



ARIZONA
TEXAS
NEW MEXICO
OKLAHOMA

March 16,2020

Margaret Haynes
NMDOT Assistant District 3 Traffic Engineer

Matthew Grush
Senior Engineer, City of Albuquerque Planning
Department

Re: Fortuna Coffee Shop TIA City of Albuquerque & NMDOT Comments

The following documents comments received from CABQ & NMDOT and responses for the Fortuna Coffee Shop TIA.

City of Albuquerque Comments:

Comment 1 - Provide evidence of an transportation easement between the property being developed and the property that borders it to the north (700 Coors Rd. and 730 Coors Rd.). This is needed if you intend to build the proposed cross-access drive shown in Figure 1, Site Plan.

Response 1: Accepted. These items have been added to the Appendix.

Comment 2 - Shared access agreement for the driveway connection to Coors Blvd from the parking lot at address 730 Coors Rd. NW as shown in Figure 5, called "Coors Blvd. Driveway". We need to know that this will be allowed by your neighbor.

Response 2: Accepted. These items have been added to the Appendix.

NMDOT Comments:

Specific Comments:

Comment 1 – Page 1 add to second sentence - NM 45 (Coors Blvd)

Response 1: NM 45 added to second sentence on page 1.

Comment 2 – Page 4 Coors is a state roadway (NM 45) and maintained by NMDOT. The signal at NM 45 and Fortuna is maintained by the COA.

Response 2: Report corrected to reflect NM 45 is NMDOT maintained roadway and signal is CABQ maintained.

Comment 3 – Page 4 it's not clear why the westbound approach cannot have protected/permissive signal phasing because of the combined through/right lane striping. Eastbound has the same lane configuration and it has protected/permissive phasing.

Response 3: Accepted with Incorrect language removed from page 4.

Comment 4 – Page 10 in the future, the traffic analysis should consist of evaluation of the peak 15 minute period with a PHF of 1.0. The 15 minute volumes may be multiplied by 4 and added to the existing traffic counts. There is no need to use peak hour when traffic counts are available in 15 minute increments. The analysis provided is acceptable in this instance but will not be in the future.

Response 4: Noted for future reports.

Comment 5 – Page 11 acceptable LOS is also defined in the SAMM for state facilities.

Response 5: Accepted with language added to page 11.

Comment 6 – Page 12 delete Table 8, redundant info on Table 10.

Response 6: Table 8 is included to show results of the existing conditions capacity analysis in the existing conditions analysis section of the report. Information is repeated in Table 10 to provide easy comparison between existing conditions and buildout conditions capacity analysis. Language added to page 14 stating the inclusion of previous data is for comparison purposes.

Comment 7 – Page 13 correct typo "Error!..."

Response 7: Corrected to figure reference.

Comment 8 – Appendix E the NB and SB through phases are coordinated but they are only analyzed as Min Recall. Does a coordinated phase not have to be set to Max Recall?

Response 8: Phase recall is not a user assignable option when phase is assigned as the coordinated phase. It is understood that the software assumes coordinated movements to operate as if Max Recall were selected. See image below.

	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT
Assigned Phase	(7)	(4)		(8)	(5)	(2)	(1)	(6)
Phase Split, s	15.4	51.7	0.0	36.3	16.5	45.1	13.2	41.8
Yellow Change, s	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.5
Red Clearance, s	0.5	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0
Minimum Green, s	3	8	6	8	3	16	3	16
Lag Phase	<input type="checkbox"/> EL	<input type="checkbox"/> ET	<input type="checkbox"/> WL	<input type="checkbox"/> WT	<input type="checkbox"/> NL	<input type="checkbox"/> NT	<input type="checkbox"/> SL	<input type="checkbox"/> ST
Passage Time, s	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Recall Mode	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Min	Off	Min
Dual Entry	<input type="checkbox"/> EL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ET	<input type="checkbox"/> WL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WT	<input type="checkbox"/> NL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NT	<input type="checkbox"/> SL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ST
Dallas/FYA Phasing	<input type="checkbox"/> E/W <input type="checkbox"/> N/S		Simultaneous Gap		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E/W <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/S			

Comment 9 – Appendix E the signal report says that this intersection was analyzed as uncoordinated yet the report says that it is coordinated?

Response 9: Signal report shows Uncoordinated option set to “No” indicating signal is operating coordinated.

Signal Information			
Cycle, s	110.0	Reference Phase	2
Offset, s	0	Reference Point	Begin
Uncoordinated	No	Simult. Gap E/W	On
Force Mode	Fixed	Simult. Gap N/S	On

Sincerely,



Jonathon Kruse, PE
Project Engineer

CC:

Brad Julian, NMDOT

Nancy Perea, NMDOT

Jeanne Wolfenbarger, CABQ

James Roeder, CABQ

Jake Palmer, Accelerated Development Services