



January 13, 2023

Brian Zurek  
First Cup  
106 S Kyrene Road, Suite 2  
Chandler, Arizona 85226

**RE: Review Comment Responses / Owl Place Commercial  
El Paso County, Colorado**

Dear Brian,

SM ROCHA LLC is pleased to provide comment response information for the proposed Owl Place Commercial development. This development is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Meridian Road with Owl Place in El Paso County, Colorado.

The purpose of this letter is to respond to review comments provided by Felsburg Holt & Ullevig (FHU) made to the September 2022 version of the Traffic Impact Study and dated November 28, 2022 (2<sup>nd</sup> Review). We have provided detailed responses to the review comments and made revisions to the Traffic Impact Study where applicable. We remain available to discuss further if needed.

The following is a summary of comment responses:

**FHU General Comment 1:** The TIS adequately describes the site and proposed access points, existing conditions, anticipated site trip generation, and street classifications.

**Comment Response:** Noted.

**FHU General Comment 2:** Background forecasts for two future years, 2024 and 2040, are provided. The traffic assignment appropriately accounts for pass-by traffic, and the LOS analyses of existing, background, and total traffic conditions generally follow industry standard methods. Synchro HCM output for signalized intersection analyses have been added since the June submittal.

**Comment Response:** Noted.

**FHU General Comment 3:** The TIS now includes a brief review of pedestrian and bicycle facilities but does not address the following evaluation elements per ECM Section B2.4.2B (Full TIS):

- a. Sight distance evaluation
- b. Recommended taper/deceleration/storage lengths for turn lane improvements
- c. Safety and accident analysis
- d. Neighborhood/public input

**Comment Response:** Comment Acknowledged.

- a. General horizontal site distance information has been added.
- b. A general summary of auxiliary lane design lengths has been added.
- c. A general discussion of safety is included in the provided Pedestrian Circulation & Safety Analysis in Section VI of the TIS. However, due to the conceptual nature of the site plan proposed, details needed for requested analyses are unknown at this time. Additional details and assessments are expected to follow with later development applications for actual land uses.
- d. As previously stated in prior responses, it is understood that this project has not yet been through any neighborhood meetings or public hearings allowing for public input. As such, neighborhood/public input cannot be addressed in the TIS at this time.

**FHU General Comment 4:** Although signal coordination data has been added to the TIS, the signal progression bandwidth requirements in ECM Section B4.1.B are not discussed. Also, the signal offsets shown in Appendix C (Capacity Worksheets) do not reflect the offsets in Appendix A (Signal Timing Information) despite the text on page 7 stating a desire to “remain consistent with existing signal coordination plans.” The progression analysis should be updated and results documented in the TIS.

**Comment Response:** Synchro modeling has been updated to reflect the latest available signal timing information. It is to be noted that Section B4.1.B of the ECM is primarily associated with new traffic signals, and bandwidth discussions are to be provided when associated with signalization of a site access and where a reduction is identified. Given that no new signalization is proposed with this development, no discussion of bandwidth is provided. Additionally, given the conceptual nature of the site plan, this level of analysis is considered not applicable for a rezone application.

**FHU General Comment 5:** The TIS does not include pedestrian and bicycle LOS results per ECM Section B4.1.C.

**Comment Response:** Pursuant to previous responses pedestrian and bicycle LOS is not provided since the development does not exist and no data is available indicating significant presence of either pedestrians or bicycles within the study area. Additionally, Section B.4.1 indicates an impact evaluation of pedestrian and bicycle traffic is only to be included if specific issues are identified. As previously noted, due to the conceptual nature of the proposed site plan, the requested analysis cannot be performed.

**FHU General Comment 6:** A Recommended Improvements Summary Table and related improvement responsibilities have been incorporated since the June submittal.

**Comment Response:** Noted.

**FHU General Comment 7:** The Engineer's Statement and Developer's Statement have been provided on the certification page, but they have not been executed.

**Comment Response:** Noted. Final signatures to be added upon TIS acceptance.

**FHU Technical Comment 1:** Figure 2, the Site Plan, shows that three driveways along the north-south spine roadway are anticipated. This is likely an improvement when compared to the site plan presented in the previous TIS. However, these accesses have not been analyzed for traffic volumes, LOS, or queuing. Potential queuing into the northernmost driveway from Lot 1 or Lot 2 could impact traffic operations at the access road intersection at Owl Place (Access A).

**Comment Response:** Operational analysis of specific lot access locations added to revised TIS.

**FHU Technical Comment 2:** The year 2040 LOS analyses identify unacceptable projected operational levels at Meridian Road/Woodmen Road (signalized). On pages 15 (background conditions) and 25 (total traffic conditions) it is suggested that widening of Woodmen Road and/or future network connectivity may help mitigate congestion at these intersections. The MTCP does identify conversion of Woodmen Road to an expressway in the study area, but with a 4-lane cross-section (not 6 lanes as assumed in the TIS). The TIS puts the onus of monitoring conditions and determining any future improvements on County staff. This report should evaluate and identify potential mitigation and make appropriate recommendations for this intersection.

**Comment Response:** Potential mitigation methods already provided in text of report on page 15. However, additional analysis added to further discuss projected LOS results on implementation of roadway improvements.

**FHU Technical Comment 3:** The year 2040 LOS analyses identify unacceptable projected operational levels at Meridian Road/Eastonville Road (signalized) under total traffic conditions (page 25). This is attributable to the project, as acceptable operations are identified under background conditions (page 15). The text describes several options to address these shortfalls. This report should evaluate the various options and make appropriate recommendations for this intersection.

**Comment Response:** Additional details regarding proposed mitigation options provided. However, it is emphasized that due to the conceptual nature of the proposed land uses, mitigation measures are subject to change and are expected to be evaluated further in more detail upon actual site plan development. As such, this level of analysis is considered not applicable for a rezone application but may be considered in detail as actual land uses are defined.