



Planning Division  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300  
Aurora, Colorado 80012  
303.739.7250

Worth Discovering • [auroragov.org](http://auroragov.org)

January 27, 2023

Donald Rosier  
Sherman Associates  
5850 Central Ave  
Westminster, CO 80031

**Re: Initial Submission Review:** Everlea – Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan Amendment  
**Application Number:** DA-2337-00  
**Case Numbers:** 2022-7005-00; 2022-1002-00

Dear Mr. Rosier:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on December 30, 2022. 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 outside agencies. Staff would be happy to meet with you and your design team in the next couple weeks to discuss these comments and address any questions you may have.

Since many important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before February 16, 2023 to remain on schedule.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover 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.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please give me a call. I may be reached at 303-739-7857.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wile, AICP  
Senior Planner, City of Aurora  
Planning & Development Services Department

cc: Al Cunningham, PCS Group  
Cesarina Dancy, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\2337-00rev1.rtf



## *Initial Submission Review*

### **SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- Pay the development application invoice prior to resubmitting (see Item 2)
- Set up a meeting with Planning to discuss the proposed Mixed-Use Commercial planning areas and the concerns about the proposed notes and uses (see Item 3)
- Improve street connectivity within the development (see Item 5)
- Updates the designs standards in Tabs 10-12 to ensure consistency with the UDO and the overall vision of the Master Plan (see Item 6)
- Review all Landscape comments in Tab 11 and update accordingly (see Item 7)
- Make changes to the PIP narrative, provide cross sections for all streets, and review street construction obligations of this development (see Item 8)
- Address all Traffic Engineering comments on the Master Traffic Impact Study and resubmit (see Item 9)
- Address all Aurora Water comments on the Master Utility Study and resubmit (see Item 10)
- Set up a meeting with PROS and Planning to discuss the high point (see Item 11)
- Review all PROS comments in Tab 9 and update accordingly (Tab 11)
- Reach out to OEM to determine if a Whelen siren system is required (see Item 12)
- Update the plan to comply with the connectivity and bike lane requirements within a Master Plan (see Item 13)
- Revise the location of the public art to be within the community park (see Item 14)
- Review comments from Xcel Energy and Aurora Public Schools (see Items 16 and 17)

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### **1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns**

1A. Referrals were sent to four registered neighborhood organizations and thirteen adjacent property owners. No comments were received, so a neighborhood meeting is not required at this time. If additional comments are received in the future, this will be reevaluated.

#### **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application**

2A. Pending the discussions with staff on commercial vs. mixed-use vs. multi-family planning areas, please ensure that the narratives in Tab 1 and Tab 6 include accurate information regarding the makeup of different land uses in the Master Plan.

2B. Make minor adjustments to the maps in Tab 3 per redline comments.

2C. Add more details about the high point and the proposed changes in Tab 4.

2D. Upload the [Mineral Rights Affidavit](#) with the next submittal.

2E. Please submit an avigation easement to the city per the provisions of Section 146-2.6.2.B.2. This is required before the Master Plan is recorded.

2F. Please note that an invoice in the amount of \$51,688.00 is due prior to the second submittal of the application. The next submittal will not be accepted if this fee is not paid.

2G. Ensure that the MTIS, MUS, and PIP refer to this application as the “Everlea Master Plan” instead of Everlea Development, Hilltop/Everlea, etc. so that all documents are consistent.



### **3. Zoning and Land Use Issues**

3A. Please contact Planning to setup a meeting to discuss the Mixed-Use Commercial planning areas (PA-3 and PA-18) that include primarily multi-family uses. The proposed notes are not sufficient to ensuring that the intent of the MU-A zone district regulations is met.

3B. No residential is proposed within PA-2 or PA-6, so these should be changed to Commercial planning areas instead of Mixed-Use Commercial planning areas.

3C. Please review comments from PROS regarding the requested changes to the high point and coordinate with ODA to setup a meeting with Planning and PROS to discuss this (see Item 11). Staff is potentially open to changes, but further analysis by the applicant will be required to determine how this will impact this site as well as other nearby developments.

3D. The proposed statement regarding live/work units in Tab 8 is not acceptable because it is too vague. It doesn't state that other standalone commercial uses would also need to be required, what percentage of the ground floor needs to be commercial uses, etc. Additional discussions are needed about this and the overall plans for multi-family.

3E. Please note that the proposed densities included in Form D for two of the Single-Family Attached planning areas (14.92 DU/AC and 13.68 DU/AC) are higher than the city typically sees for this type of use if all standards (lot sizes, block sizes, etc.) are being met. It is acceptable to leave these densities in Form D if you believe it is possible to achieve them on this site, but the actual density could be reduced during the Site Plan process.

3F. The number of small lots noted in Form D is less than 50% of the proposed number of single-family detached and single-family attached lots. Please verify that this is the intent.

### **4. Adjustments and Comprehensive Plan Amendment**

4A. If an adjustment is requested for the percentage of residential uses within a Master Plan in the MU-A zone district (see Item 3A), it will need to be justified in Tabs 1 and 6 with the next submittal. The Master Plan would need to be approved in a Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing if an adjustment is requested.

4B. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment Placetype Map should not follow the boundary of any specific planning area. It should be a straight line across the site. Please update with the next submittal.

### **5. Streets and Pedestrian Issues**

5A. Please improve street connectivity within the development, especially between PA-5 and PA-6. As currently shown, PA-6 is completely isolated from the rest of the Master Plan. A north/south street should be added through this area to connect to PA-5. There is also no east/west street that connects through the Master Plan as required by Section 146-4.5.3.

5B. The internal street network identified in the PIP and in Tabs 10-12 has a few areas that appear to exceed the maximum block length requirement. Although this is typically not reviewed until Site Plans are submitted, showing conceptual plans where the street network that does not comply with code requirements is problematic. Please review redline comments and update with the next submittal.

5C. Tab 10 and the Master Traffic Impact Study need to address ideas for adding a pedestrian crossing and improving pedestrian safety in the northwest corner of the site near the community park and PA-2. Based on the descriptions of this area in the Master Plan, there will likely be high levels of pedestrian *and* vehicular traffic on this street as this is the only north/south street proposed through the development. In order to successfully integrate the community park and the commercial uses, this is an important topic to analyze at the Master Plan level.



## **6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues**

6A. The maximum monument sign height allowed is 14'. Please reduce the size of the primary commercial monument unless an adjustment is being requested.

6B. There are many design standards in Tab 10 related to auto-oriented uses such as drive-thrus, gas stations, and car washes. Given that there is limited commercial acreage proposed within this Master Plan, staff is concerned about potential plans to include these types of uses within the Master Plan, especially along 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue or near the community park. This seems to go against the urban vision that has been described throughout the Master Plan documents. Please consider adding limitations to the areas where these types of uses could potentially be allowed.

6C. There is conflicting information about required building heights in Tabs 10 and 12. The potential height limitations related to the view corridor also need to be addressed. Please review redline comments.

6D. There are a few design standards in Tabs 10-12 that are less restrictive than UDO standards. Any standards should be equal to or more restrictive than UDO requirements unless an adjustment is being requested. Please review redline comments and update with the next submittal.

6E. Review comments regarding the live/work design standards and add more standards related to the design of the ground floor.

6F. Please ensure that any concept plans are consistent with the proposed design standards. For example, the design standards include limitations on the amount of parking that can be adjacent to 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue, but the concept plan shows the entire 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue frontage in PA-6 as parking. This layout would not be consistent with the stated vision of the Master Plan or with the Urban District placetype.

6F. Please address all miscellaneous comments in Tabs 10-12.

## **7. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / [kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:kbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)**

### *Tab 8*

7A. Update note #9 per redline comments.

### *Tab 10*

7B. Expand upon the statement regarding monument signage.

7C. Update the language regarding fencing.

7D. Is multi-family being proposed? The Letter of Introduction doesn't mention multi-family specifically.

7E. Address the language pertaining to the use of columns in association with open rail / open space fencing requirements.

7F. The caption and image for open rail fencing do not align. The text alludes to arterial and collector streets.

7F. Is multi-family being proposed with respect to the use of pavers?

### *Tab 11*

7G. Update the requirements for landscape items per redline comments.

7H. Define what is meant by non-compatible uses. If a parking lot is not proposed but general retail and/or commercial is, would the buffer requirements be the same at 25' wide?



- 7I. Should the buffer described be measured from the back of walk or the property/lot line?
- 7J. Update the map on page 4 to include all areas where there could be non-compatibility between uses. See graphic.
- 7K. Please clarify if the 25' wide buffer, wall, and landscaping are required for loading areas?
- 7L. The quantity of plants being specified to screen between the non-compatible uses appears to be less than what is required by the UDO. It should be equal to or greater than.
- 7M. Dimension the actual buffer in the graphic.
- 7N. Show the property line/lot line more definitively.
- 7O. Add the word conceptual to the graphic image descriptions.
- 7P. Update the landscape standard note where indicated to be more restrictive on page 5.
- 7Q. Change the verbiage regarding turf to “in accordance with the turf ordinance, turf is only permitted for programmed spaces and shall not be used for aesthetic or visual purposes.”
- 7R. Update the language regarding elevation changes for walls per redline comments..
- 7S. What are the anticipated plant quantities per linear foot for the buffer between residential rear lots and adjacent open space?

## **REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

### **8. Civil Engineering** (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7306 / [jbingham@auroragov.org](mailto:jbingham@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

#### *PIP*

- 8A. Indicate that the half sections will include necessary offsite transitions.
- 8B. The narrative should detail the specific public improvements (utilities and roadways) required for each area to develop independently. For each planning area, address the roadway, sanitary sewer, water, and drainage (ponds and culverts) improvements required. For each planning area, do not assume that the improvements will be completed by a different planning area. If the narrative is revised to combine multiple planning areas together, all the improvements will need to be completed and accepted prior to the issuance of the first CO/TCO, typical.
- 8C. For each planning area, add a statement that additional offsite improvements for planning areas may be required based on Traffic or Life Safety needs.
- 8D. Collector streets need to be included in the PIP Narrative.
- 8E. It is preferred that detention ponds are not identified as a separate planning area as they are usually required to be constructed with the first planning area and do not have a separate development timeframe.
- 8F. The timing of the parks and open spaces needs to be identified.
- 8G. The statement on page 6 is confusing. Typically, the curbside landscaping is required with the construction of the street.



8H. The PIP is not a phasing plan. Revise the statement on page 7 to indicate that the purpose of the PIP is to reflect improvements required for each planning area to develop independently.

8I. Exhibits for each planning area or planning area group should be provided to show the required public improvements as described in the narrative.

8J. Include classifications for all identified roadways.

8K. It is unclear what the limits of PA-7 vs. PA-11 vs. PA-10 vs. PA-5 are. Please clearly identify the limits of each planning area.

8L. 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue should be identified as a 144' ROW, not 142' ROW.

8M. The west half of Tibet Road is the obligation of this development unless it is being provided by High Point or Skydance. The High Point PIP does not clearly indicate that they will be providing the full section of Tibet Road. The ISP for Skydance does show the full section will be constructed, but this PIP should still identify the half section as an obligation of this development if Skydance does not provide it.

8N. Only half of the median is existing for Picadilly Road. The other half is the responsibility of this development.

8O. The north half of 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue is the obligation of this development. The Skydance PIP only indicates that they will only provide the south half. The ISP for Skydance does show the full section will be constructed, but this PIP should still identify the half section as an obligation of this development if Skydance does not provide it.

8P. Provide a typical section for the collector road(s).

8Q. Provide sections for all of the required arterials, including 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Tibet Road, and 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Clearly indicate the limits of the responsibilities of this Master Plan. The ROW in the sections should match the exhibit.

#### *Tab 9*

8R. Verify with Traffic that on-street bike lanes would be supported on a three-lane collector.

#### *Tab 10*

8S. Note that pedestrian railing is required for walls over 30".

### **9. Traffic Engineering** (Carl Harline / 303-739-7584 / [charline@auroragov.org](mailto:charline@auroragov.org) / Comments in orange)

9A. Address all redline comments on the Master Traffic Impact Study.

### **10. Aurora Water** (Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / [cballard@auroragov.org](mailto:cballard@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

10A. Address all redline comments in the Master Utility Study.

### **11. PROS** (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / [mteller@auroragov.org](mailto:mteller@auroragov.org) / Comments in purple)

#### *General*

11A. Further discussion is needed around the request to shift the high point in the view shed ordinance. Please connect with PROS to discuss.

11B. The community park design and process should be further discussed. Note that this will need to go through a Parks Master Plan process inclusive of public input and approval and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, Planning Commission and City Council. Therefore, no design or elements should be identified in the plan. Any graphics should include 'conceptual, for intent only' and Form J language should note in conformance with the PROS Dedication and Development Criteria Manual.

*Tab 9*

11C. Note that any adjacent buildings may not obstruct the view shed.

11D. Per the annexation agreement and city ordinance, the view shed must be protected within the community park. Further discussion is needed on whether the high point is allowed to shift.

11E. Since park design needs to be coordinated through the master planning process, please remove all the trail lines and show general connectivity to each adjacent parcel and connected trail corridors.

11F. Show the view shed corridor. The high point on the site must be preserved and designed in a way that draws attention to the space. Art or other features that create a viewing area to look at the mountains should be included.

11G. A greater discussion around the design intent of this space is needed. Note that this will need to go through a PROS master plan approval process. Remove all graphic elements in this plan so that design can be discussed and planned based on PROS/public input.

11H. Some of the amenities are already planned on the Painted Prairie side of the community park. This area was always anticipated to include an amphitheater and community space to be used for events.

11I. The subject area should be replaced with a small amphitheater or event space that can be built into the natural topography.

11J. The service radii are not accurate. Please update to show ½ mile from the perimeter of the neighborhood park and community park. Note that community parks have a service radii of 2 miles. Since the community park is providing some neighborhood park credit for the excess required, we need to ensure it provides neighborhood park radii at ½ mile.

11K. If the highlighted areas are at least 30' wide with at least a 6' wide trail, they can be counted as open space.

11L. Any private elements need to be excluded from the neighborhood park acreage.

11M. Detention may be credited toward open space if it is designed as a park-like feature to include trails, seating and landscaping. Anything above the 240hour recovery time as noted by your drainage engineer may count.

11N. Verify that this is the location to connect back to the Skydance development to the south.

11O. Where is the additional 4 acres for the community park? Note that at least 20 acres must be dedicated for community park acreage.

11P. If construction responsibility is on PROS, the community park development fees will be collected with all building permits. Please coordinate with PROS to define the process. This needs to be discussed further as to whether the land and park fees should be collected so that PROS can design and construct at our timing discretion.

11Q. Add a trail width (neighborhood, community, regional).

11R. Include arterial medians for 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Picadilly Road. Medians should meet PROS standards and they should be completed at full right-of-way dedication.

*Tab 8*

11S. The view shed corridor needs to be identified. This must be included in the park boundary per the annexation agreement and city ordinance.



11T. Update total residents to 2,843.

11U. It is PROS standard that all dedication acreage be met on site. Since a large portion of the site is made up by the required community park, PROS supports a portion of the open space being met via cash in lieu if preferred. Include exact amount and type to be collected at first Plat. Connect with PROS on the acceptable per acre value to be used.

11V. Add a note that excess community park acreage will cover outstanding neighborhood park and open space.

*Tab 7*

11W. Public art should be included within the community park and should be coordinated closely with PROS to speak to the intent of this special location where you're able to see many peaks of the Rockies. Note it is currently located at the high point which needs to be discussed further with PROS and in accordance with the view shed ordinance.

*Tab 10*

11X. Design standards should include height standards for any developments within the view shed corridors. Note that design may not obstruct the view shed and should be designed with materials that have natural colors/mesh well with being the view shed. This could include more windows, reflective materials to sit within the eye line, etc. Include language from page 28 of this document.

11Y. Address other comments through Tab 10.

*Tab 11*

11Z. Include language that states that landscaping should not obstruct the view shed corridor.

**12. Fire / Life Safety** (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / [mapodaca@auroragov.org](mailto:mapodaca@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

*Tab 8*

12A. Reach out to the Office of Emergency Management to verify if a Whelen siren system will be needed for this development. If applicable, show the Whelen siren system location on the Land Use Map and include it in the Land Use Matrix.

12B. Update note #8 and add the requested note per redline comments.

*PIP*

12C. Update the requested note.

12D. Street sections in the PIP must show fire hydrants in the landscape areas between 3'6" minimum and 8' maximum from the back of the face of curb. Update the street sections accordingly.

*MUS*

12E. Provide a data table showing fire flow demands by land use type for the system modeling.

12F. The developer is responsible for construction of all on-site and off-site infrastructure needed to establish two points of emergency access and looped water supply.

**13. Transportation Planning** (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / [tworker@auroragov.org](mailto:tworker@auroragov.org))

13A. Please review the Picadilly intersection in the 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue Multimodal Study for guidance: [https://cdn5-hosted.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server\\_1881137/File/Business%20Services/Planning/Transportation%20Planning/64th%20Avenue%20Multimodal%20Transportation%20and%20Urban%20Design%20Study%20Final%20Report%20\(1\).pdf](https://cdn5-hosted.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_1881137/File/Business%20Services/Planning/Transportation%20Planning/64th%20Avenue%20Multimodal%20Transportation%20and%20Urban%20Design%20Study%20Final%20Report%20(1).pdf).



13B. One-quarter sections need one continuous north-south collector, and one continuous east-west collector per UDO Section 146-4.5.3.A.2.

13C. Collector streets require bike lanes.

**14. Public Art** (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org))

14A. The Public Art Element should be within the community park. Please see comments from PROS and resubmit.

**15. Denver International Airport** (Elise Brenninkmeyer / 303-342-2549 / [elise.brenninkmeyer@flydenver.com](mailto:elise.brenninkmeyer@flydenver.com))

15A. No comments were received from DEN with this submittal.

**16. Xcel Energy** (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com))

16A. See the attached comment letter.

**17. Aurora Public Schools** (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / [jdhensley@aurorak12.org](mailto:jdhensley@aurorak12.org))

17A. In accordance with Section 146-4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance, the school land dedication obligation for the 1,096 proposed residential units is approximately 6.9 acres. Aurora Public Schools will accept cash-in-lieu of land for this obligation valued at market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place. Cash-in-lieu will be assessed as Site Plans are submitted and will be due prior to Plat recording.



**Right of Way & Permits**

1123 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80223  
Telephone: **303.571.3306**  
Facsimile: 303. 571.3284  
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

January 17, 2023

City of Aurora Planning and Development Services  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Aurora, CO 80012

Attn: Sarah Wile

**Re: Everlea, Case # DA-2337-00**

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way and Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the master plan and comprehensive plan amendment for **Everlea**. As always, thank you for the opportunity to take part in the review process. To ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development, PSCo requests that the following language or plat note be placed on the preliminary and final plats for the subdivision:

*Six-foot (6') wide utility easements are hereby dedicated on private property adjacent to the front lot lines and eight-foot (8') on the rear lot lines of each lot in the subdivision or platted area identified as **single-family lots**. Ten-foot (10') wide utility easements are hereby dedicated on private property adjacent to all public streets, and around the perimeter of each **commercial/industrial** and **multi-family** lot in the subdivision or platted area including tracts, parcels and/or open space areas. These easements are dedicated to the City of Aurora for the benefit of the applicable utility providers for the installation, maintenance, and replacement of electric, gas, television, cable, and telecommunications facilities. Utility easements shall also be granted within any access easements and private streets in the subdivision. Permanent structures, improvements, objects, buildings, wells, water meters and other objects that may interfere with the utility facilities or use thereof (Interfering Objects) shall not be permitted within said utility easements and the utility providers, as grantees, may remove any Interfering Objects at no cost to such grantees, including, without limitation, vegetation. Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) and its successors reserve the right to require additional easements and to require the property owner to grant PSCo an easement on its standard form.*

PSCo also requests that all utility easements be depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats. While these easements should accommodate the majority of utilities to be installed in the subdivision, some additional easements may be required as planning and building progresses.

In addition, 31-23-214 (3), C.R.S., requires the subdivider, at the time of subdivision platting, to provide for major utility facilities such as electric substation sites, gas or electric transmission line easements and gas regulator/meter station sites as deemed necessary by PSCo. While this provision will not be required on every plat, when necessary, PSCo will work with the subdivider to identify appropriate locations. This statute also requires the subdivider to submit a letter of agreement to the municipal/county commission that adequate provision of electrical and/or gas service has been provided to the subdivisions.

Please be aware PSCo has existing natural gas distribution facilities in the west half of the north property

line, and underground electric distribution facilities in several areas of the north property line. 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 existing facilities via [xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect](http://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 (i.e. transformers), the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to contact Colorado 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Donna George  
Right of Way and Permits  
Public Service Company of Colorado dba Xcel Energy  
Office: 303-571-3306 – Email: [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

**AURORA PUBLIC SCHOOLS - STUDENT YIELD**  
**1/20/2023**

**Everlea - Master Plan (DA-2337-00) 1st Submittal**

Dwelling Type	Units	Yield Ratio	Student Yield
SFD	106	0.7	74
MF-LOW	577	0.3	173
MF-HIGH	413	0.145	60
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,096</b>		<b>307</b>

YIELD	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE SCHOOL		K-8 TOTAL	HIGH SCHOOL		K-12
	RATIO	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	TOTAL
SF	0.34	36	0.16	17	53	0.2	21	74
MF-LOW	0.17	98	0.08	46	144	0.05	29	173
MF-HIGH	0.075	31	0.04	17	47	0.03	12	60
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>165</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>245</b>		<b>62</b>	<b>307</b>

SCHOOL TYPE	STUDENT YIELD	ACRES PER CHILD	ACRES REQUIRED
ELEMENTARY	165	0.0175	2.8893
MIDDLE	80	0.025	1.9910
HIGH	62	0.032	1.9981
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>307</b>		<b>6.8784</b>