

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



Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

March 9, 2023

Kelsey Hall
Western Transport, LLC
1331 17th Street, Suite #1000
Denver, CO 80202

Re: Second Submission Review - Port Colorado – Infrastructure Site Plan #1
Application Number: **DA-1793-20**
Case Number: 2022-6055-00

Dear Ms. Hall:

Thank you for your latest submission. We reviewed it 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.

Since several important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before March 27, 2023.

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.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. I can be reached at, 303.739.7186 or srodrigu@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Stephen Rodriguez". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Stephen Rodriguez, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Diana Rael - Norris Design 1101 Bannock Street, Denver CO 80204
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Services
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1793-20rev2.rtf



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- See the comments from Planning (Item 1)
- See the various comments/redlines from Landscaping (Item 2)
- See the comments/redlines from Civil Engineering regarding drainage, PIP and curb ramps (Item 3)
- Contact Traffic Engineering directly for any comments (Item 4)
- See Aurora Water comments/redlines regarding casings, mains and hydrant easements (Item 6)
- See PROS comments regarding trails and amenity (Item 8)
- See comments from outside agency – CDOT (attached)
- Please respond to each comment in your *response letter* and adjust the ISP #3 as required.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Stephen Rodriguez srodrigu@auroragov.org / 303-739-7186 / PDF comment color is teal.

1. Community Comments and Planning Comments

- 1A. Comments were received from an outside referral agency. See the attached comment letter from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). Respond to the comments in the resubmittal.
- 1B. Address all Site Plan redlines.

2. Landscape Comments

Reviewed by: Bill Tesauro / Btesauro@cgasolutions.com (954) 921-7781/ PDF comments in teal.

OVERALL COMMENTS:

SHEET L-1

1. Please clarify why there are 544 required trees and 564 provide trees in this chart and only 511 proposed trees in the plant list. As such, please correct this.
2. Please provide the entire east side curbside landscaping for Peterson Road to N. 48th Avenue.
3. Please clarify the open space note.
4. Please revise the note to reference the variances and that landscaping with each lot will be installed per the plans for the issuance of a C.O. Also, that the proposed detention ponds landscaping will be installed with the detention ponds.

SHEET L-2

1. Please clarify why the total number of proposed trees (511) does not concur with the number of proposed trees (564) in the landscape chart on L-1.

SHEET L-3

1. Please label the one proposed GL SK tree.

SHEET L-4

1. Please change the proposed 4 GL SK trees from 5 to 4.

SHEET L-8

1. Please correct the tagline to attach the proposed GL SK tree.

SHEET L-11

1. Please add the trees back to this location.
2. Please indicate the proposed detention pond as temporary.



REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3. Civil Engineering (Reviewer was unable to redline the ISP. Please contact with any questions)

Reviewed by: Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in **green**.

- 3A. C1 - The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.
- 3B. C2 - This section for Colfax doesn't match the section in the currently approved PIP. Is there a master plan amendment that is revising this section? If so, please provide the RSN in the comment response. The currently approved section has a 10' shared-use path and a 13' landscape. When are the sidewalk improvements going to be proposed for Colfax? The PIP amendment revised the section for Colfax but I don't understand why the sidewalk/streetlight improvements would not be the obligation of this property.
- 3C. Sheet C11 - *pointing to the curb ramps* Either propose receiving ramps for these ramps or defer them until the south and west halves of the streets come in.

4. Traffic Engineering

Reviewed by: Dean Kaiser / 303-786-7584 / djkaiser@auroragov.org / Comments in **gold**.

- 4A. No comments were received to date. Please contact the reviewer directly for comments and incorporate all necessary revisions into the plan set and comment response letter.

5. Land Development Review Services

Reviewed by: Andy Niquette and Roger Nelson / Comments in **magenta**.

- 5A. No further comments.

6. Aurora Water

Reviewed by: Casey Ballard // (303) 739-7382 (Comments in **red**)

- 6A. C10 – Is Fire/Life Safety okay with the hydrants not alternating over the road? Please verify.
- 6B. C11 – having the 2nd point of connection be parallel does not meet the intent of a looped system.
- 6C. C12 – Make this a DIP within the casing.
- 6D. C13 – Waterline in casings is to be DIP. There is also text overlap in the Legend.
- 6E. C13 - Access is needed to all manholes and valves.
- 6F. C13 - What is the timeline on the future water main? There are concerns on stagnant water that will need to be frequently flushed.
- 6G. C13 – For dead end mains that are going to extend in future phases include a temporary blow off.
- 6H. C13 – Label these storm culverts that cross private rail lines as private.
- 6I. C18 – Include temporary blow off.
- 6J. C19 – Label temporary ponds and non-regional infrastructure as private. Ensure this aligns with the master drainage report.
- 6K. C20 – Ensure labels for temporary ponds are shown.
- 6L. C22 – Advisory comment – Valves will likely need to be placed outside of the airport's fenced area. This is to allow uninterrupted access to the valves.
- 6M. C26 - An easement is needed for all hydrants.
- 6N. C26 – Per a comment response it sounded like this hydrant was being removed.
- 6O. C26 – Is a future railroad crossing here? Please clarify.

7. Life Safety

Reviewed by: William Polk/ 303-739-7371 / wpolk@auroragov.org (See blue comments)

Site Plan Comments:

- 7A. No further comments.



8. Parks and Recreation (PROS)

Reviewed by: Curt Bish / 303-739-7131 / CBish@auroragov.org (Comments in purple)

- 8A. L1 – Include a map/graphic which delineates and supports the calculated area (acreage) proposed for open space credit.
- 8B. L6 – There should be a more direct, enhanced connection between the sidewalk and the crusher fines trail. The angled maintenance path is not sufficient.
- 8C. L6 – What other type of amenity, such as a shade shelter, might be incorporated into the space to expand the recreational value?
- 8D. L8 – The crusher fines trail should not be dead end here. Weaving through the detention pond on the maintenance paths is problematic. An ADA-compliant connection to the sidewalk through the landscape buffer should be provided.

9. Xcel Energy / Donna George ROW and Permits / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com / 303-571-3306

- 9A. No additional comments. Previous comments still apply.

10. Colorado Department of Transportation / Steven Loeffler

- 10A. See the attached comments and respond in detail in your comment response letter.

STATE OF COLORADO

Traffic & Safety

Region 1

2829 W. Howard Place
Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Project Name: **Port Subarea 6 - Transport Colorado**

Print Date:

Highway:

Mile Marker:

Environmental Comments:

No concerns from planning as long as the RE is good with landscaping and curbing.

Info for Applicant/Contractor:

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.

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.

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.

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.

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: <https://www.historycolorado.org/file-access> Email: hc_filesearch@state.co.us

Paleo File Search: Colorado University Museum of Natural History - Email:

jacob.vanveldhuizen@colorado.edu and <https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/> and/or Denver Museum of Nature and Science – Email: kristen.mackenzie@dmns.org

<https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>

Traffic Comments:

This is an industrial location. I will need to see truck turning templates. 25' radius is small for trucks.

Signing and striping plans need a lot of work.

Signing is missing merge sign for acceleration lane. The ultimate there it looks like the outside lane drops at Petterson

but no signage is shown. The interim shows sign C as a speed sign but it is not listed on that sheet.

Striping doesn't use CDOT standards. Edge lines are 6". Channelizing lines are 8". For turn pockets over 350' we need 3 turn arrows and not two. The acceleration should have 2 merge arrows. Ultimate condition doesn't show stop bars. Dashed lines should be called out as dotted extension lines and those are 6" lines.

Show delineators on the signing and striping sheets.

Add dimensions for the eastbound left turn deceleration lane taper.

Has the railroad agreed to grading on there property?

ultimate cross section east of Peterson on Colfax doesn't show sidewalk. Why are we only adding sidewalk to Peterson?

Ultimate cross section east of Peterson on Colfax shows only a 12' median. This should be 16' so that we can do offsets.

The TIS I believe had improvements happening at Manilla. These plans are only focused on Peterson.

Has analysis been done to figure out when we will need to switch from the interim condition to the Ultimate condition?

Jason Igo 3/3/2023

Resident Engineer Comments:

Sheet C2: Please indicate cross slope value as well as sawcut location on the typical sections.

Please ensure to provide roadway design sheets for C7 through C11 when they become available for review.

KM_3/1/23

Rev1

Looks like for c7 c8 c9 c10 c 11 work will happen in CDOT ROW. Clearly Identify CDOT ROW where applicable

Provide roadway design sheets when they become available.

C5: Grading plans show Direction of flow is toward Colfax. Please ensure all sheet flows are away from state highway or provide detail mitigation sheet for hydraulic to review. I recommend Showing direction of flow on other grading sheets where applicable

KM_11/27/22

Permits Comments:

Clearly show the CDOT ROW and label as such. Any utility work in the CDOT ROW will require a CDOT Utility permit. Any landscaping in the CDOT ROW will require a CDOT Landscaping permit. No trees in the CDOT ROW. All sawcuts need to be within 6" to 12" of the final proposed lane striping because of paving joints and not in the wheel

path. Add CDOT M and S Standard specification for S 614 1. Ground Sign Placement, Add CDOT M and S Standard specification for S 627 1. Pavement Markings. All thermoplastic in CDOT, Region 1 are inlaid, Add CDOT M and S Standard specification for S 612 01. Delineators. Need a pavement detail. Show subgrade, base and asphalt layers and types and depths for paving in CDOT ROW. Do you have a pavement design? Show the selected pavement design on the plans. How thick is the existing pavement? Shoulder slope should be a 4:1 minimum or flatter. Needs more details for work in CDOT ROW. What is the shoulder material? How thick is the shoulder material? RLW
November 15 2022

I have multiple concerns and comments on the plans provided. Insufficient information provided in particular:

Need a cross section of SH 36. Plans lack detail on SH 36 highway improvements.

Improvements along SH 36 need to meet CDOT standards.

Utilites along SH36 do not appear compliant with the Utility Accomodation code.

Need detail of the RR crossing on Peterson & what is the means to accomodate large trucks (not impact through traffic on SH 36) when an approaching train creates a queue south of the tracks?

Geneally, public improvements laong SH 36 are lacking - unclear what is by others (Rocky Mountain Railyard) and what is by this project.

See redlines

- RS 11-28-22

All utility work will require a seperate CDOT permit. Any landscaping in the CDOT ROW requires a seperate CDOT permit. No trees i nthe CDOT ROW. 3rd party inspection required. RLW March 3 2023