



MEMORANDUM

TO: Gilbert LaForce, Senior Engineer, El Paso County

FROM: Paul Brown, PE, PTOE, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig

DATE: June 6, 2023

SUBJECT: El Paso County Development Reviews; PO # 8115428
Owl Place (Meridian) Storage Rezone Traffic Impact Study (CS224)
Second Review

This memorandum includes a list of comments on the April 2023 Owl Place Storage Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by Galloway & Company, Inc. for Meridian Storage, LLC. These comments are based on our past review, Galloway's responses to our comments, and requirements provided in the County's Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), Appendix B.

Comments

Comments on the TIS are divided into previous comments, general requirements to conform to ECM requirements, and technical report comments that request further clarification or missing information.

Previous Comments

Galloway provided a detailed comment response memorandum dated April 21, 2023 that reflects previous comments on the TIS. We accept these responses, with the following caveats:

1. Comment #14 (bicycle and pedestrian evaluation): We concur that the evaluation has been provided, per the response memo. See our general comments on the bicycle and pedestrian evaluation below.
2. Comment #15, Comment #42 (progression analysis): We concur that an evaluation has been provided, per the response memo. See our technical comments on the progression analysis below.
3. Comment #20, Comment #65 (queue spillback along Eastonville Road between Meridian Road and Meridian Park Drive): We concur with the conclusion reached regarding spillback into the roundabout. See our additional comments on this segment of Eastonville Road below.

General Comments

The following general requirements need to be addressed in the Owl Place Commercial TIS to meet ECM requirements:

4. The revised TIS adequately describes the site, proposed access points, and anticipated site trip generation and distribution. It also includes an update to the county-requested analysis of a maximum development scenario.
5. The revised study adequately describes and evaluates existing conditions and future conditions per ECM Section B.3.1. and B.3.2. The operational analyses of existing, background, and total traffic conditions were conducted using accepted tools per ECM Section B.3.1.B. Improvement responsibilities have been incorporated per ECM Section B.6.

6. The revised TIS includes a pedestrian and bicycle evaluation per ECM Section B.4.1.C. The conclusion that the applicant does not need to provide connectivity to regional bicycle and pedestrian facilities is reasonable given the information presented. However, the applicant is still required to provide sidewalks along Meridian Park Drive through the project site per the site plan in Appendix A and ECM roadway design requirements. The conclusion should be reworded to not exclude these on-site elements.
7. A review of signal progression along Meridian Road is provided in the revised TIS. However, the presented materials do not reflect a detailed progression analysis as required by ECM Section B.4.1.B. Given the limited trip generation associated with the planned development, we are willing to accept the progression review as presented. Refer to technical report comments below for further clarification.
8. The Engineer's Statement and Developer's Statement have been provided and executed per ECM Section B.8

Technical Report Comments

Specific concerns with the technical report are as follows:

9. Although we have agreed to accept the progression data presented in the TIS, the following items should be addressed if the TIS is significantly revised.
 - a. There is no documentation of how existing offsets were determined (Meridian at Woodmen and at Bent Grass)
 - b. When a signal is added to a corridor (Meridian at Eastonville), offsets need to be recalculated. Synchro provides offset optimization tools; other software can also be used.
 - c. When signal timings are optimized, offsets should also be adjusted. Without this second step, resulting bandwidths can vary widely. We believe some future year bandwidths are small (less than 5 seconds) because this optimization has not been performed.
10. The projected need for a 6-lane cross-section along Meridian Road in the TIS is not consistent with the El Paso County Major Transportation Corridors Plan (MTCP). We understand that this need is not driven by project traffic volumes, but the TIS text should note this limitation.
11. The background recommended mitigations presented at Meridian Road and Eatonville Road intersection indicate the need for a northbound to westbound left turn lane (Section IV, page 25). As noted in comments on the original TIS, the spacing along Eastonville Road between Meridian Road and the new roundabout at Meridian Park Drive is very limited. In addition to previously mentioned eastbound queue length issues, the northbound to westbound double left turn lane will require modifications to the roundabout and/or the westbound approach lanes. Although this improvement is not the developer's responsibility, it should be noted in the TIS.
12. Various existing turn pocket lengths shown in Table 4-2 for the Meridian Road and Eatonville Road intersection do not match recent aerials of Eastonville Road in Google Earth. Please update (also carries into Table 6-2 and Table 7-2).
13. We have provided various minor technical comments in the County's Bluebeam session established for this review.

Conclusions

The subject report should be revised to address the comments above. We believe that the revisions will not affect the conclusions of the study, and that the revised TIS may be submitted for approval.