

# REVIEW COMMENTS

<b>Project:</b>		<i>In-N-Out (Gibson)</i>		<b>PDE:</b>		
<b>Review:</b>		<i>Draft Dated 10/29/2024</i>		<b>Reviewers:</b>		
<b>Date:</b>		<i>2/12/2025</i>		<i>Curtis Cherne, PE for CABQ Philip Gallegos, PE (Wilson &amp; Co) for NMDOT</i>		
<b>#</b>	<b>PAGE</b>	<b>SECTION</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
1			Trips were assigned to a driveway three, which does not exist. See HCS Two-Way Stop-Control Report pp 130 and 131, 158 and 159 of 173. Reassign trips to the two driveways shown on the Site Plan. Additional comments/questions may arise after the revised information is presented.	CABQ	Agree	No trips were assigned to DWY 3 in report body, they were assigned as stated in the report. Errant old HCS reports were found in the appendix and removed.
2			The queue and delays for Alumni Dr SBL will most likely be long. With a long SBL queue and delay, drivers may make a SBR onto Gibson Blvd then execute a U-turn at Mulberry Dr. Provide a discussion and recommendation(s), if any, to reduce the queue for the Alumni Dr SBL and to mitigate the U-turn at Gibson Blvd and Mulberry Dr.	CABQ	Agree	Added U-turn to discussion on page 40 and updated recommendations.
3			The Site Access and Justification paragraph mentions three access driveways, whereas, the Site Plan shows 2.	CABQ	Agree	Corrected.
4			Provide the methodology/calculations used to determine the 160 ft turn lane length: decel, storage and taper or 95% percentile queue length.	CABQ	No Action	No Action. The methodology is stated on Page 26 before Table 8.
5			Provide a clear 11” x17” site plan that shows the dimensions and striping discussed in the Auxiliary Lane Analysis section.	CABQ	Agree	In N Out has provided new stand-alone site plan.
6			Need vicinity map and legal description of the project in the introduction section as required by the NMDOT TIS Outline.	NMDOT	Agree	Vicinity Map shown in figure 2. Added legal description.
7			In the executive summary it refers to site access as being one on Gibson Blvd and 2 on Alumni Drive. Per NMDOT guidance the only access is to be on Alumni Drive which is reflected in the body of the report. Reference to site access on Gibson Blvd should be removed.	NMDOT	No Action	Report delivered on 2/14/2025 addressed this issue.
8			Page 7 second sentence wording at the beginning of the sentence does not make sense. Sentence needs to be revised.	NMDOT	Agree	Corrected.
9			The Gibson Mulberry intersection should be narrated in the report indicating that future access for this intersection will likely be limited. This intersection has a significant crash rate and this should be discussed in detail.	NMDOT	Disagree	Narration added regarding possible future access restriction. Crash summary not included in agreed study scope.
10			It is shown in Table 7: Turn Lane Warrants – City of Albuquerque DPM Requirements that Site Driveways 1 & 2 meet Turn Lane Warrants for the NBL movement but this is not shown or discussed in the in the Off-Site Recommendations Section. If this is to be built as part of the UNM extension of Alumni Drive it should be mentioned.	NMDOT	Disagree	Report language states storage is provided by existing TWLTL.
11			The report should elaborate on the fire station access analysis and how the queuing affects that access to demonstrate that the “Do Not Block Intersection” sign (R-10-7) is sufficient to address unhindered access to the fire station.	NMDOT	Disagree	R-10-7 regulatory signs are standard practice. Signs are existing.
12			Report should reference that bike and pedestrian facilities will not be impacted by the two full access driveways and associated queuing and that construction of the driveways will comply with ADA and Bike Facility requirements.	NMDOT	Agree	Language added to state driveways will not impede pedestrian facilities and that driveways should meet ADA requirements.

13			<p>The Signal Warrant Analysis shows that a signal at Gibson Blvd and Alumni Drive is warranted under the full build and horizon year scenarios. The exiting stop-controlled SBL has a LOS E during the PM peak hour and SBR LOS E during the PM peak hour. In the full build scenario, the NBL/R during the MD peak hour, the SBL during the MD and PM peak hours and the EBL during PM peak hours are all reduced to LOS F. In the Horizon Year the LOS is further reduced for these movements as well as the SBR operates at a LOS E during the PM peak hour. A signal at this intersection improves all these movements to acceptable Levels of Service.</p> <p>In the Intersection Capacity Mitigations Section of the Report on page 40 it is stated that the Intersections of Mulberry Street and Alumni Drive are too close to the interchange to be signalized therefore no signal mitigations are recommended in this report. It is recommended that existing and 2026 background signal analyses for Alumni Drive be completed to compare to the Signal Analyses done for the full build and horizon years to determine any signal mitigations by the development. HCS Signalized Intersection Results Summaries could not be located in the appendices of the report.</p>	NMDOT	Disagree	Report does not include any signal warrant analysis.
14			<p>In summary the NMDOT should require the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Install a signal at the intersection of Gibson Blvd. and Alumni Drive</li> <li>2. Require that sidewalks in front of the business upgrade sidewalks and ramps to current ADA requirements. The NMDOT may want to consider requiring any sidewalks and ramps at the intersection of Gibson Blvd. and Alumni Drive be upgraded to current ADA requirements as part of the installation of the signal.</li> <li>3. As stated in the memo above the report should elaborate on the fire station access analysis and how the queuing affects that access to demonstrate that the "Do Not Block Intersection" sign (R-10-7) is sufficient to address unhindered access to the fire station. Additional signing for the Fire Station may be necessary.</li> </ol>	NMDOT	Disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Signal warrant analysis not performed in this study. Intersections do not meet SAMM or DPM spacing requirements for signalization.</li> <li>2. Sidewalk requirements deferred to CABQ.</li> <li>3. R-10-7 signs and "Keep Clear" pavement markings are existing.</li> </ol>