

January 31, 2024

Rachid Rabbaa, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway
Suite 2300
Aurora, CO 80012

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

Dear Rachid:

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

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

1. Community Comments

Comment

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

Response: Understood.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Comment

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

Response: Understood.

Comment

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

Response: It is our understanding that this issue is resolved. RMRP is responsible for half of a 3 lane section on Peterson and 10' of land dedication on RMRP property to make this section work. If more room is required to support the additional traffic that the Port project generates, it will be Ports responsibility to dedicate.

3. Landscape Comments

Comment

3A. No further comments.

Response: Thank you.

4. Civil Engineering

Comment

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

Response: 4:1 slopes now shown in the ROW.

Comment

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.

Response: Understood, streetlights are called out and slopes adjusted. Scales doubled checked and updated accordingly.

Comment

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

Response: Understood.

5. Traffic Engineering

Comment

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

Response: Understood. Our understanding from emails with Mr. Carl Harline is that City of Aurora traffic is satisfied with the Traffic Report as currently drafted and that no additional comments should be expected.

6. **Land Development Review Services**

Comment

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.

Response: Understood.

7. **Aurora Water**

Comment

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

Response: Cross section updated.

8. **Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)**

Comment

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

Response: Understood. Please see different comment response letter that addresses comments received from CDOT.

9. **Port Colorado Comments**

Comment

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

Sheet 4:

Comment

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

Response: Note removed.

Sheet 5:

Comment

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

Response: Note removed.

Comment

- 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.

Response: RMRP has received written confirmation that CDOT and Aurora have agreed to the single EB left turn. It is also worth noting that the 3 lane section between E Colfax Ave. and E. 38th Ave has been agreed to between RMRP and the City of Aurora.

Comment

- 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.

Response: Label adjusted.

Comment

- 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.

Response: RMRP is required to dedicated 10' of ROW as shown on the approved Subdivision Plat and approved FDP.

Comment

- 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.

Response: Section updated to show water line 5' west of the section line.

Comment

- 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.

Response: This has been agreed to between the COA , RMRP and Bennet Fire.

Comment

- 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?

Response: Street lights will follow the City of Aurora requirements.

Comment

- 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:

Response: No response required by RMRP team, this appears be directed to the City of Aurora.

Comment

- Similar comment regarding road section configuration, additional ROW, waterline alignment, and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.

Response: See response above.

Comment

- 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:

Response: Thank you for the comment.

Comment

- Similar comment regarding road section configuration, additional ROW, waterline alignment, and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.

Response: See response above.

Comment

- 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.

Response: The infrastructure for the box culvert will be constructed when this phase of Peterson is needed.

Comment

- Given the comment above, maintenance access within an easement to the box culvert outfall also needs to be included in these plans.

Response: Noted.

Sheet 8:

Comment

- Similar comment regarding additional ROW as noted on Sheet 5.

Response: See response above.

Comment

- 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.

Response: Correct, RMRP will not be providing fire hydrants north of 38th.

Sheet 9:

Comment

- Similar comment regarding additional ROW and fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 8. Sheet 10:
Response: See response above.

Comment

- There appears to be a missing sheet for the extreme west end of E. Colfax Ave. improvements.
Response: All of Colfax is now shown.

Comment

- REPEAT COMMENT: A Colfax Ave improvements section should be provided.
Response: Noted.

Comment

- 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.
Response: No response needed from RMRP team as this is between CDOT and RMRP.

Comment

- RMRP shows only a 6' shoulder. CDOT has indicated to Port that an 8' shoulder would be required.
Response: CDOT indicated a 6' shoulder to RMRP.

Comment

- 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.
Response: CDOT indicated a 12' turn lane.

Sheet 11:

Comment

- Similar comments regarding a typ. road section, shoulder width, and providing an ultimate condition.
Response: See responses above.

Comment

- 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:
Response: Noted.

Comment

- 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.
Response: Understood.

Comment

- 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.

Response: The low point has been adjusted as requested by Port. The profile is not able to be adjusted at this point in time as the grading has been complete on the RMRP site where grades will tie.

Comment

- 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.

Response: Noted.

Sheet 15:

Comment

- 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.

Response: Noted.

Comment

- 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.

Response: It is our understanding that Port needs to restrict their outfall flows to the PDR that was submitted in October 2022 and work with the City of Aurora for another solution if that isn't viable.

Comment

- 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.

Response: Noted. RMRP is working with the City of Aurora and will meet their requirements.

Comment

- 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.

Response: Information has been added as suggested.

Sheet 17:

Comment

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

Response: See response above.

Comment

- REPEAT COMMENT: The proposed grading appears to encroach into the UPRR ROW. Have you had discussions with them regarding this encroachment?

Response: RMRP is coordinating with UPRR.

Comment

- 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.

Response: This has been resolved.

Comment

- 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.

Response: Matrix and CDOT are working together on the proper drainage approach and our plans will reflect those conversations.

Comment

- 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.

Response: Colfax will be widened and the existing will remain in place.

Sheet 18:

Comment

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

Response: See response above.

Sheet 21:

Comment

- 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.

Response: There is a license agreement in place between COA and RMRP for utilities within the tree lawn limiting the ability to place trees in the tree lawn.

Thank you again for the review, we trust we have resolved all comments to the satisfaction of the City of Aurora and look forward to receiving Admin Approval and to start the Construction Document process.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at 303-572-0200.

Sincerely,

Patrick Chelin, P.E.
Senior Vice President

cc: 22.1305.003