



Sheet 5

- 10J. Please add the following notes:
 - "The resultant grade in any direction within accessible parking areas shall not exceed two percent."
 - "The maximum cross slope in an accessible path shall not exceed two percent. The maximum longitudinal slope in an accessible path shall not exceed five percent."
 - "Detailed layout and design for proposed curb ramps within the right of way or along an accessible route will be completed with the civil plans."
- 10K. Private street, private driveway, parking lot drive, and fire lane grades, other than single-family residential, maybe 4% maximum when sloping down toward the public street and up to 6% maximum when sloping up toward the public street. Identifying a variance is required.
- 10L. The scale doesn't look right. Please correct it.
- 10M. This location's grade doesn't appear to have a 3:1 ratio. According to section 2.08.1.08 of the Roadway Manual, "Maximum slopes shall be 3:1." Provide a retaining wall or reduce the slope in the landscape area. If a retaining wall is provided, provide a typical section and identify a maximum height.
- 10N. All point elevations shall be removed from the site plan grading sheet, as they are applicable for review during the civil plan.

Sheet 14

- 10O. Remove grading at walk detail. This detail indicates a 4" sidewalk which doesn't meet the City of Aurora standards. This level of detail is appropriate in civil plans.

It should be noted that improvements are not needed at the Parker Road and Havana Street with buildout of the project and possible improvements for the 2050 horizon are for informational purposes only. Further, CDOT provided comments that they would not support dual northbound left turn lanes because they do not want to implement lead-lag left turn phasing or split phasing to mitigate northbound and southbound left turning vehicles crossing paths. Lastly, CDOT has a BRT project that would eliminate the possibility of a third westbound through lane for passenger vehicle traffic. Therefore, these improvements are believed not to be necessary on the site development plan.

Havana streets to comply with current standards. For each street, identify in conformance with Section 2.12.0.1 of the applicable

Sheet 24

- 10R. Please relocate signs out of the right-of-way. If an exception is being requested, additional coordination is required.

10. Traffic Engineering (Dean Kaiser / 303-739-7584 / djkaiser@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

Sheet 3

- 11A. TIS outlined required improvements at the intersection of Parker and Havana and therefore should be included on the site plan.
- 11B. Parking spaces are required to be 19' deep.

11. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Site development plan and references have been updated appropriately.

ents to update the code years.
ossible parking count.
ilding construction type and occupancy.



- 18C. Please show and label the CDOT ROW on the site plan. ROW varies is not acceptable.
- 18D. Any signage on site cannot be wholly or partially within CDOT ROW. Signage must be compliant with CDOT code regarding outdoor advertising per 2 CCR 601-3.

Traffic Comments

- 18E. Traffic was unable to provide review comments within the allotted timeframe, please reach out to Steve Loeffler for further information.

Engineering Comments

- 18F. Engineering noted a potential conflict with a right-in resulting in slow-downs and a nearby right-out resulting in increased speeds. Traffic should provide comments regarding this conflict.
- 18G. Please clarify whether the existing roadway will be reconstructed.

19. RTD (Clayton Woodruff / 303-299-2943 / clayton.woodruff@rtd-denver.com)

- 19A. Please refer to the attached redlines regarding Parker Road. bus stop design improvements. The bus stop should be relocated to align directly with the full-width bud pad. The board area should be 50' long and extend from the back of the curb to the face of the walk. Lastly, the boarding area should be laid at 1.5% to allow for a field variance of less than 2%.

Traffic & Safety

Region 1
2829 W Howard Place, 2nd Floor
Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation
Region 1

Project Name: Quiktrip at Havana and Parker Road

Print Date: 7/26/2024

Highway: 30

Mile Marker: 3.675

A comment response letter is REQUIRED along with the next submittal.

Review POC: Loeffler, Steven

Hydraulics Comments:

Rivera Comments: I do not see the Preliminary Drainage Report for this project. The storm runoff will be conveyed using an underground detention and water quality system. This new system will not negatively impact the existing drainage conditions.

I have reviewed the drainage for this location. The proposed use of underground water quality and detention facilities represents the most feasible option for the development of the site, which will maintain historic drainage patterns while reducing impact to existing storm sewer and regional pond infrastructure. I concluded that there will be no negative drainage impact and existing drainage patterns will be maintained and improved Samer 7-19-2024

Permits Comments:

7.18.24

- The state highway access permit will cover any access work, sidewalk work, street lighting, and stormwater work. Any work outside of that including, but not limited to, landscaping, survey, or utility work will require a separate permit. Application is made online at the following link:
<https://cdotpermits.force.com/portal/s/login/?ec=302&startURL=%2Fportal%2Fs%2F>
- Please show and clearly label the CDOT ROW on the Site Plans. ROW varies is not acceptable.
- Any signing must be on premise and cannot be either partly or wholly in CDOT Right-of-Way. Signing must be compliant with CDOT rules governing outdoor advertising per 2 CCR 601-3. -- Aaron Eyl 7.18.4

7-18-2024 Traffic comments will be late for this review.

--Steve Loeffler, 7-18-2024

Residential Engineer Comments:

DJH 7/16/2024

1. There appears to be a lot of entrance / exits in a short location already. This plan would be installing a right in with traffic slowing down to turn in, and just upstream from a right out where traffic is speeding up. The two interests are going to conflict. The Traffic Office should comment on this in particular.
2. I can't tell if the existing road is being reconstructed or not.

Traffic Comments:

GRilling 07/25/2024

Separate CDOT traffic review response letter has been prepared with the updated submittal.

1. Why is the cross access to Burger King currently blocked? My guess is that one development was required to provide cross access, but that the other lot was already built, and wouldn't be required to allow such cross access until it developed in turn. That point is now. Cross access should be properly assessed, and agreements researched to determine the plan here. Is it in anybody's deed? Personally, I think cross access should be provided, as it allows the Burger King to be served by full movement intersections further south via the parking lot.
2. TIS page 32- 2050 striping changes (NB to WB dual left) are infeasible. The pavement available for the second turn lane is actually the offset so that the signal doesn't have to be split phased. The third westbound through is set to be eliminated with an upcoming project by 2030 (BRT).
3. No safety analysis has been performed. Such an analysis is required by the state highway access code. I see a potential broadside pattern associated with accesses on Parker Rd which should be discussed.
4. TIS page 32- MUTCD 11th edition is referenced in error. Colorado has not yet adopted the 11th edition, and likely won't for another year or more. Revise to read as "currently adopted version", given that this development may take a while and could see the new MUTCD adopted before completion.
5. TIS page 61- number of fueling positions given as 18, while the letter of intent states that 16 fueling positions will be used. Which is it?
6. TIS page 61- square footage of convenience store given as 4.5-5k, while the letter of intent states it will be 5,312 SF. Which is correct?
7. TIS page 63- where did these timings come from? They show a 3.5 second yellow time, but that seems short (I calculated it as 4.5 to 5 seconds depending on roadway grade)
8. TIS page 76- V/C ratios for this (2050 background AM) are higher than those on page 80 (2050 total AM). How does that work? Verify there's not an error. It looks to me like you've assumed 2 NB left turn lanes for the total scenario, but not for the background scenario. There may be other changes as well (3 WB through lanes). This keeps it from being an apples-to-apples comparison. Additionally, neither of those improvements will be present

in 2050 without an intersection rebuild, given the geometry restrictions present (NB and SB lefts would conflict if a second NBLT lane is built). The same thing has probably happened in the PM analysis. Redo this.