbert Road.

6. Please revise peak hour factors used in Synchro analysis to meet criteria from ECM B.3.

LSC Response: LSC has used Synchro's recommended PHFs, which are based on a range of vehicles/hour for each approach. These PHFs are typically more conservative than actual count data as well.

- 0 - 49 vehicles/hour = 0.78
- 50 – 149 vehicles/hour = 0.83
- 150 – 249 vehicles/hour = 0.87
- 250 – 549 vehicles/hour = 0.92
- 550 – 1,049 vehicles/hour = 0.93
- 1,050+ vehicles/hour = 0.95

7. CM B.3.requires that roadway links be analyzed. Please report ADT for each link in each scenario and determine whether the ADT falls under the acceptable traffic volume for the roadway classification.

LSC Response: Added as requested.

8. Within the auxiliary lane section, discuss existing movements that warrant auxiliary lanes. Is there the potential of operational or safety issues at any of these locations?

LSC Response: Added to the updated report. Note: "Existing" deficiencies are expected to be resolved as area development continues/proceeds. This project is currently at the Sketch Plan stage. Other nearby area development projects are farther along in the process. Improvements will either be constructed or funds will be escrowed as contributions toward improvements.

9. ECM B.5. states "When a project's vehicular impacts do not meet the minimum acceptable LOS standard, the TIS shall include feasible measures, which would mitigate the project's impacts. The mitigation measures are intended to be in addition to the minimum required improvements necessary to meet these standards." Please discuss possible interim solutions for the intersection of US-24 & Stapleton Rd to prevent the intersection from operating over capacity until a signal is constructed.

LSC Response: CDOT has indicated that this intersection is on the list of intersections programmed for signalization. Area development projects are being required to escrow funds as contribution toward signalization. The mitigation for side-street level of service at this intersection will be signalization.