

Responses to Comments

El Paso County

- Add PCD File AL-2217 **PCD File added.**
- Remove references to access on HWY 105 throughout the report. **References removed from report.**
- Revise to state a deviation has been submitted and has been denied by the Deputy County Engineer. **All references to deviations have been removed from report, since they were all denied and are no longer applicable to the report.**
- Remove statement. **Statement removed.**
- The letter of intent indicates events through the first week of November. Revise accordingly. **Report revised.**
- Please indicate why Roller Coaster Rd/Hwy 105, hwy 83/Hwy 105 and Roller coaster/Sahara Rd intersections were not studied. If the threshold per criteria was not met then please state that, otherwise these intersections should be analyzed. **Statement that these intersections did not meet the threshold criteria in the ECM was added to the report.**
- Submit a deviation request for auxiliary lanes for review by Deputy County Engineer. Deviation should include justification for not constructing lanes and provide regional examples where flaggers are an appropriate alternative. Provide an exhibit at the end of the deviation request that shows a flagging plan that includes signage, amount of flaggers, time of day they will be active, etc. **There is no longer a deviation request to not build the auxiliary lanes, as we were told by County staff that it would be denied. Therefore, there is no longer a need for a flagging plan.**
- Update to provide ECM sight distance requirements in the narratives above and compare to what is out in the field. Also list ECM criteria for stacking, storage, and taper for every affected auxiliary lane and access and state whether this access can be met. If it cannot be met, state the required modifications so that it can be met. **Sight distances, and ECM criteria added to existing conditions section of report. Auxiliary lane requirements added to auxiliary lane analysis section of report.**
- Please clarify whether these peak hrs also apply to the pumpkin patch or is it strictly the tulip festival. If just the tulip festival, then what are the peak hrs for the pumpkin patch and why weren't counts performed at that events peak hrs? Please address. **Peak hours are for both events. This has been clarified in the report.**
- Update to include first week of November. **Report revised.**
- Adjust analysis to exclude access off HYW 105. **Report revised.**
- Remove last sentence since deviation was disapproved. **Sentence removed.**
- Note: if this application is approved, applicant may be required to resubmit a TIS with updated counts based on 2023 events per previous conversations with staff. **Noted.**
- 105? **Corrected from 25 to 105.**
- Remove HWY 105 access from analysis **Report revised.**

- This distribution percentage using Appaloosa Rd seems high. As stated in the narrative, Appaloosa is a gravel road and it is a circuitous route. Per mobile map services it appears Appaloosa Rd is not suggested as a route. **Trip distribution updated.**
- Discuss how 2% was determined to be an appropriate growth rate. **Justification for 2% growth rate added. Same growth rate that was used in the Highway 105 corridor study.**
- Determine what growth rate was applied for the long-range horizon analysis per ECM B.3.2.B **Long range growth rate and justification added.**
- Please indicate the turn movements on the tables 12 & 13. Identify the direction of travel such as westbound left turn on Hwy 105 or northbound left on Canterbury. Also clarify the movement at Canterbury/Saddlewood. Is it southbound on Canterbury or westbound on Saddlewood? we assume its Southbound on Canterbury but it should be stated. Indicate whether dedicated auxiliary lanes are needed on northbound Canterbury at Hwy 105 **Turn movements column added to each table of auxiliary lane analysis.**
- Canterbury is not an arterial roadway therefore the criteria would be 25 vph. revise table accordingly. **Criteria updated.**
- Canterbury and Saddlewood are not an arterial roadway therefore the criteria would be 50 vph. revise table accordingly. **Criteria updated.**
- Acceleration lanes are generally not required per criteria for these lower classification roadways. Revise accordingly. **Table updated.**
- Submit a deviation request in the next submittal for the auxiliary lanes that are warranted per analysis for consideration and review from the ECM administrator. **We were told a deviation would not be approved, so no deviation is being requested.**
- Revise to address road impact fees that will be required to be paid. **Road impact fee section added to report.**
- Revise to state whether MTCP calls for improvements in the vicinity and state what they are. **Report revised to include discussion of MTCP.**
- Move this page to after the cover page. **Certification page moved.**