



## SM ROCHA, LLC

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS

---

**TO:** CDOT Region 1  
2829 W Howard Pl  
Denver, Colorado 80204

**FROM:** SM ROCHA, LLC

**DATE:** February 26, 2020

**RE: Meadows at Highline – Aurora, CO  
Traffic Impact Study CDOT Comment Response Letter**

To Whom it May Concern,

SM ROCHA LLC is pleased to provide comment response information for the proposed Meadows at Highline development located on the south side of Colfax Avenue (US Highway 40) between Laredo Street and Norfolk street in Aurora, Colorado.

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the CDOT Staff review comments dated 2/7/2020. We have provided detailed responses to the review comments and may make revisions to the traffic impact study as necessary. We remain available to discuss further if needed. The following is a summary of comment responses:

**Traffic Comment 1:** There are following unclear traffic information needed to be verified and revised in the TIS: Speed, Auxiliary lanes, Trip distribution, Operations, Traffic forecasts.

**Comment Response:** Comment unclear. The latest version of the Traffic Impact Study dated January 2020 is believed to provide detailed analysis regarding the above items. If specific revisions are requested for any of the above areas as discussed in the study, please indicate.

**Traffic Comment 2:** No changes made on the TIS based on previous comments (Previous comments have not been fully addressed.)

**Comment Response:** Comment acknowledged. Pursuant to the CDOT comment date it appears the above comment was made in December prior to the January 2020 revised TIS. As of the latest City of Aurora review comments no further changes to the January TIS are requested. If outstanding CDOT concerns are still present, please provide additional detail.

**Traffic Comment 3:** The latest Highway Capacity Manual (6<sup>th</sup> Edition) should be used in the analysis (methodology), not HCM 2010. It supposed to be 20-year planning. Between 2021 and 2040 is only 19 years? Why?

**Comment Response:** Noted. Pursuant to the beginning of this project HCM 2010 was used as current HCM 6<sup>th</sup> Edition analysis was not readily accessible. It is noted that the HCM 2010 results are not significantly different than the HCM 6<sup>th</sup> Edition results. Should future revision to the TIS be necessary, the analysis methodology can be updated as needed. Regarding the study horizon years, Year 2040 was selected as the long-term horizon due to City of Aurora request in order to align with their 2040 transportation planning.

**Traffic Comment 4:** Figures 4 and 5 – During the AM and PM peak hours at Adjacent intersection/Colfax intersection no incoming traffic but there are outgoing traffic.

**Comment Response:** Noted. Traffic counts collected at the adjacent intersection identified zero vehicles entering the access during these periods. Therefore, no volumes are shown, nor do growth rates provide any additional trips. It is possible some trips enter at the adjacent access; however, none were observed on the day counts were collected. It is uncertain as to why specific driver behavior was observed to act as such and given this uncertainty no adjustments or assumptions could be made in the report.

**Traffic Comment 5:** What was the basis of the background traffic growth number for year 2040?

**Comment Response:** As noted on page 6 of the January TIS, the basis for background growth was an approximate 2% growth rate due to CDOT OTIS projections indicating a growth rate of less than one percent. The use of 2% is to provide for a conservative analysis and is considered typical for most developments.

**Traffic Comment 6:** Similarly, the trip distribution justification has not been described, 70% going to west Colfax and 30% east Colfax (in/out), what were the rationales?

**Comment Response:** The distribution used was largely based on the right-in/right-out only nature of the site access. It is expected that trips will adapt to this restriction and so largely approach the site from the west. Note that on page 14 of the TIS it is mentioned as part of the Trip Assignment section that given the right-in/right-out nature of the access trip distribution/assignment also assumes various U-turns will be made where appropriate.

**Traffic Comment 7:** Please consider continuous lane as an alternative of auxiliary lane.

**Comment Response:** Acknowledged. Per the January TIS, auxiliary lane analysis is to be coordinated between CDOT and the Development Team. The possibility of a continuous lane is not precluded by the TIS. If it is decided that the development team is required to provide a continuous lane the TIS may be revised to specify this decision.

**Permits Comment 1:** Appropriate to consolidate & share access with adjacent property. However, the TIS has a false premise on background traffic. The abutting property to the west has a one-way drive isle from the westernmost adjacent access, and yet the TIS figures 4 & 5 shows zero inbound traffic here. That inbound traffic circles counterclockwise around the adjacent property with over 40 parking spaces along the west property line. That additional parking circulates back to the east and primarily utilizes the new-shared access point, thus those minuscule numbers on figure 6 (& resulting LOS) within the report are suspect. Public Improvements will be assessed separately via the access permit with consideration for warrants for eastbound auxiliary lanes.

**Comment Response:** Comment acknowledged. Regarding the lack of vehicles entering the western access note that pursuant to accurately performed data collection methods vehicles do not appear to utilize the site as described. It is agreed that the site would be expected to circulate counterclockwise, however actual count data suggests otherwise. The TIS simply reports analysis findings based on these counts as collected and does not presume any specific existing adjacent site circulation patterns. As shown in the appendix, no vehicles were shown on the day of count collection to enter the site via the western site access. Resulting analysis results and LOS based on these counts are believed to be accurate.

**Permits Comment 2:** The site plan needs to show the existing center median improvements on Colfax. Aerial images of this location indicate that residents & visitors to these properties are making illegal outbound left or U-turns at the bicycle trail crossover. Both accesses are right in-out only with U-turns permitted at Norfolk. Because this area is in the COA-CDOT Contract Maintenance area, the City needs to post signs and/or install bollards in the center median to inhibit such unsafe practice. Furthermore, there is no MUTCD signs approaching the regional trail crossing of Colfax, and the City should consider posting such signs, stenciling a crosswalk, and reposition the existing twin cobra overhead street light closer to the mid-block trail crossing to improve safety.

**Comment Response:** Acknowledged. Site plan revisions to be coordinated between City Staff and Development Team. Efforts are made to include a recent version of the site plan in the TIS; however, please note that use of the site plan in the TIS is for reference/illustration only to show general site existing and proposed conditions.