

To: Paul Brown
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig

From: Max Rusch, P.E.
Galloway

Date: 6/20/2023

Re: **Comment Response to 6/6/2023 Comments**

This memorandum serves as a comment response to the comments provided by FHU on 6/6/2023 in response to the “Owl Place Storage Traffic Impact Study”, submitted on 4/21/2023. The received comments and the accompanying responses are located below.

PREVIOUS COMMENTS

Comment #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.

Response: Noted

Comment #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.

Response: Noted

Comment #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.

Response: Noted

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment #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.

Response: Noted

Comment #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.

Response: Noted



Comment #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.

Response: The text in the report has been reworded to specify that the applicant will provided these improvements.

Comment #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.

Response: Noted

Comment #8. The Engineer's Statement and Developer's Statement have been provided and executed per ECM Section B.8

Response: Noted

TECHINCAL REPORT COMMENTS

Comment #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.

Response: Noted. Since this comment specifies that these do not need to be addressed unless the TIS is significantly revised, the analysis was not updated per this comment.

Comment #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.

Response: The report has been updated to note the limitation in making Meridian Rd a 6-lane highway.

Comment #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.

Response: The report has been updated to discuss this limitation in spacing.

Comment #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).

Response: Noted. The tables have been updated to reflect the storage lengths shown in the aerial images.

The "Owl Place Storage Traffic Impact Study" has been updated to address the received comments. The findings and recommendations of the report remain the same.

If you have any questions or would like additional information please contact me at maxrusch@gallowayus.com or 303.770.8884