

November 1, 2022

City of Aurora
Stephen Rodriguez
Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway
Suite 5200
Aurora, CO 80012

RE: Response to Comments
Rocky Mountain Railpark Roadways – Infrastructure Site Plan
Application Number – DA-2329-00
Case Number – 2022-6045-00

Dear Stephen:

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

Initial Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- See various Planning comments (Items 1-3)
- See various Landscaping comments (Item 4)
- See Engineering comments regarding drainage, ROW, curb ramps and other related items (Item 5)
- Contact the Traffic Engineer directly for comments.
- See Real Property comments regarding easement dedications and other related comments (Item 7)
- See Aurora Water comments regarding water lines, storm outfalls, and sanitary mains (Item 8)
- See Life Safety comments regarding hydrants and phasing (Item 9)
- See Xcel Energy comments (Item 10)
- See CDOT comments (Item 11)
- See Port Colorado comments regarding drainage and traffic (Item 12)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Comments

Comment

1A. No comments were received from surrounding neighborhoods. Outside agency comments were provided from Xcel Energy and CDOT.

Response: Understood.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Comment

2A. See the example below for a guide to revising the data table on the cover sheet.

Response: The data table has been updated.

Comment

2B. Label surrounding development on the vicinity map.

Response: The development names around the project have been added.

Comment

2C. Respond to all redlines and comments in the comment response letter including the outside agency comments from CDOT and Port Colorado. The letter responses may be under separate cover.

Response: Understood.

OVERALL SITE DATA:

		PP AREA
PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION		I-2
PROPOSED USE		I-2
TOTAL LIMIT OF CONSTRUCTION	100%	1,846,250.1 SF (42.8 AC)
TOTAL HARD SURFACE AREA	18%	341,659.7 SF
SIDEWALK		59,680.3 SF
ROADWAY		103,457.7 SF
OTHER		178,521.8 SF
TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA	82%	1,522,590.4 SF
TREE LAWN		57,182.4 SF
NATIVE SEED (AREA OF DISTURBANCE)		1,036,810.4 SF
DETENTION POND SEED MIX		428,597.6 SF

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

Comment

3A. Ensure that the Site Plan notes are up to date. See attachment.

Response: The Site Plan notes have been revised.

Comment

3B. Advisory comment - Port Colorado (adjacent developer) is proposing to the City the concept of a Development Bond for RMRP payable to the City for future public improvement requirements generated by development of the property.

Response: The RMRP team will review and comment once the concept is further understood.

4. Landscape Comments

Sheet 1

Comment

1. Add the Landscape Architect to the Cover Sheet

Response: The Landscape architect has been added.

Sheet 15

Comment

1. Curbside landscape widths of four to six feet in width shall be shrubs, ornamental grasses, and perennials at a ratio of one shrub/grass per 40 square feet of curbside landscape. Grasses may only be provided to a maximum of 40%. Per the transport PIP, the E 48th Avenue section includes a 10' shared use path, 12' landscaping, and ultimately 38' of pavement.

Response: This has been updated.

Comment

2. Sod cannot be used if the curbside landscape area is not 10 feet in width.

Response: Sod was replaced with native seed mix.

Comment

3. Site Lighting shall be shown on the landscape plans to ensure that there are no conflicts.

Response: Site Lighting has been added.

Comment

4. The landscape plan shall include the necessary landscape table to demonstrate compliance with the required landscape treatment.

Response: Landscape table has been added.

Comment

5. Provide/label dimension all easements and move landscape if necessary.

Response: Easement dimensions have been added.

Comment

6. For curbside landscapes, six to ten feet in width, a combination of shrubs/grasses with native seed may be provided, or all shrubs and grasses.

Response: Landscaping has been updated to reflect the standards.

Comment

7. Trees cannot be located within 10' of the storm sewer.

Response: Trees placement have been updated.

Comment

8. Sod cannot be used if the curbside landscape area is not 10 feet in width.

Response: Sod was replaced with native seed mix.

Sheet 16

Comment

1. For curbside landscapes, six to ten feet in width, a combination of shrubs/grasses with native seed may be provided or all shrubs and grasses.

Response: Landscaping has been updated to reflect the standards.

Comment

2. Trees cannot be located within 10' of the storm sewer.

Response: Trees placement have been updated.

Comment

3. Sod cannot be used if the curbside landscape area is not 10 feet in width.

Response: Sod was replaced with native seed mix.

Sheet 17

Comment

1. These trees will have to be removed if the 10' clearance is adhered to.

Response: Trees placement have been updated.

Sheet 18

Comment

1. Sod cannot be used if the curbside landscape area is not 10 feet in width.

Response: Sod was replaced with native seed mix.

Sheet 19

Comment

1. Show site triangle.

Response: Site triangle has been added.

Comment

2. For curbside landscapes six to ten foot in width, a combination of shrubs/grasses with native seed may be provided for all shrubs and grasses.

Response: Landscaping has been updated to reflect the standards.

Sheet 21**Comment**

1. Do not include any contractor notes as the city does not review landscape construction drawings. Update the notes accordingly. Provide only the required landscape notes as found in the Landscape Reference Manual and notes regarding mulch treatments.

Response: Landscape notes have been revised.

Comment

2. The current landscape plans do not comply with this requirement.

Response: Landscape plan has been updated to comply with the notes.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**5. Civil Engineering****Comment**

- 5A. The site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment

- 5B. Sheet 3 - Are ramps being proposed by Transport on the east side?

Response: We are not aware of any but if Transport is adding, we will add on our side.

Comment

- 5C. Indicate the ROW width on the cross-sections.

Response: The ROW width has been added.

Comment

- 5D. Add curb and gutter to the cross-sections.

Response: Curb and gutter have been added.

Comment

- 5E. The expectation is to provide the street improvements along the entirety of the frontage for 48th. Additional coordination may be required to determine what this looks like with the existing channel location.

Response: Per the approved FDP, 48th stops at Rail Park Drive. Our understanding is that 48th will never extend further west as the edge condition is CASP and CASP also owns to the north.

Comment

- 5F. Show the clear zone on all section details.

Response: The clear zone has been added.

Comment

5G. As a reminder, per the pre-app notes the section for 48th should be continuous from the other side of the intersection. Per the Transport PIP, the section includes a 10' shared use path, 12' landscaping, and ultimately 38' of pavement.

Response: The section was discussed with City of Aurora and adjusted as shown to reflect the ROW width that was planned for in the approved FDP.

Comment

5H. Sheet 5 - Streetlights are required along public streets. Please show the location of the streetlights and propose a fixture and pole height based on the draft standards. (typical)

Response: Streetlights have been added.

Comment

5I. Please show the location of 38th. Per the Transport PIP amendment under review, the section between Colfax Ave and 38th should be a five-lane collector. The section north of 38th is the previously approved 3-lane collector from the Transport PIP which includes a 10' shared used path and 12' curbside landscaping.

Response: We have provided for the turn lanes required to support the RMRP project. This includes an eastbound to north double left turn from Colfax to Peterson and then we have merged into 1 lane north where appropriate. The expectation is that Transport, if they require more laneage will provide with their project.

Comment

5J. Sheet 6 - What is the ROW easement? Utility easement? (typical)

Response: The label has been corrected.

Comment

5K. Sheet 8 – The curb ramp should be directional.

Response: The curb ramp has been updated.

Comment

5L. Sheet 9 - Shade back anything that is not proposed by this project. (typical all sheets)

Response: Anything that is not proposed have been shaded.

Comment

5M. Sheet 10 – Show contours tying to existing, typical.

Response: Contours have been extended to tie into the existing surface.

Comment

5N. Sheet 12 - Clearly show the limits of the ROW that is being dedicated. (typical)

Response: ROW limits have been clarified.

Comment

5O. Label the longitudinal slope of the road.

Response: The longitudinal slopes have been added.

Comment

5P. These slope labels are confusing. It should be 2% cross slope per Section 4.05.6 in the Roadway Manual. (typical)

Response: The cross slopes have been revised.

Comment

5Q. Sheet 13 - See the redlines regarding slope labeling.

Response: Understood and addressed.

Comment

5R. Sheet 14 – See the redlines regarding grading.

Response: Understood and addressed.

Comment

5S. Sheet 17 – Ensure all trees are a minimum of 10' from the storm sewer.

Response: Trees placement have been updated.

Comment

5T. Sheet 22 - Manual. Specify a fixture and pole height that meets the draft lighting standards. There is a draft list of pre-approved fixtures available. Please email me jbingham@auroragov.org if you need a copy of this list.

Response: Lighting specifications have been updated.

6. Traffic Engineering**Comment**

6A. Contact the reviewer for comments. None were provided at the time of this letter. Incorporate all redlines in the resubmittal and the comment response letter.

Response: Understood and since this review we have received comments and they are addressed in the submitted TIS.

7. Real Property**Comment**

7A. See the site plan for redlines.

Response: Understood and addressed.

Comment

7B. For easements that are going to be dedicated contact Andy Niquette at dedicationproperty@auroragov.org.

Response: Understood, we will reach out to Andy once all the easements are agreed to.

Comment

7C. Along lot lines show dimensions, bearings, and curve data.

Response: Dimensions, bearings have been added.

8. Aurora Water

Comment

8A. Sheet 3 – Include ownership information for the water lines.

Response: Ownership information has been added.

Comment

8B. Sheet 5 – Clarify if the sanitary main is proposed or existing. If it is existing, include the ownership information.

Response: Sanitary main information has been clarified.

Comment

8C. Sheet 9 - This note should be clarified. During civil plan review, the specific items that are to be public or private must be labeled as such.

Response: Note has been clarified.

Comment

8D. Sheet 10 – Adjust the call-out.

Response: Callout has been adjusted.

Comment

8E. Manhole access is needed at this deflection.

Response: Manhole is in the middle of the street at the bend, so access is available.

Comment

8F. Sheet 11 - If it hasn't already occurred, we recommend coordinating with Port Colorado (Transport) to ensure all necessary utilities are installed before the pavement is placed.

Response: Acknowledged. We have coordinated with Port.

Comment

8G. Sheet 12 – Please identify where the storm outfalls to.

Response: Storm outfall has been shown.

Comment

8H. Please provide access to all manholes.

Response: Manhole access has been added.

Comment

8I. Sheet 13 – Swales should be a 2% minimum.

Response: Slopes have been updated where appropriate. Note that many of the swales are not within the City of Aurora jurisdiction so we are designing per Adams County and Mile High Flood District standards and currently going through their review and approval process.

9. Life Safety

Comment

9A. Sheet 2 - No existing or proposed fire hydrants are shown. Provide a narrative explaining how the looped water supply will be established and the spacing of fire hydrants.

Response: The fire and water system being designed is per the Rocky Mountain Rail Park District standards and Bennet Fire. Per their requirements, hydrants are provided at 1000-foot spacing. Looping as shown has been agreed to with the Rail Park District.

Comment

9B. Sheet 3 – Add a key map showing all portions of this project.

Response: Key map has been added.

Comment

9C. A phasing plan must be provided with the Planning Departments' site plan and Public Works Departments' civil plan submittals. The phasing plan must illustrate each phase and provide a narrative that describes how the phasing will implement the required two points of access and a looped water supply at all times during the phased construction. Also, make sure to incorporate COA Water and Public Works phasing requirements into the phasing plan.

Response: Understood. Phasing is not planned for with this project and all improvements shown shall be built as one package.

Comment

9D. Revise the fire hydrant symbol to a large and distinct image.

Response: The fire hydrant symbol has been updated.

Comment

9E. Place fire hydrants at 500'; arranged on an alternating basis. Show and label fire hydrants.

Response: The fire and water system being designed is per the Rocky Mountain Rail Park District standards and Bennet Fire. Per their requirements, hydrants are provided at 1000-foot spacing. Looping as shown has been agreed to with the Rail Park District.

Comment

9F. Sheets 5 thru 9 - Place fire hydrants at 500'; arranged on an alternating basis. Show and label fire hydrants.

Response: The fire and water system being designed is per the Rocky Mountain Rail Park District standards and Bennet Fire. Per their requirements, hydrants are provided at 1000-foot spacing. Looping as shown has been agreed to with the Rail Park District.

10. Xcel Energy

Comment

10A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCO) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the infrastructure site plan for Rocky Mountain Railpark Roadways and requests that 10-foot-wide utility easements are dedicated abutting all property lines located along public rights-of-way for natural gas and electric distribution facilities.

Please be aware PSCo owns and operates an existing underground electric distribution line crossing Peterson Road roughly 250 feet north of the railroad tracks in the area near the access road to the property at the northeast corner of the railroad tracks and Peterson Road. Please show this line on the plan.

As the project progresses, the property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service or modification to the existing facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

For additional easements that may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities, the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Comment response requested.

Response: Noted.

11. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)

Comment

11A. See the attached memo regarding in part, drainage, traffic and ROW comments. Respond to each comment in your resubmittal.

Response: See attached.

12. Port of Colorado Comments

Comment

12A. Please find attachments from Felsburg Holt & Ullevig and Westwood regarding Rocky Mountain Railpark's Infrastructure Site Plan as submitted to the City of Aurora. In addition to the items included within each memo, Port Colorado request further coordination with Applicant (Robert Wahl – JHL Constructors) and Agent (Patrick Chelin - Matrix Design Group Inc) regarding the design plans and elevations of Peterson Road. Below are the additional items requiring clarification and/or modifications.

Private Water Infrastructure:

- Design as provided shows private infrastructure to be located within the public right-of-way. How does this impact the future City of Aurora mainline design and installation by Port Colorado as identified in the Master Plans? Private utilities should come secondary to the City of Aurora's ultimate water and sanitary design for three utilities under Peterson and 48th Ave.
- Who is "Others" as indicated in the 48th Ave 12" water line to be "installed by others"?
- Water hydrants are not included within the report for public improvements. How is the public right-of-way landscaping set to be maintained? Additionally, whom will be providing life, fire and safety for the roadway if hydrants are not installed be City of Aurora code?

Streetscape and Elevations:

- Further coordination needs to occur with Matrix regarding the elevations and preliminary drainage report, as Port has not been provided a copy to review.
- What street light fixtures are being proposed? Port Colorado has elected to use specific light improvements within its development and we would like to ensure the applicant matches those parameters for aesthetics along the City of Aurora right-of-way.
- Sheet 8 calls out a “Proposed Box by Others”; who is “Others”?

Rail / PUC Improvements:

- There does not appear to be any detail for the proposed improvements at the railway crossing. Increased traffic along Peterson will trigger improvements at the railway crossing. Please provide details and coordination/approval from the PUC regarding the proposed improvements.
- Similar to the escrowed funds for the traffic signals, will an escrow be created for any crossing protection (lights / gates) that is called for by PUC or any other authority? Once the proper road design has been established, improvements will require additional crossing protection at Peterson and the UPRR railway crossing.

Traffic Impact Study:

- Matrix is utilizing dated materials for review when it comes to the Port Colorado Master Traffic Impact Study. All analysis should be completed to reflect the 2022 report(s) for the Master Plan and subsequent Sub Area 6 Master Plan.
- Furthermore, Colfax improvements are not identified within this plan? Improvements will be required, as increased traffic counts for the proposed project will require modifications, as well as improvements will occur for the private water line installation servicing the property. The same could be said for the proposed railway crossing details.
- Coordination will need to occur for the road closure details associated with these improvements. A traffic control plan, timeline and alternate access route(s) will be required to ensure Port Colorado continues to have access to the Sub Area 6 property (located between Colfax and 48th) in its entirety.

Response: Noted.

WESTWOOD

Sheet 3

Comment

1. The ultimate road section is a little confusing. Is the work by this project (“RMRP”) and work by others reversed?

Response: Please see plans.

Comment

2. This road section does not match with the 48th Ave road section to the east of Peterson Road as part of Port Master Plan. RMRP’s pre-app notes indicate these sections should match and follow the Port Master Plan(s).

Response: Noted.

Comment

3. RMRP is placing their private waterline only 4' from the road edge, leaving ~13' between this waterline and the ROW. The Port Master Plan utility design will need to install three lines (water and 2 sewer) north of this waterline. Port will also need additional ROW and contend with an existing overhead power line. Since there appears to be room further south, we recommend this private line be moved further south to allow room for the three utility lines serving the Port Master Plan, which are the planned permanent public utilities serving the City of Aurora user needs. Public utilities for the City of Aurora should take priority in City roadways.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

4. RMRP's plans indicate a 40' ROW, while their recorded plat (not included with this package) shows it as future ROW. Is this being dedicated as part of this project?

Response: Yes, will dedicated with this project.

Comment

5. The Port Master Plan will need casing pipes for the three utilities for Sub Area 6 under the 6'x8' box culvert crossing at 48th.

Response: Noted.

Sheet 5**Comment**

1. This road section does not match with the Peterson Road section in the Port Master Plans. RMRP's pre-app notes indicate these sections should match and follow the Port Master Plans.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

2. This road section does not match the Port Master Plan TIS recommendations regarding the need for a 5-lane road section from Colfax Ave to 38th Ave (40th Place on these plans). See FHU comments regarding the TIS issues.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

3. RMRP's road section shows the bike lane in the roadway, while Port Master Plan sections show it in a wider sidewalk.

Response: Comment noted and plans adjusted.

Comment

4. RMRP's private waterline is shown only 5' off the road centerline but appears to have room to be 10' off which will accommodate a Port Master Plan utility going down the centerline, which is the planned permanent public utilities serving the City of Aurora user needs. Public utilities for the City of Aurora should take priority in City roadways.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

5. RMRP's interim road section shows only a 2' shoulder. City of Aurora requires a 4' paved shoulder.

Response: Shoulder has been updated to 4'.

Sheet 10**Comment**

1. There is a channel crossing 48th Ave just off the page west of the box culvert. Port will need casing pipes for our three utility lines under this crossing, as well.

Response: Noted.

Sheet 12**Comment**

1. The grading does not accommodate the 5-lane section as determined in the Port Master Plan TIS. See FHU comments regarding the TIS issues.

Response: 5-lane section not needed to support the RMRP project and not reflected on the approved FDP.

Comment

2. There appears to be a missing waterline on this sheet and the next. The section shows two private waterlines. In addition, there is a sewer line shown on the plan but not shown on the sections.

Response: Noted.

Comment

3. The multiple utility lines necessary for the Port Master Plan project are permanent, public utilities serving the City of Aurora user needs. These alignments should take priority over private utilities. We believe there is some flexibility in these private utility alignments that would not adversely impact their project while facilitating the Port Master Plan utility design.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

4. While this project is not within the City of Aurora, both Peterson Road and 48th Ave. are within the City of Aurora and as a result, this project is responsible for hydrants along their project edge to serve the fire hydrant needs for the roadways. These hydrants alternate on both sides of the roadways. The hydrants and stubouts to the public main constructed by the Port Master Plan should be included in this package design.

Response: Waterline and hydrants are provided meeting the Rocky Mountain Rail Park District and Bennet Fire requirements. This system is not available for expansion by the Port project and if they need additional hydrants, they will need to provide a water system to do so.

Sheet 13

Comment

1. The low point grading of Peterson Road just north of the intersection of 40th Place will not allow sufficient grade differential between this low point and the water quality/detention pond located immediately to the east of Peterson Road. As a result, this needs to be raised 2 feet to facilitate this pond design.

Response: This has been adjusted and addressed.

Sheet 16

Comment

1. The discussion above regarding fire hydrants also applies to the landscaping. Specifically, the types and aesthetics of plantings should be coordinated with what is proposed for the east side of Peterson Road.

Response: RMRP project has designed the landscape to meet City of Aurora requirements.

Sheet 24

Comment

1. The discussion above regarding fire hydrants also applies to the streetlights. Specifically, the types and aesthetics of these lights should match with what is proposed for the east side of Peterson Road.

Response: RMRP project has designed the landscape to meet City of Aurora requirements.

FELSBURG HOLT & ULLEVIG

Comment

1. We disagree with the introductory paragraph of the Matrix Design Group analysis regarding the developments appropriately recognizing traffic from one another. Both the MTIS and the Subarea 6 TIS for Port Colorado recognized background traffic from the RMRP site. Our first submittal of the MTIS (dated April 2019) utilized a July 2018 version of the RMRP TIS prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates which has been incorporated in every subsequent submittal. Furthermore, the total traffic conditions turning movement counts for the intersection of Peterson and Colfax presented on pages 16 (AM) and 18 (PM) are nearly identical to the RMRP site trips presented on pages 12 (AM) and 14 (PM). Matrix utilized total volumes from the Port MTIS for Subarea 1 only which would have minimal impact on a design of Peterson Road as only a small percentage of Subarea 1 traffic would utilize Colfax Avenue for origins and destinations to the east in the Town of Bennet. Matrix Design Group was informed by FHU that a Subarea 6 TIS was submitted and approved by the City of Aurora and that they would need to complete a Colorado Open Records Act request to obtain that information for inclusion in their analysis. The RMRP analysis still does not account for any trips associate with Port Colorado Subarea 6. Therefore, all analysis for Peterson Road underrepresents projected traffic volumes.

Response: Comment noted. Matrix requested a copy of the Port TIS while we were preparing ours and told they would not provide. It has since been provided.

Comment

2. Previous iterations of the RMRP TIS used 277 acres of land beyond the paving plant for trip generation purposes and the current study only reflects 207 acres. It looks as though this 70-acre loss for rail and roadway infrastructure. If this is the case, a 2 employee per acre assumption might be low for this project site. Furthermore, in documents of Series A and B bonds for the RMRP there is a detailed estimate of building square footages for each lot. The north parcel of RMRP as noted in the documentation of RMRP contains lots 1 through 10 with lot 1 representing the paving plant. The bond documentation indicates that 1.486 million square feet of industrial space is planned for lots 2 through 10 (see attached excerpt). Utilizing the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) publication Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition (2021) to forecast vehicle-trips based on the land use types and sizes RMRP would generate significantly more traffic than is reported in this analysis. Utilizing Industrial Park (Land Use #130) consistent with the RMRP analysis a 1.486 million square foot industrial park would generate 5,008 daily trips and 505 trips in each of the AM and PM peak hour. These values are more than double the 1,702 daily trips and 207 and 220 trips in the AM and PM peak hour reported for lots 2 through 10 in the provided analysis.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

3. While not noted in the analysis, it appears through calculations of existing counts to background traffic projections as though an annual background growth rate of 1.7% per year has been applied to existing counts to get to 2040 projections presented on pages 2(AM) and 3 (PM) of the RMRP analysis. Given the level of development anticipated in the Town of Bennet this feels like a significant underestimation of what level of background traffic may be present in 2040. Notably, the RMRP analysis indicates a buildout daily volume of 7,400 along Colfax adjacent to the site where NEATS presents a daily volume of 8,100. Furthermore, NEATS modeling indicates significant underestimates in that just 87 trips occur in 2040 from TAZ 1005 which includes both RMRP north parcel and Port Colorado Subarea 6. These underestimates are likely true for adjacent TAZs as well. Based on the collected daily volume presented in the RMRP analysis of 3,285 daily vehicles along Colfax Ave east of Manila Road collected on March 23, 2022, by All Traffic Data and the 2040 NEATS value a 5.1% annual growth rate should be utilized.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

4. The trip generation presented in the RMRP analysis indicates that the paving operation would generate 94 peak hour trips, with 44 of those being trucks representing a 47 percent presence of heavy vehicles for that portion of the site. Analysis of the intersection of Peterson and Colfax presented in the RMRP analysis utilizes a heavy vehicles percentage of 16%. For this to be true, specifically for the inbound (eastbound left), 48 of the 301 AM trips and 50 of the 314 PM trips would be trucks. This implies that the remainder of the park would be generating just 4 truck trips during the AM peak hour and 6 truck trips during the PM peak hour or percentages of 2.0 and 2.7 for the AM and PM peak respectively. This appears to significantly underestimate the number of truck trips to and from the remainder of the industrial park. CDOT requires a second left turn lane when the peak hour flow of a left turn exceeds 300 vehicles per hour (vph), including a 3-passenger car equivalent for trucks. Using the presented eastbound left turn volume of 225 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 16% trucks results in 297 vph, just under that 300 vph threshold. If appropriate truck trip generation is included from the remainder of the industrial park, a second eastbound left turn

lane at Peterson and Colfax would be warranted with just the RMRP traffic even in the absence of Port Colorado Subarea 6. This improvement drives the need for a 5-lane cross section along Peterson Road immediately north of Colfax Avenue to provide the appropriate receiving lanes rather than the 3-lane cross-section that has been presented on behalf of RMRP.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

5. We believe that the traffic analysis provided for RMRP is incomplete and needs to be updated to appropriately determine the roadway cross-sections and intersection geometries for Peterson Road adjacent to RMRP and Port Colorado Subarea 6. The following list of items needs to be considered in an updated TIS:

- Inclusion of site traffic volumes from the Port Colorado Subarea 6 TIS
- Accurate representation of development potential for trip generation purposes
- A background traffic annual growth rate of at least 5 percent
- A heavy vehicle percentage that accurately represents a rail served industrial park

Response: Comment noted.

Comment

6. It is our belief that once these updates are made, a 5-lane cross-section is likely most appropriate for the segment of Peterson Road immediately north of Colfax Avenue, driven by the need for a dual eastbound left turn at the intersection of Colfax Avenue with Peterson Road. Consideration to the needs of traffic signalization and preemption at the intersection of Colfax Avenue with Peterson Road as a result of vehicles queuing in the southbound direction across the at-grade rail crossing should also be thoroughly analyzed.

Response: RMRP does not require a 5-lane section north of Colfax.

STATE OF COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Drainage Comments:

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.

Response: Understood and now reflected.

Environmental Comments

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: Comment noted.

Comment

2. 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.

Response: Comment noted.

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.

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.

Traffic Comments

Comment

1. I do question the amount of traffic that this going to produce. Port Colorado right next to you is

assuming roughly 3 employee 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: We have used the information provided to us from the Developer and the different end users that have been identified.

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: The I-70/Manilla interchange work is the last phase of Development. We will be in touch with CDOT to ensure the timing is sufficient.

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: A southbound right turn has been added after further analysis.

Comment

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

Response: Understood.

Comment

5. 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: The layout has been provided with this resubmittal.

Right of Way Comments

Comment

1. AD 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: Great, thank you.

Resident Engineer Comments

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: Will do.

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: Understood, will be provided with the design plans.

Comment

3. Clearly Identify existing and proposed CDOT ROW.

Response: Labels added.

Comment

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

Response: Will do on the design plans.

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: Understood. We have met the sight triangle requirements for trees (nothing 24-inches wide between 36-inches and 84-inches).

Sheet 12 of 26

Comment

1. Show flow pattern around the intersection.

Response: 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: Added

Permits Comments

Comment

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

Response: Labels added.

Comment

2. 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

Response: Comments noted and will be addressed as the project moves into design phase.

Required Site Plan Notes

Comment

1. The developer, his successors and assigns, including the homeowners or merchants association, shall be responsible for installation, maintenance and replacement of all fire lane signs as required by the City of Aurora.

Response: Note has been updated.

Comment

2. All signs must conform to the City of Aurora sign code.

Response: Note has been updated.

Comment

3. Right of way for ingress and egress for service and emergency vehicles is granted over, across, on and through any and all private roads and ways now or hereafter established on the described property, and the same are hereby designated as "Service/Emergency and Utility Easements" and shall be posted "No Parking - Fire Lane."

Response: Note has been updated.

Comment

4. "Accessible exterior routes" shall be provided from public transportation stops, accessible parking, accessible passenger loading zones and public sidewalks to the accessible building entrance they serve. At least 50% of all building entrances shall be the most practical direct route. No slope along this route may exceed 1:20 without providing a ramp with a maximum slope of 1:12 and handrails. Crosswalks along this route shall be wide enough to wholly contain the curb ramp with a minimum width of 36", and shall be painted with white stripes. Required accessible means of egress shall be continuous from each required accessible occupied area to the public way. The "Accessible Exterior Routes" shall comply with U.B.C. Chapter 11, Appendix 11, and C.A.B.O./A.N.S.I. 117.1.

(Note to Applicant: Please see Exhibit B8 under the Development/Design Standards section of this Guidebook for items to be shown on a Site Plan).

Response: Note has been added.

Comment

5. The applicant has the obligation to comply with all applicable requirements of the American with Disabilities Act.

Response: Note has been updated.

Comment

6. The developer, his successors and assigns, shall be responsible for installation, maintenance and replacement of all landscaping materials shown or indicated on the approved Site Plan or Landscape Plan on file in the Planning Department. All landscaping will be installed prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

Response: Note has been added.

Comment

7. All crossings or encroachments by private landscape irrigation lines or systems and/or private utilities into easements and street rights-of-way owned by the City of Aurora are acknowledged by the undersigned as being subject to City of Aurora's use and occupancy of the said easements or rights-of-way. The undersigned, their successors and assigns, hereby agree to indemnify the City of Aurora for any loss, damage or repair to city facilities that may result from the installation, operation or maintenance of said private irrigation lines or systems and/or private utilities.

Response: Note has been updated.

Comment

8. The approval of this document does not constitute final approval of grading, drainage, utility, public improvements and building plans. Construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate agency prior to the issuance of building permits.

Response: Note has been updated.

Comment

9. All building address numbers shall comply with Sections 126-271 and 126-278 of the Aurora City Code.

Response: Not applicable to this phase of the project.

Comment

10. All rooftop mechanical equipment and vents greater than eight (8) inches in diameter must be screened. Screening may be done either with an extended parapet wall or a freestanding screen wall. Screens shall be at least as high as the equipment they hide. If equipment is visible because screens don't meet this minimum height requirement, the Director of Planning may require construction modifications prior to the issuance of a permanent Certificate of Occupancy.

Response: Not applicable to this project.

Comment

11. Notwithstanding any surface improvements, landscaping, planting or changes shown in these site or construction plans, or actually constructed or put in place, all utility easements must remain unobstructed and fully accessible along their entire length to allow for adequate maintenance equipment. Additionally, no installation, planting, change in the surface, etc., shall interfere with the operation of the utility lines placed within the easement. By submitting these site or construction plans for approval, the landowner recognizes and accepts the terms, conditions and requirements of this note.

Response: Note has been updated.

Comment

12. Final grade shall be at least six (6) inches below any exterior wood siding on the premises.

Response: Not applicable to this project.

Comment

13. All interested parties are hereby alerted that this Site Plan is subject to administrative changes and as shown on the original Site Plan on file in the Aurora City Planning Office at the Municipal Building. A copy of the official current plan may be purchased there. Likewise, Site Plans are required to agree with the approved subdivision plat of record at the time of a building permit; and if not, must be amended to agree with the plat as needed, or vice versa.

Response: Note has been updated.

Comment

14. Errors in approved Site Plans resulting from computations or inconsistencies in the drawings made by the applicant are the responsibility of the property owner of record. Where found, the current minimum Code requirements will apply at the time of building permit. Please be sure that all plan computations are correct.

Response: Note has been added.

Comment

15. All representations and commitments made by applicants and property owners at public hearings regarding this plan are binding upon the applicant, property owner, and its heirs, successors, and assigns.

Response: Note has been added.

Comment

16. Architectural features, such as bay windows, fireplaces, roof overhangs, gutters, eaves, foundations, footings, cantilevered walls, etc, are not allowed to encroach into any easement or fire lane.

Response: Not applicable to this phase of the project.

Comment

17. *(This note is required only when applicable)--*

Attention Building Department: An acoustic analysis, prepared by an acoustic expert, and prepared according to the Planning Application Guidebook instructions, will identify building design features necessary to accomplish exterior noise reduction to achieve interior noise levels not exceeding Ldn (Ldn value to be determined for each project) under worse-case noise conditions.

Response: Not applicable to this project.

Comment

18. *(This note is required only when applicable)--*

The vendor of any future sale of the real property shall provide the required notice per City Code Section 146-1587(c) to be recorded with the County Clerk and Recorder and shall provide such notice to each prospective purchaser of any and all said property. See Exhibit C4 under the Airport Related Land Use Restrictions section of this Guidebook.

Response: Not applicable to this project.

Comment

19. *(This note is required only when applicable) --*

State any requested waivers of development standards and the applicable terms and conditions pursuant thereto.

Response: Not applicable to this project.

Comment

20. *For proposed auto repair/service uses, add the following note:*

There will be no outside, overnight storage of vehicles on the site.

Response: Not applicable to this project.

Comment

21. *For proposed auto sales lots, add the following notes:*

- No loading and unloading of vehicles will be allowed in the public rights-of-way.
- No parking or sale of display vehicles will occur in the public rights-of-way.
- No vehicle shall be parked, stored or displayed for purpose of sale in the designated display spaces that shows evidence of having flat tires or has exterior body damage that is obviously visible from public rights-of-way.
- No vehicle ramp display equipment will be allowed on the site and no vehicle(s) for display or sale shall be mounted on vehicle ramp display equipment.

Response: Not applicable to this project.

Thank you very much for the review. We believe we have adequately addressed the comments and look forward to your concurrence. Please don't hesitate to reach out at 303-572-0200 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Patrick Chelin, P.E.
Senior Vice President

cc: 21.1280.001