



Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
phone 303.739.7217

AuroraGov.org

November 4, 2024

Robert Wahl
JHL Constructors
9100 Panorama Drive, Suite #300
Englewood, CO 80112

Re: First Technical Submission Review – Rocky Mountain Railpark Roadways – Infrastructure Site Plan
Application Number: **DA-2329-00**
Case Numbers: **2022-6045-00**

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Thank you for your first technical submission, which we started to process on October 24, 2024. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Please revise your previous work and resubmit your technical corrections submittal. Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a comment response letter specifically responding to each item. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303-739-7541 or rrabbaa@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Rachid Rabbaa, Planner III
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Eric Sakotas - THK Associates 2956 S Peoria St Ste 101 Aurora, Colorado, 80014
Rachid Rabbaa, Case Manager
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\2329-00tech1



First Technical Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please see all the comments from Traffic in the Site Plan and TIS (Item 4)
- License agreement for the private lines is needed. The ISP cannot be approved without this agreement being ready for signature - Water (Item 5)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. No comments were received from outside registered neighborhood organizations or agencies.

2. Plannuing (Rachid Rabbaa / 303-739-7541 / rrabbaa@auroragov.org)

2A. No comments.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green).

3A. No comments.

4. Traffic Engineering (Jason Igo/ 303-739-1792 / jigo@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

- 4A. This intersection should align better. Eastbound and westbound are offset and this will cause issues in the future.
- 4B. This is an interim condition. Will need a right turn lane based on TIS. Please provide ultimate condition also.
- 4C. The 48th\Peterson intersection is skewed. City doesn't allow skewed intersections. Colfax\Peterson intersection will need a SB right turn lane. This could be an interim design but will need a full design of the intersection.

TIS

- 4D. Due to safety concerns arising from the railroad crossing's proximity (approximately 225 feet from the intersection), the City of Aurora will not allow a queue exceeding two vehicles in the southbound direction on Peterson Road. In anticipation of an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the County, CDOT, and the City, the traffic study should perform a threshold analysis to establish the maximum development density that will not surpass the acceptable queue length at the intersection. This density limit will be documented within the IGA to ensure ongoing safety and operational efficiency at this location.
- 4E. The City of Aurora strongly encourages RMRP to start the coordination process with UP/PUC to reduce delay in regard to the improvements within UP's ROW.
- 4F. Three WB-50 trucks in queue could actually require up to 195 ft, which would be far closer to the 225-ft distance. This shorter buffer could be problematic under higher or fluctuating traffic volumes, particularly if more than three trucks queue or if there are mixed vehicle types. Delays at the Colfax Avenue/Peterson Road intersection, such as a longer-than-expected queue or slower-moving trucks, could impact the clearance time for vehicles near the railroad crossing.
- 4G. This section feels out of place.
- 4H. Provide the Trip Gen Version and provide if average rate is being used or if the fitted curve is being use.
- 4I. Discussion of south section should be included with this report. This report is only covering the North section. The report is also going to 2050. This report is implying that south section is not going to be built till after 2050.
- 4J. Repeat comment. As discussed in last meeting. Eastbound is roughly 30 vehicles lower than counts taken in 2022 for Colfax/Manila. Colfax/Peterson eastbound is 8 vehicles lower than counts taken in 2022. We need to be conservative for this report.
- 4K. Repeat comment. As discussed in last meeting. Eastbound is roughly 30 vehicles lower than counts taken in 2022 for both Colfax/Manila and Colfax/Peterson. We need to be conservative for this report.



- 4L. The table doesn't include SB movement for Peterson. It should be included can reference text below.
- 4M. Page 149 has the 2030 PM queue for southbound to be 2.06 vehicles.
- 4N. Vehicle queues do not exceed two
- 4O. At least three trucks can queue on the southbound approach.
- 4P. This is dependent on the size of vehicle. Based on Invervehicle Spacing and Queue Characteristics study done in 2022 it showed that the average distance between vehicles stopped is 12'.
(<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3141/1796-10?journalCode=trra>) Three WB-67's would be 201 feet long and the space between is 24'. That puts 3 vehicles at 225' and with a possibility of trucks bumpers being queued and be on the tracks.
- 4Q. Conversation needs to be reference with a date
- 4R. Discussion of the queue length being 3.13 vehicle for the southbound movement should be included. This puts the queues over the train tracks if all vehicles are WB 67.
- 4S. A SB Right turn will be required for Colfax\Peterson based on queue data provided and the proximity to the railroad line.
- 4T. Due to safety concerns arising from the railroad crossing's proximity (approximately 225 feet from the intersection), the City of Aurora will not allow a queue exceeding two vehicles in the southbound direction on Peterson Road. In anticipation of an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the County, CDOT, and the City, the traffic study should perform a threshold analysis to establish the maximum development density that will not surpass the acceptable queue length at the intersection. This density limit will be documented within the IGA to ensure ongoing safety and operational efficiency at this location.
- 4U. This shows that it exceeds 2 vehicles but text shows less than 2.

5. Aurora Water (Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / cballard@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

- 5A. I am not seeing the license agreement as in process for the private lines. The ISP cannot be approved without this agreement being ready for signature.

6. Easements (Grace Gray /303-739-7277 / ggray@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

- 6A. No comments.