E17D079 TIS discussion 6-6-24

Curtis Cherne

1. Show the Pan American Frontage Rd N.
2. The Subaru/ Cadillac dealership uses the road along the southern edge of this site. This plan appears to cut them off.
3. Paragraph 1.3.1 references Figure 2 to show the proposed driveways, but it appears to be Figure 7. Figure 2 is the “Existing roadway Network.
4. In Figure 7,show the frontage road on the west side of the development .
5. Figure 7. Garcia dealership uses Pan American NE. This site plan changes it from an access raod to a parking lot. Discuss changes to Garcia automotive
6. Paragraph 3.3.6.2> Seem sthis should be Pan American Fwy East rather than Pan American Fwy West.

Crashes 275 5 years is high- not at nodes IT does not eqial PDO plus Injury fatal.

Failure to yiled is a high reason Remove left permissive on San Mateo.

Node 1: 92

Node 2: 194

Node 3: 65

Historic volumes obtained from NMDOT rather than from MRCOG.

San mateo east of pan am eat 49,000 daily volume=- getting close to saturated-LOS D?

.

1. Table 2: Pass by Trips OK for San Mateo, but should not be applied to Pan American NE, as there is currently no traffic on it.
2. HFIN hs the segment of San Mateo fronting this property as “Above 2X Mean”. Actually form Pan American west to Jefferson all Above 2X- this project may not change it. Does carsh dat warrant a right turn lane?
3. When platting you will need a wiaver for no sidewalk along san mateo frontage.
4. Ped crossing san mateo on west side of Pan MAerican NE.
5. Add sidewalk on south side of Osuna from Pan American fwy west to existing sidewalk
6. Site Trip gen: what companies are porpsoed for the fast food w/ drive thru? They also both have doiuble drive thrus’s. I think the trip gen may be low. Plan on higher.
7. Add the southbound I25 to east bond san mateo to Figure 8.
8. Do we need to widen San mateo west of Pan Marican pl for eastbound and westbound?
9. P. 26- Access Sesign REecomendations\_ “..Ownership of Pan American NE ROW east of San Mateo….”. I think you mean “west” of san mateo.
10. Have back-ups/poor LOS on he site rather than o n San Mateo/pan American NE.
11. P.26 489’ wide driveway is not good for pedestrians. Still should have 3 lanes but they don’t need to be 1’ wide each.
12. P.27- cmmt 3-include eval with next revision of study
13. P.27 #6- Add sidewalk on south side of Osuna from Pan American fwy west to existing sidewalk
14. P. 27 for peds to walk to the south side of Osuan from I25 to Jefferson, they would cross san mateo on the north side of the intersection, walk west, then cross Osuna (south) at Pan American Fwy West, then walk west on the south side of Osuna Blvd. Basically the sidewalk that isn’t getting built on this projecgts San Mateo frntogae will get built ontgh south side of OSuan west of I25.
15. P. 27 6.d- This won’t eliminate conflicts with SBR traffic as peds will walk south across Pan American, which may be worse, due to reduced visibility. Remove 6.d.
16. P.27 Don’t want midblock pedestrian crossing across Pan AMercan NE. Also the Figure 2 is Figure 7. Remove #7.
17. P. 27 #8 prefer longer queues on corss-streets rathern than on San Mateo.

Stopped review at appendx- p. 41 or so.