

January 31, 2024

Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)
Traffic & Safety
Region 1
2829 W. Howard Place
Denver, CO 80204

RE: Response to Comments
Rocky Mountain Rail – North Site Plan
Highway 036 – Mile Marker 84.708

Thank you for your review of the ISP for the Rocky Mountain Rail Park. Below are the list of comments received and our responses.

SBL - 3/15/2023

Comment

1. CDOT will need to see a drainage report for all improvements within CDOT right-of-way. In the report, state the CDOT Drainage Design Manual requirements for proposed highway improvements (see Ch. 7 - Hydrology and Ch. 9 - Culverts) and include all supporting calculations and proposed basin maps. Please discuss existing drainage features the project intends to retain or extend. Existing culverts must meet a 50-year remaining service life or they must be replaced.

Response: Understood, a drainage report specific for CDOT will be prepared during the Access and Utility Permit process.

SBL - 9/15/2022

Comment

1. CDOT will need to see a drainage report for all improvements (Colfax Ave and Peterson Rd) within CDOT right-of-way. Drainage improvements must meet the requirements as defined in the CDOT Drainage Design Manual. Please identify CDOT right-of-way on basin maps and plan sheets.

Environmental Comments:

No planning or WQ concerns.

Response: Understood, a drainage report specific for CDOT will be prepared during the Access and Utility Permit process

Comment

1. **For ANY ground disturbance/work within CDOT ROW--Required:**

Arch/History/Paleo:

Since this is a permit, a file search for Arch, Paleo and History is required. If the file search identifies anything, a more extensive report will be required. If nothing is identified, then the file search should be sufficient. For the file search contact:

Cultural/History File Search:

<http://www.historycolorado.org/oahp/file-search>

email: hc_filesearch@state.co.us

Paleo File Search:

<https://www.colorado.edu/cumuseum/research-collections/paleontology/policies-procedure> and
<https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>

The ECIS will be used to support HazMat requirements.

Non-historic 4f does not apply.

If any non-historic 6f properties will be impacted or disturbed applicant shall coordinate with
Veronica McCall veronica.mccall@state.co.us

Response: Understood, will provide during Access and Utility Permit phase.

Info for Applicant/Contractor:

Comment

1. The Permittee shall complete a stormwater management plan (SWMP) which must be prepared with good engineering, hydrologic, and pollution control practices and include at a minimum the following components: qualified stormwater manager; spill prevention and response plan; materials handling; potential sources of pollution; implementation of control measures; site description; and site map.

Response: Understood, will provide during Access and Utility Permit phase.

Comment

2. In addition, the Permittee shall comply with all local/state/federal regulations and obtain all necessary permits. Permittee shall comply with CDOT's MS4 Permit. When working within a local MS4 jurisdictional boundary, the permittee shall obtain concurrence from the local MS4 that the local MS4 will provide construction stormwater oversight. The local MS4 concurrence documentation shall be retained with the SWMP.

Response: Understood.

Comment

3. Clear Zone: It is the responsibility of the engineer/architect who stamps the plans to ensure that: any new landscaping/trees are outside of the clear zones for any State Highway/CDOT ROW and that the new landscaping/trees do not interfere with site lines from any State Highway/CDOT ROW.

Response: Understood, this project will comply with the clear zone requirements.

Comment

4. Landscape: Any new or changes to existing landscaping within CDOT ROW must be reviewed and approved by CDOT. Landscaping plans should be submitted and should include details of all proposed plant species and seed mixes/ratios.

Response: Understood, will provide during Access and Utility Permit phase.

Comment

5. 3/20/2023: Will need copies of the file search reviews before environmental review can continue.

Response: Understood, will provide.

Traffic Comments:

Comment

1. The striping is hard to see on this page. Please provide a separate signing and striping plans.

Response: A complete signage and striping plan will be provided during the Access and Utility Permit phase.

Comment

2. The signing plans are missing signs such as a merge sign for the acceleration lanes. There is a street sign in the middle of Colfax and Peterson intersection. Having a separate plan would make it easier to see.

Response: These details will be provided during the CDOT process.

Comment

3. Colfax lane width should be 12 feet. This is based on the CDOT Roadside Design Guide.

Response: Colfax revised to a 12' section.

Comment

4. A 6' shoulder should be used when there is not a right turn deceleration lane. This is based on the CDOT Roadside Design Guide.

Response: 6' shoulder added

Comment

5. Show the length of the shifting tapers. The plans show transition tapers but we will also need to know the shifting taper lengths.

Response: Tapers called out.

Comment

6. Provide truck turning templates. This looks tight for the size of trucks that will be using this development.

Response: Radius updated to ensure proper truck movements are met.

Comment

7. CDOT doesn't want a double left EB to NB on Colfax till it is signalized. The second lane will need to be striped out till it meets warrants.

Response: Understood, single left EB is now shown.

Comment

8. Has anyone reached out to the properties to the east of Peterson. This configuration would make the accesses there a right in right out configuration.

Response: The property to the east has been coordinated with and they have copies of the Plans and CAD files for incorporation into their site planning.

Comment

9. It looks like some of the shifting tapers are calculated as transition tapers. This is specifically for the beginning and end of the project.

Response: Tapers have been updated.

Comment

10. The EB acceleration lane just west of Peterson looks like the final merge point looks to be at the back of queue once Peterson is signalized. This has potential to increase crashes at this location.

Response: This will be adjusted when the 2nd left turn lane is added once signal warrants are met.

Jason Igo 3/20/2023

Comment

1. I do question the amount of traffic that this going to produce. Port Colorado right next to you is assuming roughly 3 employees per an acre. This is all lower that the ITE Trip Generation Manual which I think is closer to 6 employees per an acre.

Response: After discussion with CDOT and City of Aurora, the number of employees per acre has been accepted. This was validated with users that are either under contract for land or have expressed interest.

Comment

2. This TIS has significant improvements to I-70 and Manilla interchange. CDOT does not have a 1601 application for making improvements at that interchange. Not sure when those are needed based on this development.

Response: Understood. That is a much later phase in the project and we will submit the required permits as we get closer.

Comment

3. The aspect that Peterson Rd doesn't have turn lanes going southbound worries me. The analysis shows only a 7 ft queue. The train tracks are around 230 feet from the intersection and there is over

250 vehicles going southbound on Peterson. There is possibility of queueing on the tracks. A southbound right turn lane would allow for a more free movement.

Response: Southbound right turn lane added.

Comment

4. Manilla will need to meet warrants with existing traffic before CDOT will signalize it.

Response: Understood.

Comment

5. I agree with KMD that we need to see a cross section. There was an access proposed on the southside of US-36 that was putting in a decel right lane. I am not sure how the new acceleration lane at Manilla will interact with the decel lane.

Response: This will be provided as we get closer to needing to build the improvements at Manilla.

Jason Igo 9/16/2022 Right of Way Comments:

Comment

1. JAD Comments 9/14/22 - There does not appear to be any survey or right of way line information/issues at this time, or included in this submittal. When any platting, existing ROW determinations, ROW dedications, A-Line questions, or other relevant items along Colfax become available we can review further.

Response: Understood.

Comment

2. JAD Comment 3/6/23 - The ROW on Colfax does not have A-lines per the ROW plan set. I uploaded the set to this Sharepoint. The ROW width shown in the design plans of 100' matches what is scaled on the old plans along Colfax. No other survey comments at this time.

Response: Understood.

Comment

3. MJO 3-20-2023 - No comments at this time - no A-Lines are being crossed, all work withing Colfax ROW is under the Permit.

Response: Understood.

Comment

4. MJO 9/18/2023 - NO Comments at this time, it appears Colfax ROW is 100' wide and all work within CDOT ROW is being done under the permit. The remaining ROW / ROW Impacts are on private property and part of the development not part of CDOTs Colfax system.

Response: Understood.

Resident Engineer Comments:

Comment

1. No Comments for this revision. Thanks. KMD_10-2-23

Response: Understood.

Comment

2. Thanks for the response

One comment for this revision

Sheet 11: Taper Length on the WB US 36 from Paterson Rd acceleration lane appear a bit short for a 55mph road. Ratio should be 18.5:1 per CDOT roadway design guide. This leaves the length at 259 ft at minimum based on a 14 ft wide lane.

Looking forward to the plan sheets.

KMD_3/16/23

Response: Taper lengths updated

At Peterson Rd and Colfax Intersection

Comment

1. Provide roadway design plan and profile sheets for the widening and tie in section of Colfax when available.

Response: Understood, will provide during CD process.

Comment

2. Callout turn Radius, Provide Truck turning template if available. Given the nature of the area, we want to make sure some minimum designated design vehicles have adequate turning room.

Response: Radius added

Comment

3. Clearly Identify existing and proposed CDOT ROW.

Response: ROW labels updated.

Comment

4. Please show sawcut lines on the plans and typical sections with added distance labels, referenced from an existing roadway feature.

Response: Sawcut line now shown.

Comment

5. All features proposed within CDOT ROW shall meet CDOT standards.

Response: Understood.

Sheet 16 of 26 of Infrastructure Plan

Comment

1. Some proposed deciduous trees appear to be within the sight triangle. Ensure the sight triangles are free of obstructions.

Response: Trees will be maintained to ensure they comply with sight triangle requirements.

Sheet 12 of 26 – KMD_9/15/22

Comment

1. Show flow pattern around the intersection.

Response: Flow patterns added.

Comment

2. Some sheets in the Preliminary Drainage (sheet 100 to 104) calls out Flow arrows in the legend but do not show it on the plan.

Response: Flow arrows removed from legend.

Permits Comments:

Comment

1. Please clearly identify and label the CDOT ROW. Label as CDOT ROW. RLW September 8 2022

Response: ROW label updated.

I don't have more to add from previous reviews. I would like to instruct that:

Access permits be complete when applied for. The permit application must include the approved site plan showing the amount of RoW existing & proposed for SH 36, and the improvements required for the north (and/or south) half by the local agency.

Noted that the TIS recommends the following for Colfax Avenue / Peterson Road full turn intersection

- **A 600-ft westbound right-turn deceleration lane**
- **Colfax Ave/Peterson Rd Westbound Right-turn Deceleration Lane 600 @ Buildout**
- **Colfax Ave/Peterson Rd Eastbound Left-turn Deceleration Lane 825 @ Buildout**
- **Colfax Ave/Peterson Rd Westbound Right-turn Acceleration Lane 960 @ Buildout**

Since this TIS suggest that the scope of roadway improvements should be phased and to build less than the full roadway profile (including a center median) we need to see what the City & County are in agreement with for this highway and that the infrastructure plan has the correct thresholds in-place when to warrant the omitted improvements.

The infrastructure plan set strangely omits SH 36 and we need to see it. Both design and when the latter 3 bullet items will be built. Including and not limited to: curb, gutter, sidewalk, crosswalks, street lights, center median, etc. to be located in the RoW.

With a subsequent referral, please address all CDOT comments and if-how-where our remarks are addressed. And if not, why not?

RS 09-13-22

Comment

1. Please separate comment responses from CDOT and The City of Aurora next time. Do not combine. All traffic lanes on Colfax SH 36 need to be 12 feet wide minimum. All thermoplastic is inlaid in the CDOT ROW. No trees in the CDOT ROW. 3rd party inspection required. RLW March 20 2023 Other Comments

Response: Understood.

Steve Loeffler 3-17-2023

Comment

1. Access permit will be needed for the improvements proposed at Petersen and Colfax. Contact for that permit is Steve Loeffler who can be reached at 303-757-9891 or steven.loeffler@state.co.us

Response: Understood.

Thank you again for the comments received. We look forward to working with CDOT on the next phase of the project (Access and Utility Permit) once the ISP has gone through Administrative Approvals with the City of Aurora.

Sincerely,

Patrick Chelin, P.E.
Senior Vice President

cc: 22.1305.003