



July 6, 2022

Trailer Direct Express  
Attn: Craig Owen  
2900 S Telephone Road  
Moore, OK 73160  
***Craig.owen@trailersdirectexpress.com***

**WEC RESPONSES – 8/8/22**

**RE: Trailer Direct Express Rezone and Site Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Submittal**

Dear Mr. Owen:

Your Rezone and Site Plan for Trailer Direct Express 2<sup>nd</sup> Submittal has been reviewed by outside agencies and Town staff. Comments and necessary revisions have been compiled and are provided below. Some items are summarized in the interest of being concise and clear. Names and contact information are provided should you need to discuss any of the comments with the specific reviewer. Town comments are provided at the end of the letter; duplicate comments have been removed for your convenience. There may be additional comments/revisions as a result of your response to this first round of comments. We are happy to discuss any of these items, if necessary.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

Bob Swatek, Utility Construction Planner – Black Hills Energy  
303-549-2271, [jason.mckune@blackhillscorp.com](mailto:jason.mckune@blackhillscorp.com)  
No comments.

Corey D. Adler, District Wildlife Manger – Colorado Springs/Northwest El Paso County  
719-439-9637, [corey.adler@state.co.us](mailto:corey.adler@state.co.us)  
No comments provided at this time.

Kylie Bagley, Planner II – El Paso County Planning & Community Development  
719-520-6323, [kyliebagley@elpasoco.com](mailto:kyliebagley@elpasoco.com)  
Gilbert LaForce, PE  
[gilbertlaforce@elpasoco.com](mailto:gilbertlaforce@elpasoco.com)

**Review #2:**

- Resolved.
- Resolved.
- Resolved.
- Landscape Plan: Resolved.
- Site Plan: Resolved.

- Traffic Memorandum:

a. Resolved.

b. Resolved.

c. Provide an Auto turn analysis of the existing driveway to verify the access return radius is sufficient for the expected design vehicle/trailer. Unresolved. County requests a copy of sheets 5F & 5S of the construction documents referenced in the WEC Response letter dated 6/20/22.

*An Auto Turn analysis for the expected design vehicle/trailer was provided in the previous submittal on sheet 5S of the Construction Documents. The full Construction Document set, which includes Auto Turn Vehicle Tracking for the design vehicle/trailer can be found as Item 02 of this submittal.*

Justin Annan, GIS Analyst – El Paso-Teller County 9-1-1 Authority

719-785-1900, [gwest@elpasoteller911.org](mailto:gwest@elpasoteller911.org)

No action for E911 on this submittal.

Michelle Regalado, Access Management Trainee – Colorado Department of Transportation

719-562-5537, [michelle.regalado@state.co.us](mailto:michelle.regalado@state.co.us)

No comments received at this time.

Tom Tharnish, Public Works Director – Town of Monument

719-884-8039, [ttharnish@tomgov.org](mailto:ttharnish@tomgov.org)

No comments provided at this time.

Mark Parker, District Manager – Monument Sanitation District

719-694-6801, [parker@msan.co](mailto:parker@msan.co)

No comments received at this time.

Bob Krassa, Esq. - Krassa & Miller, LLC

303-442-2156, [bob@krassa.com](mailto:bob@krassa.com)

No comments provided at this time.

Bruce Lytle, PE – Lytle Water Solutions, LLC

303-350-4090, [bruce@lytlewater.com](mailto:bruce@lytlewater.com)

I have reviewed the documents in the referral packet and I don't see any changes related to water supply from the conditions evaluated in our April 6, 2022 referral letter (attached). Therefore, LWS does not have any further comments.

Mark Kitzmiller - Jacobs

484-269-3738, [mark.kitzmiller@jacobs.com](mailto:mark.kitzmiller@jacobs.com)

1. Note that Sheets 5, 6 and 7 appear to be duplicated in the Final Drainage report as Sheets 7, 10 and 11. Duplicates should be omitted when the Construction Documents are submitted. **Addressed**

Jamey Bumgarner, Fire Marshal - Tri-Lakes Monument Fire Protection District

719-484-0911, [jbumgarner@tlmfire.org](mailto:jbumgarner@tlmfire.org)

No comments.

Terri Hayes, President & CEO – Tri-Lakes Chamber of Commerce & EDC

719-481-3282, [terri@trilakeschamber.com](mailto:terri@trilakeschamber.com)

No comments provided at this time.

Gina Perry, Engineering Coordinator – Mountain View Electric Association, Inc.

719-494-2636, [Gina.P@mvea.coop](mailto:Gina.P@mvea.coop)

No additional comments.

Amy Vanderbeek, Enumerations Plans Examiner – Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

719-327-2930, [amy@pprbd.org](mailto:amy@pprbd.org)

No further comments.

Scot Hail, Business Developer - Comcast Business

[Scot\\_hail@comcast.com](mailto:Scot_hail@comcast.com)

No comments provided at this time.

Rickey Nelson, Advanced Communities Manager – Comcast Communities

[Rickey\\_nelson@comcast.com](mailto:Rickey_nelson@comcast.com)

No comments provided at this time.

Keith Curtis, Floodplain Administrator – Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

719-327-2898, [keith@pprbd.org](mailto:keith@pprbd.org)

Project is not located in the SFHA, no comment

Elizabeth (Beth) Dukes, Community Planner - Department of the Air Force 10<sup>th</sup> Civil Engineer Squadron

[elizabeth.dukes.3.ctr@us.af.mil](mailto:elizabeth.dukes.3.ctr@us.af.mil)

See attached letter.

*The project has been submitted to the FAA. WEC will forward confirmation of acceptance from the FAA upon receipt.*

Debbie Flynn, Planner – Town of Monument

719-488-1604, [dflynn@tomgov.org](mailto:dflynn@tomgov.org)

1. Please provide an opaque chain link fence detail rather than the existing fence detail.

*An opaque chain link fence detail has not been provided as a number of evergreen trees are to be used to screen the site and the site will be used to only store new trailers. Please see the attached email from the Town of Monument (Nina Ruiz) stating that the requirement for an opaque fence will not apply in this situation.*

2. It is preferred to incorporate façade treatments to the existing metal building.

*Façade treatments to the existing metal building have not been proposed. Please see the attached email from the Town of Monument (Nina Ruiz) stating that the additional façade is not a requirement as the Trailers Direct Express application was submitted prior to the Town of Monument code update requiring the façade.*

## **TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY:**

Mark Kitzmiller - Jacobs

484-269-3738, [mark.kitzmiller@jacobs.com](mailto:mark.kitzmiller@jacobs.com)

1. No comments on letter submitted. A Traffic Impact Letter will need to be submitted. Contents of the letter can be found in Town standards. **Traffic Letter was submitted.**

### **New Traffic Comment:**

2. I understand this site generates a very low number of trips, but the traffic letter should conform to Town standards for the letter. This is under section 5.2 of the Town's criteria. Please add a small discussion on existing conditions and existing conditions with site generated traffic. Looking for some text stating existing traffic volumes and LOS, where the trips are coming from (north/south), and what the turning movements end up being. This information is shown in the supporting docs but should be summarized in the text. Please end the letter with a recommendation statement.

*An updated Traffic Letter conforming to Section 5.2 of the Town of Monument standards has been provided as requested. Please see Item – 04.*

### **FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT:**

Mark Kitzmiller - Jacobs

484-269-3738, [mark.kitzmiller@jacobs.com](mailto:mark.kitzmiller@jacobs.com)

1. Detention Pond inflow hydrograph routing and storage volumes appear to be based only on runoff from the 5.02-acre site. However, there are at least 20 additional acres draining to/through the pond from off-site land to the north. How does this additional flow affect behavior of the pond if it is only designed for flows from the 5.02-acre site? The entire tributary basin area should be routed through the pond to provide more realistic discharges and assessments of freeboard, overflow, etc. Required water quality volumes should be updated accordingly.

**Addressed**

2. Please confirm driveway culvert capacity and/or provide a reference to previous calculations. **Addressed**

3. For the Runoff Tables, there are slight differences in the reported runoff coefficients, when compared to calculated values using UD-Rational or the MHFD equations in Table 6-4 of the UD Criteria Manual. Please confirm the sources of the reported values to ensure conformance with the stated MHFD calculation methodology.

**Addressed**

4. The minor/major storm runoff coefficients reported for the "S" basin should be coordinated between the Developed Runoff Table and the Developed Drainage Plan (Sheet 11). **Addressed**

5. There appear to be discrepancies between pond stage heights reported in the UD-Detention spreadsheet and the pond details (Sheet 13). For example, if Stage 0 = Top of Micropool = 7094.17, and invert of vertical orifice is 7095.81, then stage depth = 1.64 ft., and not 1.82 ft. as reported. Similar cases exist for the weir and spillway stages. **Addressed**

6. Please check values for the center-to-center distance between circular orifices and the orifice diameters on UD-Detention versus Sheet 13 details, as well as the vertical orifice height. **Partially Addressed – See FDR plan sheet 13, water quality hole plate detail, which calls out 8-inch vertical orifice spacing, versus FDR page 78 MHFD data, which specifies 12-inch spacing.**

*The water quality hole plate detail on sheet 13 of the Construction Documents has been updated to correctly call out 12-inch vertical orifice spacing matching the MHFD spreadsheet.*

7. As stated previously, inflow hydrographs and peak flows in the UD-Detention analysis only reflect a 5.02-acre drainage area, when the actual drainage area is greater than 26 acres. **Addressed**

8. PDF page 81 provides a "Required Detention" analysis, using the full 26.71-acre drainage area to the pond. Resulting WQCV, EURV and 100-year volumes exceed design pond capacities. **Addressed**

9. The forebay calculations omit the off-site drainage areas, similar to the pond design above. Please confirm whether the resulting forebay release rates are realistic. **Addressed**

10. The forebay weir and spillway wall calculations should be checked using the rectangular weir equation. **Addressed**

11. Please provide a stability check for the East and West Ditches; i.e., what lining is needed. **Addressed**

12. The pond outlet pipe slope computes to 3.0% using the 14-ft. length listed on Sheet 12. Calculations are based on 2.1%. Is design discharge (9.27 cfs) based on "Historic" flow from just the 5.02-acre site? **Addressed**

13. Please comment on whether the existing riprap (off-site) is suitable for pond outlet pipe energy dissipation, especially considering pond discharge could be much higher than designed when the upslope 20 acres are accounted for. **Addressed**

14. An easement may be required on the property to the south, to allow for maintenance and preservation of the existing riprap basin that receives pond discharge. **Addressed**

15. The 100-year pond storage elevations reported on Sheet 12 should be coordinated with Section A-A on Sheet 13. The 100-year volume reported on Sheet 12 appears to be a typo. **Addressed**

16. On Sheet 13, the listed 18" RCP pond outlet invert is a typo in the 100-year orifice plate detail and Section B-B. **Addressed**

17. The 100-year water surface elevation in Section A-A (Sheet 13) should be coordinated with the Pond Water Surface Table on the same sheet. **Addressed**

18. **New Comment** – On plan sheet 13 in the FDR, see elevation typos in Section B-B and the orifice plate detail. *The invert elevation typo on sheet 13 in Section B-B has been corrected.*

## **SITE PLAN COMMENTS:**

Mark Kitzmiller - Jacobs

484-269-3738, [mark.kitzmiller@jacobs.com](mailto:mark.kitzmiller@jacobs.com)

### **Sheet 2:**

1. Existing utilities in Beacon Lite Road right-of-way should be shown. **Addressed**

2. Driveway culvert size and material should be shown. **Addressed**

3. On-site water and sanitary sewer lines are identified with "Proposed" legend line types ("WAS" and "SS"). These are identified elsewhere as existing. Please clarify. **Addressed**

4. Will there need to be any demo or reconfiguration of the chain link fence in the vicinity of the detention pond outlet/spillway? **Addressed**

5. There appears to be an end section and pipe leaving the riprap swale at the southwest corner of the site. Pipe size and type should be provided, as well as any known discharge location. **Addressed**

6. The watercourse running from north to south through the western portion of the site is identified on National Wetland Inventory (NWI) as a freshwater emergent wetland (PEM1C). Please comment on any historic delineations or resolutions of wetland impacts. **Addressed**

**Sheet 3:**

1. ADA parking stall is required to be van accessible. Stall and aisle widths need to meet this standard. **Addressed**

**Sheet 4:**

1. See Sheet 2 comment regarding use of “Proposed” line types for the presumably existing water and sanitary sewer services on-site. **Addressed**

**Sheet 5:**

1. Several proposed/relocated trees are shown in the center of the proposed ditch along the southern property boundary and should be moved. **Addressed**

2. A note in the Grading Legend indicates grading is to be constructed per shown spot elevations. No spot elevations are provided; however, they are provided on detailed grading plans contained in the Final Drainage Reports as Sheets 8 and 9. It is recommended that the grading sheets be made part of the Site Plan set and removed from the Drainage Report. Similarly, the drainage basin sheets can be removed from the Site Plan set and provided solely in the Drainage Report. **Addressed**

3. See Sheet 2 comment regarding the existing watercourse, as swale and pond grading are shown within the NWI wetland mapped area. **Addressed**

**Sheet 9:**

1. Please confirm whether any protective swale linings are required. **Addressed**

**Sheet L10:**

1. See Sheet 5 comment regarding trees located in the proposed ditch along the southern property boundary. **Addressed**

Debbie Flynn, Planner II – Town of Monument

719-488-1604, [dflynn@tomgov.org](mailto:dflynn@tomgov.org)

**Cover Sheet:**

1. Please change the Town Approval to Planning Director rather than Town Manager.

*The Town Approval block has been revised as requested.*

2. I apologize, I was recently informed that El Paso County Clerk and Recorder still requires the signature block.

*The El Paso County Clerk and Recorder signature block has been included as requested.*

**Site Plan:**

3. Please revise screen chain link fence to opaque chain link fence.

*An opaque chain link fence detail has not been provided as a number of evergreen trees are to be used to screen the site and the site will be used to only store new trailers. Please see the attached email from the Town of Monument (Nina Ruiz) stating that the requirement for an opaque fence will not apply in this situation.*

Please respond by making the above changes/revision/additions or commenting as to why the changes are not addressed. When issues are resolved to the Town’s satisfaction, please submit copies of the revised plan sets with a detailed list which itemizes all revisions. Revised plan sets should be submitted in electronic format with one full size paper set provided to the Planning Department. All comments must be adequately addressed before the project will be scheduled for public hearing.

*Noted.*