

October 1, 2025

Jessie Gilliam, Associate Engineer
City of Rio Rancho
Development Services / Engineering
3200 Civic Center Circle NE
Rio Rancho, NM 87144

Ernest Armijo, P.E., C.F.M., Principal Engineer
City of Albuquerque Transportation Development Section
Planning Department
600 2nd St. NW
Albuquerque, NM 7102

**RE: Amaré Rio Rancho – Rio Rancho, NM
NW corner of Black Arroyo Blvd. and 19th St. in Rio Rancho, NM
Traffic Impact Study
Response to Comments #2**

Dear Ernest Armijo and Jessie Gilliam,

The Final Traffic Impact Study is being transmitted concurrently with this letter of response to comments. In reference to the correspondence with Jessie dated September 24, 2025, please find below responses addressing the comments provided:

- 1) *“The proposed Amaré Rio Rancho Development is not anticipated to have a significant adverse impact on the adjacent transportation system”*

Comment: This doesn't seem like an accurate statement. There is LOS F in the Horizon Year. (From page vii)

Response: All LOS values remain the same for both BUILD conditions when compared to the NO BUILD, except for the BUILD scenario with the Pavilion Way and Unser Blvd. access break at Black Arroyo/Unser Blvd. In that case, the LOS declined from 'C' to 'F,' which is one of the reasons it is not recommended. Therefore, the statement is true because the impact is not significant enough.

- 2) *“20% of project trips rerouted north on Unser Blvd., then left onto Wellspring Ave.”*

Comment: This feels over estimated. Drivers generally don't want to travel past their destination. (From page 7)

Response: The assumptions underlying this comment are misguided. A substantial number of drivers will pass their initial destination to reach their intended location, particularly on access-restricted roadways. Drivers tend to follow the fastest route to their destination, especially when traveling toward their residence.

- 3) *“The 2028 and 2038 AM and PM Peak Hour, NO BUILD, and both BUILD traffic volumes were calculated for each turning movement at each intersection in the study area for eight 15-minute periods. Peak Hour volumes were calculated by multiplying the peak 15-minute period by four.”*

Comment: Why was this done as opposed to just applying the MRCOG Growth Rate to existing TMC? (From page 15)

Response: We utilize current recommended method from the Highway Capacity Manual 7th edition. We did take the peak 15 minute counts and multiple them by 4 to get the peak hour flow rate. Afterward, we applied the MRCOG grow rate to forecast the TMC. This is a common practice in all traffic analysis.

4)

| PM Peak Hour | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|
| 2038 NO BUILD Conditions Volumes | 148 | 78 | 243 | 784 | 120 | 183 | 190 | 2,172 | 385 | 96 | 1,789 | 95 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.31 | 0.76 | 1.42 | 0.26 | 0.40 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 0.38 | 0.67 | 1.11 | 0.12 |
| Level-of-Service | E | E | E | F | D | D | E | D | B | E | F | B |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | 69.9 | 55.5 | 62.4 | 260.2 | 43.0 | 41.0 | 77.1 | 38.3 | 13.2 | 71.5 | 99.3 | 18.2 |
| Intersection LOS | F - 85.2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | 5.0 | 4.6 | 13.9 | 38.7 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 6.7 | 30.2 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 54.5 | 3.1 |
| 2038 BUILD Conditions Volumes | 154 | 78 | 243 | 784 | 120 | 183 | 203 | 2,172 | 385 | 96 | 1,799 | 95 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.74 | 0.31 | 0.74 | 1.42 | 0.26 | 0.41 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 0.38 | 0.67 | 1.13 | 0.12 |
| Level-of-Service | E | E | E | F | D | D | E | D | B | E | F | B |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | 69.8 | 55.5 | 60.9 | 260.2 | 43.2 | 41.2 | 78.7 | 38.3 | 13.2 | 71.5 | 105.7 | 18.3 |
| Intersection LOS | F - 87.1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | 5.1 | 4.6 | 13.7 | 38.7 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 7.3 | 30.2 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 56.3 | 3.1 |
| Proposed Lane Geometry w/ Pavilion Way | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 2038 BUILD Conditions Volumes | 154 | 78 | 243 | 784 | 120 | 183 | 210 | 2,172 | 385 | 96 | 1,796 | 98 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.74 | 0.31 | 0.74 | 1.42 | 0.26 | 0.41 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 0.38 | 0.67 | 1.13 | 0.12 |
| Level-of-Service | E | E | E | F | D | D | E | D | B | E | F | B |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | 69.8 | 55.5 | 60.2 | 260.2 | 43.2 | 41.2 | 79.6 | 38.3 | 13.2 | 71.5 | 107.0 | 18.5 |
| Intersection LOS | F - 87.4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | 5.1 | 4.6 | 13.7 | 38.7 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 7.3 | 30.2 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 56.1 | 3.2 |

Comment: Does this fit within the storage? (From page 28)

Response:

| 1: Unser Blvd. & Wellspring Ave. 2038 Conditions | EB (Wellspring Ave.) | | | WB (Wellspring Ave.) | | | NB (Unser Blvd.) | | | SB (Unser Blvd.) | | |
|---|----------------------|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|------------------|---------|------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Existing Lane Geometry | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Queuing Length (ft) | 205 | | 270 | 250 | | 430 | 300 | | 425 | 525 | | 250 |
| PM Peak Hour | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2038 NO BUILD Conditions Volumes | 148 | 78 | 243 | 784 | 120 | 183 | 190 | 2,172 | 385 | 96 | 1,789 | 95 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.31 | 0.76 | 1.42 | 0.26 | 0.40 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 0.38 | 0.67 | 1.11 | 0.12 |
| Level-of-Service | E | E | E | F | D | D | E | D | B | E | F | B |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | 69.9 | 55.5 | 62.4 | 260.2 | 43.0 | 41.0 | 77.1 | 38.3 | 13.2 | 71.5 | 99.3 | 18.2 |
| Intersection LOS | F - 85.2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | 5.0 | 4.6 | 13.9 | 38.7 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 6.7 | 30.2 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 54.5 | 3.1 |
| 95th Percentile Queue (ft) | 125.0 | 115.0 | 347.5 | 967.5 | 155.0 | 225.0 | 167.5 | 755.0 | 250.0 | 80.0 | 1,362.5 | 77.5 |
| 2038 BUILD Conditions Volumes | 154 | 78 | 243 | 784 | 120 | 183 | 203 | 2,172 | 385 | 96 | 1,799 | 95 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.74 | 0.31 | 0.74 | 1.42 | 0.26 | 0.41 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 0.38 | 0.67 | 1.13 | 0.12 |
| Level-of-Service | E | E | E | F | D | D | E | D | B | E | F | B |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | 69.8 | 55.5 | 60.9 | 260.2 | 43.2 | 41.2 | 78.7 | 38.3 | 13.2 | 71.5 | 105.7 | 18.3 |
| Intersection LOS | F - 87.1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | 5.1 | 4.6 | 13.7 | 38.7 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 7.3 | 30.2 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 56.3 | 3.1 |
| 95th Percentile Queue (ft) | 127.5 | 115.0 | 342.5 | 967.5 | 155.0 | 225.0 | 182.5 | 755.0 | 250.0 | 80.0 | 1,407.5 | 77.5 |
| Proposed Lane Geometry w/ Pavilion Way | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 2038 BUILD Conditions Volumes | 154 | 78 | 243 | 784 | 120 | 183 | 210 | 2,172 | 385 | 96 | 1,796 | 98 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.74 | 0.31 | 0.74 | 1.42 | 0.26 | 0.41 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 0.38 | 0.67 | 1.13 | 0.12 |
| Level-of-Service | E | E | E | F | D | D | E | D | B | E | F | B |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | 69.8 | 55.5 | 60.2 | 260.2 | 43.2 | 41.2 | 79.6 | 38.3 | 13.2 | 71.5 | 107.0 | 18.5 |
| Intersection LOS | F - 87.4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | 5.1 | 4.6 | 13.7 | 38.7 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 7.3 | 30.2 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 56.1 | 3.2 |
| 95th Percentile Queue (ft) | 127.5 | 115.0 | 342.5 | 967.5 | 155.0 | 225.0 | 182.5 | 755.0 | 250.0 | 80.0 | 1,402.5 | 80.0 |

A row was added to the table to show the 95th-percentile queuing in feet, as shown above. The analysis indicates that the subject project affects queues for the EB left-turn, NB left-turn, and SB through movements. The two affected left-turns are shown to fit within the available storage.

5)

| PM Peak Hour | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|----|---|-----|----|------|-------|----|------|-------|----|
| 2038 NO BUILD Conditions Volumes | 12 | 6 | 41 | 6 | 0 | 59 | 47 | 2,381 | 18 | 41 | 2,441 | 47 |
| V/C Ratio | | | | | | | 0.32 | | | 0.23 | | |
| Level-of-Service | | | | | | | E | | | D | | |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | | | | | | | 40.1 | | | 30.4 | | |
| Intersection LOS | A - 0.6 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | | | | | | | 1.3 | | | 0.8 | | |
| 2038 BUILD Conditions Volumes | 12 | 6 | 41 | 6 | 0 | 59 | 60 | 2,394 | 18 | 41 | 2,473 | 47 |
| V/C Ratio | | | | | | | 0.43 | | | 0.23 | | |
| Level-of-Service | | | | | | | E | | | D | | |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | | | | | | | 49.7 | | | 31.5 | | |
| Intersection LOS | A - 0.8 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | | | | | | | 1.9 | | | 0.9 | | |
| Proposed Lane Geometry w/ Pavilion Way | 0 | <1> | 0 | 0 | <1> | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 2038 BUILD Conditions Volumes | 12 | 6 | 41 | 6 | 0 | 59 | 60 | 2,401 | 18 | 41 | 2,473 | 47 |
| V/C Ratio | | | | | | | 0.43 | | | 0.24 | | |
| Level-of-Service | | | | | | | E | | | D | | |
| Control Delay (Seconds) | | | | | | | 49.7 | | | 32.0 | | |
| Intersection LOS | A - 0.8 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95th Percentile Queue (veh) | | | | | | | 1.9 | | | 0.9 | | |

Comment: Analysis missing. Shown for AM peak, why not PM peak? (From page 46)

Response: Synchro or HCS did not provide results for those movements due to the v/c ratio being too high. A narrative was added to this section of the report to explain this..

6) “The 2038 Horizon analysis for the Night Whisper Rd. / Summer Ridge Rd. / Unser Blvd. intersection indicates that the majority of turning movements are expected to operate at LOS “F” or lower during the 2038 AM and PM Peak Hours for both BUILD conditions. However, when compared to the NO BUILD condition, the delays increased marginally (9.7 seconds) and the LOS remained the same due to the proposed development contributing minimal traffic to these movements.”

Comment: Up to City to accept this. (From page 47)

Response: As the intersection falls within the jurisdiction of the City of Albuquerque, it is within their authority to approve or disapprove, and they did not raise any objections during their initial review.

7) “The 2038 Horizon analysis for the McMahon Blvd. / Milky Way St. demonstrates that the majority of turning movements are expected to operate at a LOS “D” or better during the 2038 AM and PM Peak Hour for both BUILD conditions. The northbound through

movement on Milky Way St. is expected to operate at a LOS “F” during both peak periods. However, when compared to the NO BUILD condition, the delays increased marginally (less than a second) due to the proposed development contributing minimal traffic to these movements. Additionally, the 95th Percentile queues are all reasonable”

Comment: Again, is the City OK with LOS F regardless of development contributing?(From page 55)

Response: As the intersection falls within the jurisdiction of the City of Albuquerque, it is within their authority to approve or disapprove, and they did not raise any objections during their initial review.

- 8) “In conclusion, the improvements at the three study intersections are marginal, with all continuing to operate at LOS “E” or lower. As such, no mitigation measures are recommended, and the access break is not warranted.”

Comment: Assuming these are non-signalized. Were signal warrants evaluated at these potential median breaks? (From page 73)

Response: As the intersection falls within the jurisdiction of the City of Albuquerque, it is within their authority to approve or disapprove. Per conversation with Ernest Armijo on October 1, 2025, the City of Albuquerque will not support a median break at Unser and Black Arroyo nor will it entertain a signal at Night Whisper and Unser. Please see attached PDF.

- 9) “In summary, while cut-through traffic is expected to present an operational issue immediately following project implementation, the analysis indicates that the condition is likely to diminish over time and no recommendations for mitigations are made.”

Comment: Is there any research to backup this claim that cut-through will diminish? (From page 75)

Response: The trip assignment data indicates that traffic volumes will diminish. Historically, drivers tend to migrate to the fastest route or the one with the least wait time. As delays increase, drivers are likely to shift to alternate, faster routes.

10) “Access Break:

An access break at Black Arroyo Blvd. / Unser Blvd. is neither warranted nor recommended. While cut-through traffic is expected to create operational challenges immediately following project implementation, the analysis suggests that these impacts will diminish over time. Accordingly, no cut-through mitigation measures are recommended.”

Comment:. Should evaluate access break for a signal warrant and then determine if LOS is still failing. (From page 84)

Response: As the intersection falls within the jurisdiction of the City of Albuquerque, it is within their authority to approve or disapprove. Per conversation with Ernest Armijo on October 1, 2025, the City of Albuquerque will not support a median break at Unser and Black Arroyo nor will it entertain a signal at Night Whisper and Unser. Please see attached PDF.

Please call me if you have any additional comments or questions regarding the responses presented, pertaining to the subject of the traffic impact study.

Sincerely,



Terry O. Brown, P.E.

JN: 20240037
RRB/JL/TB

Enclosure/s: Verdot Rio Rancho Final Traffic Impact Study
Response to CoRR full list of comment that was marked on the draft TIS

Jacob Liberman

From: Armijo, Ernest M. <earmijo@cabq.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 8:09 AM
To: Terry Brown
Cc: Ron Bohannon; Jacob Liberman
Subject: RE: [#2024037] - Verdot - Rio Rancho

Terry,

I concur with your statements. The City will not support a median break at Unser and Black Arroyo nor will it entertain a signal at Night Whisper and Unser.

Thanks,



ERNEST ARMIJO, P.E., C.F.M.

principal engineer

transportation

o 505.924.3991

e earmijo@cabq.gov

cabq.gov/planning

From: Terry Brown <tbrown@tierrawestllc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 7:12 PM
To: Armijo, Ernest M. <earmijo@cabq.gov>
Cc: Ron Bohannon <rbr@tierrawestllc.com>; Jacob Liberman <jliberman@tierrawestllc.com>
Subject: [#2024037] - Verdot - Rio Rancho

Ernest,

This e-mail is to document our telephone discussion yesterday. During our telephone conversation, I informed you that the City of Rio Rancho had provided comments for the Subject Verdot (Amare) Development TIS that included:

- 1) Suggestion that a signal warrant analysis be prepared for the intersection of Night Whisper Rd. / Unser Blvd. and Black Arroyo Blvd. / Unser Blvd.
- 2) Suggestion that an access break (i.e., median break) be considered at the existing right-in, right-out unsignalized intersection of Black Arroyo Blvd. / Unser Blvd.

Early conversations with Curtis Cherne initially considered a median break on Unser at Black Arroyo Blvd., but he quickly changed his stance and strongly opposed any median break on Unser Blvd. at Black Arroyo Blvd. Based on most of the later conversations with Curits, I concluded that the City of Albuquerque would not support a median break at Black Arroyo Blvd.

Also, it is my opinion that there will be no consideration of signalization of Night Whisper Rd. / Unser Blvd. since it is only about 1,150 feet north of the signal at McMahon Blvd. / Unser Blvd. The City of Albuquerque would be opposed to signalization of the intersection of Night Whisper Rd. / Unser Blvd. due primarily to signal spacing issues.

Please let me know if you concur with my statements in this e-mail or if you would make corrections.

Thanks,

Terry Brown
(505) 270-6981 - cell