



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

March 23, 2023

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

Re: Second 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 second 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.

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

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

Sincerely,

Stephen Rodriguez - Planning Supervisor
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\2329-00rev2.rtf



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- See various Planning comments (Items 1-2)
- See various Landscaping comments (Item 3)
- See Engineering comments regarding drainage, ROW, curb ramps and other related items (Item 4)
- Contact the Traffic Engineer directly for comments (Item 5)
- See various Land Development Review Services comments (Item 6)
- See Aurora Water comments regarding water lines, storm outfalls, and sanitary mains (Item 7)
- See Life Safety comments regarding hydrants (Item 8)
- See Xcel Energy comments (Item 9)
- See CDOT comments (Item 10)
- See Port Colorado comments regarding infrastructure (Item 11)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Stephen Rodriguez srodrigu@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 Xcel Energy and 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 and Port Colorado. The latter responses may be under separate cover.

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

Sheet 22

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%.

For all sheets, the ornamental grasses exceed 40% of the curbside landscape areas. Please select another species to reduce the percentage.

Conflict with tree and drainage, omit this tree.

For all sheets, label, and dimension the curbside landscape width.

For all sheets, label the utilities, utility easements, sight triangles, overhead power lines, Site boundary and sign locations as was shown in the last submittal.

Revise the Right of Way Table to reflect the correct number of trees provided. The Plant List total for trees is 185 and the Table shows that 255 have been provided.

Sheet 23

For all sheets, the ornamental grasses exceed 40% of the curbside landscape areas. Please select another species to reduce the percentage.

Sheet 24

Adjust the sign location as this will be in conflict with the tree canopy.

Sheet 25

Ensure that tree and fire hydrant are not in conflict with the clear zone requirements.

Sheet 26

For all sheets, adjust the Table to reflect the correct number of provided trees for the project.



REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

4. Civil Engineering

Reviewed by: Julie Bingham, jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in **green**.

- 4A. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.
- 4B. Sheet 3 - Are ramps being proposed by Transport on the east side?
- 4C. Indicate the ROW width on the cross-sections.
- 4D. Add curb and gutter to the cross-sections.
- 4E. 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.
- 4F. Show the clear zone on all section details.
- 4G. 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.
- 4H. 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)
- 4I. 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.
- 4J. Sheet 6 - What is the ROW easement? Utility easement? (typical).
- 4K. Sheet 8 – The curb ramp should be directional.
- 4L. Sheet 9 - Shade back anything that is not proposed by this project. (typical all sheets).
- 4M. Sheet 10 – Show contours tying to existing, typical.
- 4N. Sheet 12 - Clearly show the limits of the ROW that is being dedicated. (typical)
- 4O. Label the longitudinal slope of the road.
- 4P. These slope labels are confusing. It should be a 2% cross slope per Section 4.05.6 in the Roadway Manual. (typical)
- 4Q. Sheet 13 - See the redlines regarding slope labeling.
- 4R. Sheet 14 – See the redlines regarding grading.
- 4S. Sheet 17 – Ensure all trees are a minimum of 10' from the storm sewer.
- 4T. 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.

5. Traffic Engineering

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

- 5A. 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.

6. Land Development Review Services

Reviewed by: Roger Nelson/ ronelson@auroragov.org / 720-587-2657 / Comments in **Pink**.

- 6A. See the site plan for redlines regarding notes, labeling reception numbers, and bearings.
- 6B. For easements that are going to be dedicated contact Andy Niquette at dedicationproperty@auroragov.org

7. Aurora Water

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

ISP

- 7A. Sheet 3 – Include ownership information for the water lines.
- 7B. Sheet 5 – Clarify if the sanitary main is proposed or existing. If it is existing, include the ownership information.
- 7C. Sheet 8 - This note should be clarified. During civil plan review, the specific items that are to be public or private must be labeled as such.
- 7D. Sheet 10 – Adjust the call-out.



- 7E. Manhole access is needed at this deflection.
7F. 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.
7G. Sheet 12 – Please identify where the storm outfalls to.
7H. Please provide access to all manholes.
7I. Sheet 13 – Swales should be a 2% minimum.

8. Life Safety

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

8A. ISP:

- Provide a detail showing the looped water supply and all proposed/existing fire hydrants.
- It appears that 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, spaced every 500', alternating sides.
- Fire hydrants shall be placed between 3'6" and 8'0" from the edge of the fire lane easement or public way. Also, fire hydrants must be placed at least one foot in front or behind a sidewalk while still meeting the minimum back of curb clearance requirements. Please relocate these fire hydrants to be within the required distance.

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

9A. Public Service Company of Colorado has no further comments.

10. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)

10A. See the attached memo regarding drainage, traffic, access permits, and ROW comments. Respond to each comment in your resubmittal.

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

11A. On behalf of the Port Colorado Team, please find a consolidated review from the greater group and ***attached memos*** from Felsburg Holt & Ullevig and Westwood regarding Rocky Mountain Railpark's Infrastructure Site Plan second submittal to the City of Aurora (uploaded on 2/28/2023). As previously noted in prior conversations with City of Aurora staff, Port Colorado request further coordination with the Applicant (Robert Wahl – JHL Constructors) and Agent (Patrick Chelin - Matrix Design Group Inc) regarding the design plans and elevations of Peterson Road. Additionally, we feel as though the applicant has still not addressed a number of our questions/concerns from the prior comment period, whether in the plan set or in the formal response to comments. Below are the additional items requiring clarification and/or modifications.

Private Water Infrastructure:

- Port Colorado continues to emphasize the priority of public utilities over private when being located within the public right-of-way. RMRP continues to show design for private infrastructure to be located within public right-of-way under Peterson Road. Additionally, the private utilities are encroaching further toward the section line than in the prior submittal. Port Colorado is willing to coordinate with RMRP regarding the spacing of utilities at the direction / approval of the City of Aurora. However, we want to ensure public utility spacing will continue to be the priority over any private infrastructure plans.
- Hydrants, including enough hydrant line to extend beyond the paving limits, along the west side of Peterson road is the responsibility of RMRP. That said, Port Colorado will provide stub outs for connection to the City of Aurora waterline when installed.

Streetscape and Drainage:

- RMRP has updated the plan set from irrigated turf to native grasses within the curbside landscape, however it is unclear if this is irrigated. Native grasses in this area are difficult to establish without irrigation. Additionally, even with irrigation these areas tend to establish poorly when in close proximity to the roadway. The Port Colorado team recommends the plan set be revised to match the east side and include 1 ½" river rock.



- 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.
- RMRP plans show 3 crossings under Peterson Road that are accepting flow from the SA6 site. Per the low point along Peterson just north of 38th Ave, Port Colorado has identified a single crossing of 2-6'x10' culverts at the pond outfall. The culvert size was updated to convey emergency overflow through the outfall structure rather than utilizing a low point on the road.
- Port Colorado expects RMRP to install enough of the box culverts to extend beyond the limits of proposed paving. This will ensure the work completed by RMRP is not immediately removed by the Port Colorado Sub Area 6 ISP 1, in the event the RMRP work is completed prior to Port Colorado's improvements. If RMRP completes activities after Port Colorado's improvements, this will be a non-issue.

Rail / PUC Improvements:

- 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.
- Additionally, what coordination has occurred for encroachment along the UPRR mainline? Improvement to the roadway will require right-of-way from both CDOT and UPRR, as well as slope and grading modifications for appropriate drainage.

Traffic Impacts:

- 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.
- Additionally, some of the proposed improvements will impact and occur within the Port Colorado property boundary. These improvements will require temporary and permanent easements.
- RMRP is required to dedicate their portion of the ultimate right-of-way for a full 5-lane configuration. The City of Aurora standard practices include all landowners adjacent to future roadway infrastructure to dedicate the applicable right-of-way and enforce equal sharing of such right-of-way dedication with the adjacent landowners. RMRP should not be excluded from this City practice.
- Furthermore, a single lane on Peterson associated to south bound right turns onto westbound Colfax will not be appropriate for peak hour volumes ranging from 1400-1500. Port Colorado asks RMRP to revisit its evaluations for right turns with high volumes and to recognize the City of Aurora approved Port Subarea 6 TIS, which indicates a 5-lane cross-section of Peterson is needed as far north as 38th Avenue.

MEMO

Date: March 9, 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 2nd 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 February 28, 2023, and we have the following comments:

Sheet 4:

- The plan view and section don't match up completely. We suspect the plan view labels are in error.
- Is the 6' shoulder just dirt? Does that conform to Adams County requirements?
- The City of Aurora (COA) reiterated that the 48th road section should reflect the Port PIP. RMRP responded by indicating that per discussions with COA, the current section would reflect the approved FDP for RMRP.
- Sleeve pipes for the water and sanitary sewer force main under the box culvert still haven't been provided.

Sheet 5:

- While the extra lane to accommodate the EB Colfax dual left turn lanes has been added, it quickly transitions to the 3-lane configuration just north of the southern boundary. All ROW is shown being provided on the east side of Peterson Road with a slight amount provided by Port. This is unacceptable and we repeat our assumption that COA will enforce equal sharing of dedicated ROW by both RMRP and Port to service a full 5-lane configuration as shown on the Port PIP and as required by COA in their 1st round of comments.
- 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 private utilities shown in the section are still in the way of the public utilities proposed as part of Port's design and are in fact closer to the section line than previously shown. As was stated previously, Port is willing to work with RMRP regarding the spacing of utilities, but we still assume that COA will support the priority of public utilities over private utilities within the COA public roadway.
- RMRP is responsible for their half of Peterson Road including fire hydrants. Hydrants and enough hydrant line to extend beyond the paving limits needs to be installed by RMRP. Port will connect these stub outs to the waterline being installed in the east side of Peterson Road.

Sheet 6:

- Similar comment regarding fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.

Sheet 7:

- 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.
- Similar comment regarding fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.

Sheet 8:

- Similar comment regarding fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5.

Sheet 9:

- Similar comment regarding fire hydrants as noted under Sheet 5

Sheet 10:

- A Colfax Ave improvements section should be provided.
- 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.
- Road improvements extend well beyond the western limits of the Port configuration to support their improvements along the southern edge.

Sheet 11:

- The first 960' of the Colfax Ave. improvements west of Peterson Road appear to have the same basic overall configuration with a slightly longer WB acceleration lane and a slightly shorter taper.
- The EB lanes as they approach Peterson Road are narrower than Port's configuration. CDOT specifically requested 12' wide turn lanes and RMRP have only provided 11'.
- RMRP plans have provided 4' shoulders and CDOT requires 8'.

Sheet 12:

- The first 600' of the Colfax improvements east of Peterson appear to be the same configuration as the Port plans, their final connection taper to the existing roadway is about 135' shorter.
- The WB lanes as they approach Peterson Road are narrower than Port's configuration. CDOT specifically requested 12' wide turn lanes and RMRP have only provided 11'.
- RMRP plans have provided 4' shoulders and CDOT requires 8'.

Sheet 14:

- What's driving the need for a wall along the north edge of 48th Ave. near the box culvert? What's preventing sloping down to daylight at a 4:1 slope.

Sheet 15:

- As currently shown, the road improvements will require ROW from Port. As noted previously, Port will not accept this current lane configuration and will not provide this ROW as currently shown.
- 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.

Sheet 16:

- Despite RMRP's comment response to the contrary, the low point near the box culvert crossing has not been raised to accommodate our low point inlets that need to drain into our WQ/Detention Pond. Our proposed contours have previously been provided to Matrix for their coordination.
- 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.
- Access to the downstream end of this box culvert with an easement granted to the COA hasn't been accommodated for by these plans.
- 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.

Sheet 18:

- The proposed grading on the north side appears to be cutoff.
- The proposed grading appears to encroach into the UPRR ROW. Have you had discussions with them regarding this encroachment?
- 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.
- 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.

Sheet 19:

- Similar comments to Sheet 18 regarding grading encroachments and the north swale.
- The site entrance isn't graded correctly.

Sheet 20:

- Similar comments to Sheet 18 regarding grading encroachments and the north swale.
- Need contour labels.
- Contours appear to be cutoff.

PDR Comments

1. RMR plans show 3 crossings under Peterson Road that are accepting flow from the SA6 site. 2 crossings are sized as 18" RCP and the other one as a 6'x8' RCBC. Transport SA6 shows one single crossing at Pond outfall, north of 38th Ave.
2. RMR sizes the Pond outfall as 6'x8', whereas Westwood has revised it to 2-6'x10'. The culvert size was updated to convey emergency overflow through the outfall structure rather than utilizing a low point on the road. Coordination is needed to make sure who is responsible for building crossing and the d/s channel has adequate capacity to handle the flow.
3. There is no discussion about details on channels/ponds or swales within the drainage report.
4. The low point on Peterson Road, north of 38th Ave needs to be verified. Values are different for RMR (5494') and Westwood Plans (5496').



March 9, 2023

Mr. Steven Marshall
Western Transport, LLC.
1331 17th Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80202

**RE: Port Colorado Subarea 6 – Review of RMRP Traffic Analysis for Peterson Road ISP
FHU Project No. 121358-01**

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Felsburg Holt & Ullevig (FHU), in support of your ongoing development of Port Colorado, has reviewed traffic analysis of Rocky Mountain Rail Park (RMRP) prepared by Matrix Design Group dated January 27, 2023. This analysis is in support of a second submittal for the ISP for Peterson Road that borders the RMRP site to the east and Port Colorado Subarea 6 to the west. This analysis was provided by City of Aurora for the Port Colorado team to provide comment as part of the city review process.

The RMRP TIS seems to have addressed many of the concerns raised with previous analysis regarding recognition of Port Colorado traffic, trip generation for their site, and heavy vehicle percentages. However, we still have two major comments that should be addressed:

Southbound Right-Turns at Colfax Avenue and Peterson Road

We disagree with the conclusion that a single channelized right turn lane in the southbound direction will be adequate for the projected southbound right turning movements in the PM peak hour at the intersection of Colfax Avenue and Peterson Road. The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology utilized by Vistro software in the RMRP analysis for signalized intersections assumes that these right turns are removed from the intersection and therefore incur no delay. This is a well-documented limitation of the methodology that is being left out of the analysis. The RMRP TIS indicates that approximately 1,400 vehicles would make the southbound right turn movement, which is well beyond the capacity of single lane and even encroaches on the saturation flow rate. Furthermore, a substantial percentage of this traffic will be trucks further exacerbating this issue. Using Synchro II software (as an alternative methodology to HCM) to evaluate this southbound right turn, preliminary analysis suggests a delay in excess of 240 seconds (4 minutes) which is not acceptable.

Solution: There is very little southbound through traffic at the intersection, and it seems logical to share the through lane with right turning vehicles which would substantially increase the capacity for the movement. CDOT has jurisdiction over this intersection and will need to approve the design as part of their access permitting process.

While not relevant to the ISP for Peterson Road, the same assumption of a single channelized right turn lane has been made in the RMRP analysis for the northbound right turn at the intersection of Colfax Avenue and Manilla Road. This movement is projected to serve approximately 1,300 vehicles in the AM peak hour. We suggest that analysis of this intersection be revised in a similar manner.

Peterson Road Cross Section between Colfax Avenue and 38th Avenue

RMRP has also recognized the need for dual eastbound left turns at the intersection of Colfax Avenue and Peterson Road to meet CDOT design standards based upon projected volumes. However, the design plans indicate that the 5-lane cross-section would be narrowed to a 3-lane cross section immediately north of the at-grade crossing with Union Pacific Railroad mainline tracks. The RMRP TIS indicates a northbound

volume of 1,672 in the AM peak hour and a southbound volume of 1,567 in the PM peak hour in the vicinity of the tracks. The RMRP TIS also indicates a northbound volume of 1,436 in the AM peak hour and a southbound volume of 1,339 in the PM peak hour between RMRP Access 1 and 38th Avenue. Given this forecasted volume, Peterson Road would not operate acceptably with a single travel lane in each direction especially considering the high truck percentage associated with RMRP and Port Subarea 6 which would further strain capacity.

Solution: City of Aurora has approved the Port Subarea TIS with a 5-lane cross-section of Peterson Road between Colfax Avenue and 38th Avenue. Design plans for the Peterson Road ISP need to incorporate the approved configuration.

Summary

We request that RMRP continue to refine traffic analysis for heavy right turn volumes and design a solution that would provide acceptable operations. We also request that plans for Peterson Road be revised to incorporate the approved 5-lane cross-section between Colfax Avenue and 38th Avenue.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this letter or need any additional information.

Sincerely,
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig



Philip Dunham, PE, PTOE
Transportation Engineer

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: 3/20/2023

Highway:

036

Mile Marker:

84.708

Drainage Comments:

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.

Resident Engineer Comments:

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.

Clearly 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

--Steve Loeffler, 3-17-2023