



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

October 9, 2023

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

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

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process recently. 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 as soon as feasible. When you resubmit, include a *comment response letter* specifically responding to each item. Do not resubmit until comments are obtained from Traffic Engineering and Land Development Services. The resubmittal will be rejected if the comment response letter is not included and/or does not all comments including comments from outside agencies. Note that all our comments are numbered. 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, 303.739.7541 or rrabbaa@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Rachid Rabbaa – Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Kevin Fennelly – Matrix Design Group 707 17th St Ste #3150 Denver CO 80202
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\2329-00rev3.rtf



Third Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- See Engineering comments (Item 4)
- Comments will be forward to you from Traffic Engineer (Item 5)
- Please contact Land Development Review Services directly for comments (Item 6)
- See Aurora Water comments - Per the cross section the private water main is to be 5-feet west of the Peterson Road centerline (Item 7)
- See Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) comments (Item 8)
- See Port Colorado comments (Item 9).

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Rachid Rabbaa rrabbaa@auroragov.org / 303-739-7186 / PDF comments in teal.

1. Community Comments

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

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Respond to all redlines and comments in the *comment response letter* including the outside agency comments from CDOT.

2B. Staff continues to examine the Peterson Road cross section adjacent to the RMRP project.

3. Landscape Comments Tammy Cook / 954-266-6488 / tdcook@auroragov.org

3A. No further comments.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

4A. Sheet 13 - Repeat: Max 4:1 slopes in the ROW.

4B. Sheet 14 - Streetlights are required along public streets. Please show the location of the streetlights and propose a fixture Repeat: Max 4:1 in the ROW, max 3:1 slopes outside of the ROW. Please check that the scales are all correct on every sheet. It seems that the scale is smaller than 1:40.

4C. Sheet 17 - Please ensure the ROW linework is shown on all sheets.

5. Traffic Engineering

Reviewed by: Carl Harline / charline@auroragov.org / 303-739-7584

5A. Staff will forward the comments once we receive them from Traffic Engineering.

6. Land Development Review Services

Reviewed by: Maurice Brooks/ mbrooks@auroragov.org / 303-739-7294 / Comments in Pink.

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

7. Aurora Water

Reviewed by: Casey Ballard / cballard@auroragov.org / 303-739-7382 / Comments in red.

7A. Sheet 5 – Per the cross section the private watermain is to be 5-feet west of the Peterson Road centerline.

8. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)

8A. See the attached memo regarding drainage, traffic, access permits, and ROW comments. Respond to each comment in your resubmittal.

**9. Port Colorado comments / Kelsey B Hall / khall@portcolorado.com / 303-353-1088 ext.105**

9A. Westwood has reviewed the referral package for the above referenced project dated September 11, 2023, and we have the following comments:

Sheet 4:

- The Ultimate Built Out Condition section has a note regarding the pavement section that references Note 4. There is no Note 4 shown.

Sheet 5:

- The Ultimate Built Out Condition section has a note regarding the pavement section that references Note 4. There is no Note 4 shown.
- The plans have gone back to showing a single EB left turn lane on E. Colfax Ave. onto NB Peterson Road. Jacob Cox had indicated to Sarah Kolz that had been agreed upon, but we have seen no documentation from CDOT authorizing this change. In addition, they are still showing a 3-lane configuration between E. Colfax Ave. and E. 38th Ave. along Peterson Road that Matrix indicates is per an agreement between RMRP and the City of Aurora. This conflicts with what Jacob Cox had told Sarah Kolz very recently.
- The label for the curb return at the NW corner of the E. Colfax Ave./Peterson Road intersection appears to be pointing at something other than the curb return. Has this been confirmed with turning movement analysis, as this has been requested of the Port plans.
- REPEAT COMMENT: RMRP still has not shown the extra 2' of ROW being dedicated along the 3-lane configuration to fully conform to the 84' ROW section as shown in the Port PIP. COA has previously indicated that RMRP needs to conform to the Port PIP. We repeat our assumption that COA will enforce their code.
- The waterline alignment does not conform to their typical road section for Peterson Road. The waterline runs along the section line, not 5' off, and a 2nd line is shown east of the section line. This conflicts with the discussion Jacob Cox had with Sarah Kolz.
- RMRP is now showing hydrants tying into their private water line along the west side of Peterson Road south of E. 38th Ave. We are unsure if the City of Aurora Fire Dept. will accept this since it's fed by a private system.
- There is no information provided regarding the streetlights other than location. Will these streetlights conform to City of Aurora standards and match what is being provided on the east side?
- Question: What happens if Union Pacific (UP) does not provide COA with a modified license agreement for the Peterson Road improvements? UP has indicated to COA that the Peterson Road improvements across their ROW would require the abandonment of 2 existing crossings. Will this impact the ability of either RMRP or Port to obtain a license agreement for the water lines crossing the UP ROW? Will the Port project be delayed because their improvements and waterline crossing are coming in behind the RMRP improvements with regards to UP processing rather than doing everything at the same time?

Sheet 6:

- Similar comment regarding road section configuration, additional ROW, waterline alignment, and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.
- RMRP is showing a stop condition along Peterson at the Rail Park Dr. tee intersection. FHU recommends only a stop condition for Rail Park Dr. and not Peterson Road.

Sheet 7:

- Similar comment regarding road section configuration, additional ROW, waterline alignment, and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.
- REPEAT COMMENT: RMRP plans show the box culvert outfalling from the Port detention pond being done by Port. As noted previously, Port expects the COA to enforce the need to install enough of the box culvert to extend beyond the limits of proposed paving, so Port doesn't have to rip up the new pavement. In addition, this box is necessary to facilitate historic drainage of offsite Port drainage to avoid overtopping of the roadway. As a result, it needs to be included as part of the RMRP plans. This is typical of other projects in Aurora where similar conditions occur.
- Given the comment above, maintenance access within an easement to the box culvert outfall also needs to be included in these plans.



Sheet 8:

- Similar comment regarding additional ROW as noted on Sheet 5.
- RMRP are not showing hydrants along the west side of Peterson Road north of E. 38th Ave. since they have no private waterline along this section. However, they can provide fire hydrants and enough stub out pipe to get past the proposed paving, and the Port project will connect to the proposed public waterline.

Sheet 9:

- Similar comment regarding additional ROW and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 8.

Sheet 10:

- There appears to be a missing sheet for the extreme west end of E. Colfax Ave. improvements.
- REPEAT COMMENT: A Colfax Ave improvements section should be provided.
- REPEAT COMMENT: RMRP plans have not provided an ultimate layout site plan for Colfax Ave. The Port TIS indicates that Colfax Ave. between Peterson Road and Manila Road needs to be a 4-lane minor arterial with curb and gutter and sidewalk/bike lane. RMRP would be responsible for their frontage with their future development.
- RMRP shows only a 6' shoulder. CDOT has indicated to Port that an 8' shoulder would be required.
- Only a single EB left turn lane on E. Colfax Ave. onto NB Peterson Road is shown which aligns with discussions with Jacob Cox, but no documentation with CDOT has been provided as yet. This turn lane is shown as 12' wide and CDOT has indicated to Port that this needs to be 14' wide.

Sheet 11:

- Similar comments regarding a typ. road section, shoulder width, and providing an ultimate condition.
- The E. Colfax Ave. improvements east of Peterson Road are similar in configuration, but a little bit shorter than shown on Port plans.

Sheet 14:

- REPEAT COMMENT: There is a storm sewer crossing Peterson Road that will pick up a small area of the existing Port site runoff. Port improvements will not require this storm sewer and it will be plugged and abandoned in place.
- In the response to comments, Matrix has indicated that the profile grades have been coordinated between RMRP and Port. Westwood has not received updated cad files and/or profile information reflecting this current grading, so this response isn't completely true. We have been trying to match the RMRP grades where possible as the RMRP project has been ahead of the Port project, so we didn't believe we had the flexibility to make changes to the profile with the lone exception of the low point just north of E. 38th Ave. Port would prefer steeper than 0.5% slopes, so if changes to this profile are still an option, Port would like to provide input in that area shortly.
- A new sump in Peterson Road has been added at the Rail Park Drive intersection. This has not been accommodated for in the Port drainage design at all. In addition to adding 200-300' of additional storm sewer to the Port project, fitting this into the Peterson Road section, given the private utility encroachments noted previously, may prove to be difficult. This was also not coordinated with Westwood previously.

Sheet 15:

- It does appear that the grading of the low point in Peterson Road just north of E. 38th Ave. has been finally raised to address our previously noted concerns.
- REPEAT COMMENT: Surface emergency overflow from the Port Detention Pond located immediately to the east has not been accommodated by this design through Tract C. Given the limited information provided by RMRP, the Port design was required to upsize the box culvert to accommodate this flow and this hasn't been reflected on the plans. See Sheet 7 notes above.
- REPEAT COMMENT: Access to the downstream end of this box culvert with an easement granted to the COA hasn't been accommodated for by these plans. See Sheet 7 notes above.
- REPEAT COMMENT: The RMRP Preliminary Drainage Report was provided to us directly from Matrix. This report doesn't discuss the Port runoff outfall from the detention pond mentioned above, but only provides old information from the Enertia report from 3 years ago which still assumes Port will have multiple outfall points and lower runoff flow from the detention pond. Westwood hasn't been provided any updates to the PDR to confirm any changes to this comment.



Sheet 17:

- There appears to be a missing sheet for the extreme west end of E. Colfax Ave. improvements.
- REPEAT COMMENT: The proposed grading appears to encroach into the UPRR ROW. Have you had discussions with them regarding this encroachment?
- REPEAT COMMENT: The proposed grading along the southern edge appears to be incomplete and channels along the edge of the shoulder which could undermine the roadway with erosion. The site entrance grading also looks missing.
- REPEAT COMMENT: Is the swale along the north side for WQ purposes? Otherwise, why not sheet flow? The area between Colfax Ave. and the tracks act as a broad swale anyway and would minimize grading encroachments into the UPRR ROW.
- Is the intent of the E. Colfax Ave. improvements to add pavement to the existing roadway or is it a complete remove and replace along the impacted length of roadway. The hatching implies pavement widening while the contours indicate a complete removal and replacement. The plans are unclear regarding this intent since no typ. section has been provided.

Sheet 18:

- Similar comments to Sheet 17 regarding grading encroachments and the remove/replace issue.

Sheet 21:

- The tree table indicates RMRP is providing 60 fewer trees than what is required along the Peterson Road tree lawn. Why is there a shortage? We suspect this is because there is a private waterline within the tree lawn south of Rail Park Dr. Since Peterson Road is a public road in the City of Aurora, the tree lawns on both sides of the street should match and meet City of Aurora landscaping standards. The waterline should be relocated on-site to avoid this conflict.

STATE OF COLORADO

Traffic & Safety

Region 1

2829 W. Howard Place
Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Project Name: **Rocky Mountain Rail - North Site Plan**

Print Date:

Highway:

Mile Marker:

Drainage Comments:

SBL - 9/26/2023

CDOT specific drainage report is still required for all improvements within CDOT right-of-way. Comments from 3/15/2023 and 9/15/2022 still apply.

SBL - 3/15/2023

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.

SBL - 9/15/2022

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.

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

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.

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

Traffic Comments:

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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.

Jason Igo 3/20/2023

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

Jason Igo 9/16/2022

Right of Way Comments:

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.

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.

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

MJO 9/18/2023 - NO Comments at this time, it appers 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.

Resident Engineer Comments:

No Commnts for this revision. Thanks.
KMD_10-2-23

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

At Peterson Rd and Colfax Intersection

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

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.

Clery Identify existing and proposed CDOT ROW.

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

All features proposed within CDOT ROW shall meet CDOT standards.

Sheet 16 of 26 of Infrastructure Plan

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

Sheet 12 of 26

Show flow pattern around the intersection.

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.

KMD_9/15/22

Permits Comments:

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

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 medain) 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 stangely omits SH 36 and we need to see it. Both design and when the latter 3 bullet items will be built. Incuding 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

Please seperate 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:

3-17-2023 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

MEMO

Date: September 28, 2023

To: Stephen Rodriguez

From: Craig Northam, P.E., Westwood

CC: Kelsey Hall, Port Colorado

RE: Rocky Mountain Rail Park (E48th Ave and Peterson Road 3rd ISP referral package)

Project Name: Port Colorado Sub-Area 6

Project Number: R0032061.00

Westwood has reviewed the referral package for the above referenced project dated September 11, 2023, and we have the following comments:

Sheet 4:

- The Ultimate Built Out Condition section has a note regarding the pavement section that references Note 4. There is no Note 4 shown.

Sheet 5:

- The Ultimate Built Out Condition section has a note regarding the pavement section that references Note 4. There is no Note 4 shown.
- The plans have gone back to showing a single EB left turn lane on E. Colfax Ave. onto NB Peterson Road. Jacob Cox had indicated to Sarah Kolz that had been agreed upon, but we have seen no documentation from CDOT authorizing this change. In addition, they are still showing a 3-lane configuration between E. Colfax Ave. and E. 38th Ave. along Peterson Road that Matrix indicates is per an agreement between RMRP and the City of Aurora. This conflicts with what Jacob Cox had told Sarah Kolz very recently.
- The label for the curb return at the NW corner of the E. Colfax Ave./Peterson Road intersection appears to be pointing at something other than the curb return. Has this been confirmed with turning movement analysis, as this has been requested of the Port plans.
- REPEAT COMMENT: RMRP still has not shown the extra 2' of ROW being dedicated along the 3-lane configuration to fully conform to the 84' ROW section as shown in the Port PIP. COA has previously indicated that RMRP needs to conform to the Port PIP. We repeat our assumption that COA will enforce their code.

- The waterline alignment does not conform to their typical road section for Peterson Road. The waterline runs along the section line, not 5' off, and a 2nd line is shown east of the section line. This conflicts with the discussion Jacob Cox had with Sarah Kolz.
- RMRP is now showing hydrants tying into their private water line along the west side of Peterson Road south of E. 38th Ave. We are unsure if the City of Aurora Fire Dept. will accept this since it's fed by a private system.
- There is no information provided regarding the streetlights other than location. Will these streetlights conform to City of Aurora standards and match what is being provided on the east side?
- Question: What happens if Union Pacific (UP) does not provide COA with a modified license agreement for the Peterson Road improvements? UP has indicated to COA that the Peterson Road improvements across their ROW would require the abandonment of 2 existing crossings. Will this impact the ability of either RMRP or Port to obtain a license agreement for the water lines crossing the UP ROW? Will the Port project be delayed because their improvements and waterline crossing are coming in behind the RMRP improvements with regards to UP processing rather than doing everything at the same time?

Sheet 6:

- Similar comment regarding road section configuration, additional ROW, waterline alignment, and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.
- RMRP is showing a stop condition along Peterson at the Rail Park Dr. tee intersection. FHU recommends only a stop condition for Rail Park Dr. and not Peterson Road.

Sheet 7:

- Similar comment regarding road section configuration, additional ROW, waterline alignment, and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.
- REPEAT COMMENT: RMRP plans show the box culvert outfalling from the Port detention pond being done by Port. As noted previously, Port expects the COA to enforce the need to install enough of the box culvert to extend beyond the limits of proposed paving, so Port doesn't have to rip up the new pavement. In addition, this box is necessary to facilitate historic drainage of offsite Port drainage to avoid overtopping of the roadway. As a result, it needs to be included as part of the RMRP plans. This is typical of other projects in Aurora where similar conditions occur.
- Given the comment above, maintenance access within an easement to the box culvert outfall also needs to be included in these plans.

Sheet 8:

- Similar comment regarding additional ROW as noted on Sheet 5.
- RMRP are not showing hydrants along the west side of Peterson Road north of E. 38th Ave. since they have no private waterline along this section. However, they can provide fire hydrants and enough stub out pipe to get past the proposed paving, and the Port project will connect to the proposed public waterline.

Sheet 9:

- Similar comment regarding additional ROW and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 8.

Sheet 10:

- There appears to be a missing sheet for the extreme west end of E. Colfax Ave. improvements.

- REPEAT COMMENT: A Colfax Ave improvements section should be provided.
- REPEAT COMMENT: RMRP plans have not provided an ultimate layout site plan for Colfax Ave. The Port TIS indicates that Colfax Ave. between Peterson Road and Manila Road needs to be a 4-lane minor arterial with curb and gutter and sidewalk/bike lane. RMRP would be responsible for their frontage with their future development.
- RMRP shows only a 6' shoulder. CDOT has indicated to Port that an 8' shoulder would be required.
- Only a single EB left turn lane on E. Colfax Ave. onto NB Peterson Road is shown which aligns with discussions with Jacob Cox, but no documentation with CDOT has been provided as yet. This turn lane is shown as 12' wide and CDOT has indicated to Port that this needs to be 14' wide.

Sheet 11:

- Similar comments regarding a typ. road section, shoulder width, and providing an ultimate condition.
- The E. Colfax Ave. improvements east of Peterson Road are similar in configuration, but a little bit shorter than shown on Port plans.

Sheet 14:

- REPEAT COMMENT: There is a storm sewer crossing Peterson Road that will pick up a small area of the existing Port site runoff. Port improvements will not require this storm sewer and it will be plugged and abandoned in place.
- In the response to comments, Matrix has indicated that the profile grades have been coordinated between RMRP and Port. Westwood has not received updated cadd files and/or profile information reflecting this current grading, so this response isn't completely true. We have been trying to match the RMRP grades where possible as the RMRP project has been ahead of the Port project, so we didn't believe we had the flexibility to make changes to the profile with the lone exception of the low point just north of E. 38th Ave. Port would prefer steeper than 0.5% slopes, so if changes to this profile are still an option, Port would like to provide input in that area shortly.
- A new sump in Peterson Road has been added at the Rail Park Drive intersection. This has not been accommodated for in the Port drainage design at all. In addition to adding 200-300' of additional storm sewer to the Port project, fitting this into the Peterson Road section, given the private utility encroachments noted previously, may prove to be difficult. This was also not coordinated with Westwood previously.

Sheet 15:

- It does appear that the grading of the low point in Peterson Road just north of E. 38th Ave. has been finally raised to address our previously noted concerns.
- REPEAT COMMENT: Surface emergency overflow from the Port Detention Pond located immediately to the east has not been accommodated by this design through Tract C. Given the limited information provided by RMRP, the Port design was required to upsize the box culvert to accommodate this flow and this hasn't been reflected on the plans. **See Sheet 7 notes above.**
- REPEAT COMMENT: Access to the downstream end of this box culvert with an easement granted to the COA hasn't been accommodated for by these plans. **See Sheet 7 notes above.**
- REPEAT COMMENT: The RMRP Preliminary Drainage Report was provided to us directly from Matrix. This report doesn't discuss the Port runoff outfall from the detention pond

mentioned above, but only provides old information from the Enertia report from 3 years ago which still assumes Port will have multiple outfall points and lower runoff flow from the detention pond. Westwood hasn't been provided any updates to the PDR to confirm any changes to this comment.

Sheet 17:

- There appears to be a missing sheet for the extreme west end of E. Colfax Ave. improvements.
- REPEAT COMMENT: The proposed grading appears to encroach into the UPRR ROW. Have you had discussions with them regarding this encroachment?
- REPEAT COMMENT: The proposed grading along the southern edge appears to be incomplete and channels along the edge of the shoulder which could undermine the roadway with erosion. The site entrance grading also looks missing.
- REPEAT COMMENT: Is the swale along the north side for WQ purposes? Otherwise, why not sheet flow? The area between Colfax Ave. and the tracks act as a broad swale anyway and would minimize grading encroachments into the UPRR ROW.
- Is the intent of the E. Colfax Ave. improvements to add pavement to the existing roadway or is it a complete remove and replace along the impacted length of roadway. The hatching implies pavement widening while the contours indicate a complete removal and replacement. The plans are unclear regarding this intent since no typ. section has been provided.

Sheet 18:

- Similar comments to Sheet 17 regarding grading encroachments and the remove/replace issue.

Sheet 21:

- The tree table indicates RMRP is providing 60 fewer trees than what is required along the Peterson Road tree lawn. Why is there a shortage? We suspect this is because there is a private waterline within the tree lawn south of Rail Park Dr. Since Peterson Road is a public road in the City of Aurora, the tree lawns on both sides of the street should match and meet City of Aurora landscaping standards. The waterline should be relocated on-site to avoid this conflict.