

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 24, 2019

TO: Kari Parsons, PCD-Project Manager

FROM: Jeff Rice, PCD-Engineering

SUBJECT: SKP-18-006 – The Ranch  
First Submittal

---

### **Engineering Division**

Planning and Community Development (PCD)-Engineering reviews plans and reports to ensure general conformance with El Paso County standards and criteria. The project engineer is responsible for compliance with all applicable criteria, including other governmental regulations. Notwithstanding anything depicted in the plans in words or graphic representation, all design and construction related to roads, storm drainage and erosion control shall conform to the standards and requirements of the most recent version of the relevant adopted El Paso County standards, including the Land Development Code (LDC), the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), the Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM), and the Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 2 (DCM2). Any deviations from regulations and standards must be requested, and approved by the ECM Administrator, in writing. Any modifications necessary to meet overlooked criteria after-the-fact will be entirely the developer's responsibility to rectify.

A written response to all comments and redlines is required for review of the re-submittal. Please arrange a meeting between the developer's team and County staff to review and discuss these comments and prepared revisions/responses prior to the next submittal.

**Due to the volume and complexity of these comments and the additional information and details required in the plans and reports, Staff will provide additional, more detailed comments on the next submittal.**

### Sketch Plan / General

1. See Sketch Plan redlines.  
**RESPONSE: addressed.**
2. Label roads as existing/proposed.  
**RESPONSE: Addressed**
3. Provide the proposed conceptual Stapleton/Briargate cross-section for the proposed 150-foot right-of-way. If the right-of-way is non-standard, a deviation request is required at the Preliminary Plan stage (or before).  
**RESPONSE: Added based on standard 4-lane principal arterial cross-section with wider median at variable width.**
4. Regarding Briargate/Stapleton naming, until a decision has been made approving the street name, label the proposed road as both, "Stapleton/Briargate".  
**RESPONSE: Amended on plan and in LOI.**

### Transportation / Traffic Impact Memorandum

1. See TIS redlines.  
**RESPONSE: See separate response to TIS redlines.**
2. Ensure that all ECM TIS report requirements are met, including B.4.1.C and D, B.5.7.B, and B.8.

RESPONSE: These elements have been added to the reports as requested except B.4.1.D. Bicycle and Pedestrian Level of Service and B.5.7.b Traffic Calming for New Roadway Design. The Sketch Plan stage is premature for these elements. These are more appropriately addressed at the Preliminary Plan stage.

3. Specifically address the second point of access proposed for the very first phase, as discussed in the Letter of Intent.

RESPONSE: Addressed as request in updated TIS.

4. See deviation request redlines.

RESPONSE: Addressed in updated deviation form.

#### MDDP / Drainage Plans

1. See MDDP redlines.

RESPONSE: Addressed with revised report

2. Address the 4-Step process described in ECM Section I.7.2.A. Because of the lack of well-defined downstream drainage conveyances it seems that low-impact development concepts should be implemented to minimize downstream impacts.

RESPONSE: 4-Step discussion is added, but determination of specific improvements will be deferred to future detailed analysis.

3. The updated (2015) Falcon DBPS is referenced, but the MDDP narrative seems to be about the old DBPS (2000).

- a. Provide excerpts as appropriate from the 2015 DBPS.

RESPONSE: Added as requested.

- b. Revise discussion as appropriate.

RESPONSE: Revised as requested.

- c. Address land use density assumptions in the DBPS.

RESPONSE: See revised.

- d. Address the diversions from Falcon to Sand Creek, including any work that needs to be done within the church property.

RESPONSE: Added as requested.

- e. Note: the existing flows (MDDP and DBPS) at specified design points need to be clear for comparison to proposed flows.

RESPONSE: Added as requested.

4. Discuss the “best” conveyance for the Sand Creek flows from the southwest corner.

- a. Even though the SCDBPS diverts these flows, any increase in runoff volumes due to development are of concern where downstream conveyances may not be adequate.

RESPONSE: See added language.

- b. Address land use density assumptions in the SCDBPS.

RESPONSE: Added as requested.

- c. Address the adequacy and condition of downstream conveyances specifically.

RESPONSE: Language added as requested.

- d. Address the need for drainage easements where flows are diverted.

RESPONSE: Language added as requested.

5. Show and label DBPS reaches and proposed ponds on the developed drainage plan.

RESPONSE: Added as requested.

#### Attachments

1. Sketch Plan redlines
2. TIS redlines
3. Deviation request redlines
4. MDDP redlines