

LSC Responses to El Paso County Department of Public Works Comments

Gateway Trucking

PCD File No. PPR-21-033

Review #1 comments received from Department of Public Works (DPW) on Nov 4 regarding the Gateway Trucking Transportation Memorandum (dated May 20, 2021):

(1) – Pg 5 references the CDOT Access Permit Application “is attached.” This has not been provided and is required by the Development Agreement Item 3. Request developer to submit per agreement.

LSC Response: A copy of the CDOT access permit application prepared in April 2021 is attached for reference. It has been our experience that, typically when a County road is the connection to the state highway ROW, the County Engineer prefers to sign CDOT applications prior to submission to the CDOT Region 2 Access Unit for processing.

(2) – Pg 12, 2nd paragraph states “LSC estimates that during peak season, when all 20 trucks are used for local projects, the site generates about 80 vehicle trips on the average weekday, with about half entering and half exiting the site during a 24-hr period.” Upon some cursory investigation via google maps satellite view, it appears the level of trucks/vehicles operating exceeds these estimates. Recommend developer and consultant provide and submit explanation on the attached satellite views.

LSC Response: It is our understanding that the average trip estimates originally provided by the applicant remain accurate/valid. Regarding the aerial photo imagery, some of these additional vehicles are the owner’s personal equipment located on his adjoining property. Please refer to the updated Letter of Intent for additional information.

(3) – Pg 18, 4th bullet references a “geotechnical evaluation of the gravel roadway surface/structure is forthcoming.” Request developer provides a copy of this referenced geotech evaluation.

LSC Response: Meetings and phone conversations were held between staff and LSC on this. Please refer to email correspondence. The report has been revised and LSC has prepared Appendix A to document the existing roadway surface conditions.

(4) – Pg 30, Section 9.1.1. Short Term provides recommendations for repair of deficiencies and cost estimate for “upgrade”, which correlates with the Developer requirement in Development Agreement Item 2.b). Request developer provides more detail and confirmation of infrastructure adequacy, as further mentioned on Pg 19-20, Section 6.3, 3rd bullet.

LSC Response: This paragraph has been updated and refers to Appendix A and Appendix B.

(5) – Pg 30, Section 9.1.2. Long Term provides proposed “applicant’s share” of 29%, which correlates with the Developer requirement in Development Agreement Item 2.c). Request developer resolves above item (2) and subsequently reevaluates or validates this proposed share.

LSC Response: Please refer to the response to #2 above.

Per the Developer Agreement number 4, DPW has generated initial estimates for annual maintenance cost. DPW will reassess the estimates for annual maintenance cost after the above items (1) through (5) has been addressed, at which point the estimates for the annual maintenance cost will be provided to the applicant.

LSC Response: Comment Noted.