

To: **Aja Tibbs, Senior Planner, City of Aurora Planning Department**

From: **Tryba Architects**

Subject: **Fitzsimons Innovation Campus GDP Amendment No. 16**

Date: **04-09-25**

Application Number: **DA-1233-55**

Below are the responses to comments received on 12/24/2024 regarding Case # 1998-2011-16.

Summary of Key Comments from all Departments		
	Comment:	Further define phasing of public improvements such as streets, utilities, parks, and detention areas. The timing of design and construction should be organized by planning area to ensure services are provided as development occurs. Develop a phasing plan for parks similar to a Form J. (All departments)
	Response:	Tryba Response: Public Improvement Area enlargements and narratives are provided on Sheets 18 through 20, which outline the required infrastructure and park space needed to support the development parcels.
	Comment:	Some conflicting items remain regarding the lists of permitted uses, and the standards established within the GDP. (Planning)
	Response:	Tryba Response: Land Use permitted uses have been updated to reflect standards established within the GDP.
	Comment:	The proposed changes in the CSTP GDP appear to constitute both a substantive change to the Urban Renewal Plan and the terms under which TIF 2 was approved between AURA and the taxing entities. (AURA)
	Response:	Tryba Response: Discussion was held on 01/27/2025 between AURA, the City of Aurora, FRA, and the Metro District. The language has been revised to specify 'FRA/Metro District' instead of 'Owner/Developer' as the responsible entity for delivering the necessary infrastructure and park space to support the development parcels.
	Comment:	The Master TIS has some stuff missing from the report. The report will need to show that the mitigations will work. Future signals warrants will need to be included in the report. The report will need to provide ADT for the roadways so we can verify the sizing of the roadways. There are questions about the trip generation and background volumes that prevent us to fully review the summary that the paper got to. (Traffic Engineering)
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: Fehr & Peers worked with City of Aurora Traffic to identify the missing items and the MTIS now includes all items that were previously missing. Signal warrants are included as an appendix. ADT is provided for roadway segments and scenarios as directed by City of Aurora Traffic. Trip generation has been modified and clarified.

	Comment:	Traffic had minor comments that refer more back to the MTIS. Without being able to fully evaluate the traffic impacts to the roadway we can't evaluate roadway cross sections and the proposed signals. (Traffic Engineering)
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: the MTIS has been updated to incorporate all comments from City of Aurora Traffic.
	Comment:	MUS comments are now saved in RSN 1829562 (Aurora Water)
	Response:	Matrix Response: Noted
	Comment:	The PROS Department is currently reviewing park credit options, including standard amenities, with city leadership. Anticipate a memo and/or meeting for follow up. (PROS)
	Response:	Tryba Response: The PROS Memorandum, received on 01/22/2025, has been coordinated with Form J and the City PROS department, which outlines the amenities allocated within each park space.
	Comment:	The design review guidelines are in conflict with the proposed GDP amendment. These shall be updated and approved by the GDP and FRA before the city can finalize approval of this GDP amendment. The city will require approval of the revised design guidelines by the DRB as a condition of approval for this GDP amendment, and prior to the final recordation of the document.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Design Review Guidelines Draft to be provided to the City of Aurora as reference to the GDP submission.
1. Planning Comments – Community Questions, Comments and Concerns		
1A.	Comment:	No public comments have been received by staff so a neighborhood meeting will not be required at this time.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted
1B.	Comment:	The Master Drainage Study and Master Utility Study have been moved to a separate review process managed by Aurora Water. Please note that review comments on this item will be processed independently of this GDP amendment. It remains the applicants responsibility to ensure consistency with the GDP and master studies.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted
2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application		
2A.	Comment:	Address phasing of the planned improvements on each sheet, or more holistically within the PIP. Even at a high level, the adjacent streets and parks should have planned timing for construction in association with the planning areas.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Public Improvement Area enlargements and narratives are provided on Sheets 18 through 20, which outline the required infrastructure and park space needed to support the development parcels.
2B.	Comment:	Continued discussions are needed if it is the FRA's intent to require future landowners to take on infrastructure construction or any of the PIP requirements. Please schedule a meeting between City Management, the FRA, Urban Renewal, Planning and Development Review to discuss.

	Response:	Tryba Response: Discussion was held on 01/27/2025 between AURA, the City of Aurora, FRA, and the Metro District. The language has been revised to specify 'FRA/Metro District' instead of 'Owner/Developer' as the responsible entity for delivering the necessary infrastructure and park space to support the development parcels.
2C.	Comment:	The design review guidelines are in conflict with the proposed GDP amendment. These shall be updated and approved by the GDP and FRA before the city can finalize approval of this GDP amendment. The city will require approval of the revised design guidelines by the DRB as a condition of approval for this GDP amendment, and prior to the final recordation of the document.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Design Review Guidelines Draft to be provided to the City of Aurora as reference to the GDP submission.
2D.	Comment:	Refer to additional redlined comments on the GDP document. The comments in this letter are meant to summarize the major comments, and some additional details may be found on the GDP redlined document.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted
2E.	Comment:	Please note that the open space area to the east of the FIC is known as the Toll Gate Creek. The Sand Creek Park is only located to the North of the GDP boundary. Please check the document and make these corrections throughout, clarify which area is being referenced throughout.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Toll Gate Creek Greenway has been identified within the GDP accordingly.
3. Zoning and Subdivision Use Comments		
3A.	Comment:	The GDP use table on sheet 7 does not clearly demonstrate what was outlined in the comment response narrative. Clarify that permitted commercial uses within the residential planning areas will only be permitted as accessory/ground floor commercial uses for mixed use residential structures.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note has been added to the Land Use Table on Sheet 7, clarifying that any Commercial, Public, Civic, or Institutional use is permitted only as a ground-floor use within Residential Planning Areas. Mixed-Use Residential areas may include Residential, Office, Commercial, or Research uses, and therefore, the ground-floor use requirement does not apply.
3B.	Comment:	Repeat Comment: outline how the proposed unit cap will be distributed across the residential planning areas. This should include the general unit and density numbers for each planning area. Flexibility to shift the units across planning areas is permitted but should be generally planned and outlined at this stage. Also note, that the split of units between the residential and mixed-residential districts does not match the overall cap number.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note on the Land Use Plan (Sheet 6) has been updated to define the unit allocation for each planning area. The unit distribution has been adjusted to align with the GDP unit cap. Additionally, a note has been added to clarify that unit reallocation between planning areas is permitted, provided that residential uses are allowed within the planning area.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Comments		
4A.	Comment:	Thank you for the block and street revisions. However, some of the blocks still exceed the goal of 660'. Please note that if additional street connectivity will not be provided, at a minimum, mid-block bike and pedestrian trail connections will be required for these blocks. This should be noted in the GDP document as a requirement or adopted in a revised set of design standards that will apply at the time of site plan design.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Block scale and size have been revised to ensure conformance with the GDP. Additionally, Section 2.3 on Sheet 10 has been updated to include a requirement for a mid-block pedestrian connection when blocks exceed the specified size.
4B.	Comment:	Thank you for beginning to address phasing of public improvements. Please ensure that each phase area clearly identifies all improvements needed for each area. Consider reducing the size of PIP Area 9 to make the public improvements for this area more manageable for the first project within the area
	Response:	Tryba Response: Public Improvement Area enlargements and narratives are provided on Sheets 18 through 20, which outline the required infrastructure and park space needed to support the development parcels.
4C.	Comment:	Please label each street typical shown on sheets with the street name that it will apply to. There are still some inconsistencies in the document.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Typical Street Sections E and F on Sheet 13 have been revised to specify the applicable streets to which each section applies. Inconsistencies have been addressed to ensure alignment with these updates.
4D.	Comment:	Street trees are required on both sides of Ursula Street. Utility conflicts should be resolved by either moving the utilities or providing a wide enough space around the utilities for tree planting. Show street trees in the proposed section.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Street trees have been added to the Ursula Street section, with a note specifying that tree placement will be located as applicable based on utility easement constraints.
4E.	Comment:	Thank you for the response regarding roadway widths and turn lanes. Have the design alternatives been looked at? Please add a note to the GDP to address the general desire to prioritize pedestrian movements at intersections.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note 1 on Sheets 15 and 16 has been revised to emphasize the prioritization of pedestrian connections at intersections. Design alternatives were analyzed to support a pedestrian and multimodal-friendly environment, with two-lane roadways remaining the planned approach unless additional lanes are required based on roadway volume.
5. Architectural and Urban Design Comments		
5A.	Comment:	Provide a description of the amenities and design themes for each of the proposed parks. Outline (at a high level) how the spaces will provide the needed services of 14,000 residents with limited land area. Amenities for all

		ages and types should be considered. Design themes and visions for each space should be updated in the design guidelines. Lastly, the timing of construction for each space should be clearly outlined in the GDP. This is typically done through the PROS Form J, which you will see referenced below. Use this form to better understand what is missing from the GDP document.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Public Improvement Area enlargements and narratives are provided on Sheets 18 through 20, outlining the required park space to support the development parcels. PROS Form J on Sheet 21 within the GDP details the required amenities and their timing, based on the adjacency of development parcels and residential unit triggers. A draft of the Urban Design Guidelines, to be shared as a reference with the GDP submission, includes descriptions and intent for each park space.
5B.	Comment:	Due to the residential uses proposed, planning would like to see at least two turf areas, a minimum dimension of 200 x 200 each proposed within the park areas. Additionally, an effort should be made to provide outdoor active and recreational spaces within the smaller park spaces provided. There is currently no private amenity space requirement for residential development. How will outdoor amenities be ensured with development of these residential units? The introduction of so many residences that will not have private usable space, the limited park areas must provide these amenities.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Turf areas and active recreation amenities have been coordinated with the requirements outlined in the PROS memorandum received on 01/22/2025 and outlined within the Form J on Sheet 21 within the GDP submission.
5C.	Comment:	Continue to coordinate the off-site improvements planned for the Sand Creek Park and Tollgate Creek areas. These improvements should be outlined in the GDP document, to include a general list of what improvements will be required, how they account for the shortage of space within the development (in addition to the proposed park areas and not to replace), and generally when the improvements will be completed. Please coordinate with PROS to determine how/if an MOU would be appropriate to memorialize maintenance responsibilities as the parks develop.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Identification of off-site improvements is provided in Note 1 on Sheet 17, indicating that an IGA will need to be formed to coordinate off-site improvements to Sand Creek Park and Confluence Park, in alignment with the Cash In Lieu requirement outlined in the PROS Memorandum received on 01/22/2025.
5D.	Comment:	The comment response indicates that standalone townhome products will not be permitted. However, I did not see this information incorporated into the GDP document. As previously requested, please add a section outlining more information on the townhome product location and design standards. These should also be further refined in the revised DRB design standards.
	Response:	Tryba Response: No townhome products are allowed. Walk-up residential products are allowed when integrated into the residential buildings outlined on Sheet 10. The draft of the Urban Design Guidelines reflects this

		requirement in Chapter 4 – Residential Site Design, which was submitted with the GDP submission as a reference.
5E.	Comment:	The revised building height table still has conflicting dimensional standards. See redlines on page 12.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The building height table on Sheet 12 has been removed and now only includes the minimum number of building stories.
6. Aurora Urban Renewal Authority (Chad Argentar/303.739.7052/cargenta@auroragov.org)		
6A.	Comment:	Please be advised that incremental revenues generated within Tax Increment Finance Area 2 of the CSTP Urban Renewal Plan still requires approval of a Public Finance and Redevelopment Agreement with AURA. The intent of those incremental revenues is to fund infrastructure costs within TIF 2. The proposed changes in the CSTP GDP appear to constitute both a substantive change to the Urban Renewal Plan and the terms under which TIF 2 was approved between AURA and the taxing entities. As a result, this could require amending the urban renewal plan through a public approval process as well as renegotiating revenue sharing agreements with the other taxing entities, primarily the County and School District.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Discussion was held on 01/27/2025 between AURA, the City of Aurora, FRA, and the Metro District. The language has been revised to specify 'FRA/Metro District' instead of 'Owner/Developer' as the responsible entity for delivering the necessary infrastructure and park space to support the development parcels.
Referral Comments From Other Departments and Agencies		
7. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org)		
7A.	Comment:	Remove repeat note as redlined on sheet 13
	Response:	Tryba Response: Repeat note removed.
7B.	Comment:	Add 22nd between Scranton and Ursula as a requirement for planning area 4. There is missing sidewalk along 22nd that would be required with development in this planning area.
	Response:	Tryba Response: 22 nd Avenue sections between Scranton and Ursula has been added as a requirement for PIP Area 4.
7C.	Comments:	It's not clear what this statement means. This PIP should clearly identify which primary streets are required for each planning area.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The statement has been removed, and Public Improvement Area enlargements and narratives are provided on Sheets 18 through 20, outlining the required infrastructure to support the development parcels.
7D.	Comments:	How are Uvalda, 23rd, Victor, or 22nd going to get built? Please associate the requirement for these streets with future development in planning area 1.
	Response:	Tryba Response: PIP Area 1 has been expanded to include Uvalda St, 23 rd Ave, Victor St and 22 nd Ave.
7E.	Comments:	Identify the streets that are required for each planning area to develop.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Public Improvement Area enlargements and narratives are provided on Sheets 18 through 20, outlining the required infrastructure to support the development parcels.

7F.	Comments:	The street sections match an approved variance and are acceptable as proposed.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted
8. Traffic Engineering (Joshua Hoffman / 303-739-1770 / jhoffman@auroragov.org)		
General Development Plan (GDP)		
8A.	Comment:	The pedestrian crossings at Fitzsimons Parkway need to be safe crossings. If these two locations don't meet MUTCD signal warrants, an evaluation of HAWK signal or other safe crossing method will be necessary. A safe pedestrian crossing will be required at these locations. A discussion on the pedestrian crossing with Aurora Traffic and PROS should occur before next submittal if these locations don't meet MUTCD signal warrants
	Response:	Tryba Response: Locations meeting MUTCD signal warrants, as defined in the 2023 approved MTIS, are planned to be signalized for safe crossings..
8B.	Comment:	Two signals on Montview don't meet signal spacing. See full comment on the TIS.
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: Fehr & Peers worked with City of Aurora Traffic to create language to add to the report regarding the signal spacing and variance that will be required. The language is in the updated MTIS.
8C.	Comment:	The TIS doesn't provide enough information to evaluate if the proposed number of the lanes are correct. Signal warrant analysis was not provided in TIS. Don't know if all the proposed signals will be needed. Will evaluate when the revised TIS comes back in.
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: Fehr & Peers incorporated ADT for the segments and analysis scenarios as directed by City of Aurora Traffic to ensure the number of lanes are correct. Signal warrant analysis from the previous report is now included in the appendix.
8D.	Comment:	Any ditches in the clear zone need to have recoverable slopes
	Response:	Tryba Response: Water quality planting areas within the clear zone will be designed in accordance with roadway standards. The design intent is to keep planter areas as shallow as possible, with a maximum depth of 18 inches to meet drainage requirements.
Master Traffic Impact Study (MTIS)		
8E.	Comment:	Several items are missing from the report which do not allow a complete review. Refer to redlines and comments on the MTIS.
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: All redlines and comments are addressed in the updated MTIS. All information needed to perform a complete review should be incorporated at this time.
9. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org)		
9A.	Comment:	Sheet 1 of 19 / Cover. See comment to update note #13.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note # 13 on Cover has been revised per comment.
9B.	Comment:	Sheet 14 & 15 of 19 / Street Sections. See comment to update note #2.

	Response:	Tryba Response: Note #2 on Sheet 14,15, 19 and 20 has been revised per comment.
10. Aurora Water (Samantha Bayliff / sbayliff@auroragov.org)		
10A.	Comment:	MUS comments are saved in RSN 1829562
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Comments have been addressed and comment responses have been provided with resubmittal.
11. PROS (Erick del Angel / 303-739-7154 / edelange@auroragov.org)		
PROS requirement for subsequent submittal		
11A.	Comment:	This development is exempt from open space requirements, therefore, all text within this document containing the words "open space" written in regard to the proposed development, whether standalone or in conjunction with other words (e.g. open space network), should be removed. They can be replaced with description such as "park and trail network". The only acceptable place to use the words "open space" is in the legend of sheet 6 where it states "Ineligible Open Space (this is not counted towards park requirements)". With that being said, relabel all narrow areas as such with the exception of select narrow areas that will be allowed as park space as depicted on sheet 9.
	Response:	Tryba Response: All notes and narratives within the document have been updated to refer to 'Park Space' instead of 'Open Space,' except in references to 'Ineligible Open Space'.
11B.	Comment:	Form J must be included with all planning areas called out for all park spaces, descriptions and inventory of facilities for each, total acreage and amount of desired PROS credited acreage, final ownership and facility funding, and triggers to each phase. Amounts of required neighborhood parkland and community parkland desired to be paid cash-in-lieu should also be stated. Contact PROS Staff for any questions regarding completion of Form J.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Form J has been added to GDP on Sheet 21 and was shared with the PROS department in draft format for review and comment on 03/14/2025 and 03/31/2025 prior to submittal.
11C.	Comment:	***Department is currently reviewing park credit options, including standard amenities, with city leadership. Anticipate a memo and/or meeting for follow up.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The PROS Memorandum, received on 01/22/2025, has been coordinated with Form J on Sheet 21 of the GDP and the City PROS department, which outlines the amenities allocated within each park space.
General Development Plan (GDP)		
11D.	Comment:	Though the park areas on sheet 4 were in the previously approved GDP, this should be revised to reflect accurate public parks. Common space on campus does not equate to public park space. Revise all 3 maps. Landscaping and private common space must be represented in a different color, not green.

	Response:	Tryba Response: Park areas on Sheet 4 have been categorized as 'Private Park Space' and 'Public Park Space,' using distinct colors to differentiate park types accordingly.
11E.	Comment:	Multi-use section along Fitzsimons Pkwy appears to be existing. Confirm and update legend as applicable
	Response:	Tryba Response: Multi-use path sections along Fitzsimons Parkway and Peoria Street have been updated to reflect existing conditions in comparison to proposed conditions.
11F.	Comment:	Adjust hatching as redlined so that it is clear and visible.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Hatching has been revised for improved clarity and visibility, creating a clear distinction between Integrated Water Quality Park Spaces and Park Space.
11G.	Comment:	Correct labels for the existing city park and greenway and the toll gate creek greenway.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Labels for 'Existing City Park and Greenway' and 'Toll Gate Creek Greenway' have been incorporated for clarity.
11H.	Comment:	Revise or remove comment 1 on sheet 9. The scope of work for the TIP grants is for design only of the Sand Creek Bridge Replacement on Peoria and will include multimodal design of Peoria and Fitzsimons Pkwy/MLK intersection. No construction funds have been secured and no improvements along the Fitzsimons Pkwy are included.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note #1 on Sheet 9 has been removed.
11I.	Comment:	See redlined plan set for areas that are not eligible for park space. Additionally, University areas cannot receive credit due to note(s) which state that University may or may not develop in compliance with GDP.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Areas not eligible to be counted as park space have been relabeled as 'Ineligible Park Space.' Additionally, the University Park Space section has been noted to be built in conformance with the Urban Design Guidelines, per the land sale agreement shared with the City of Aurora PROS department on 03/31/2025.
11J.	Comment:	Segments along Peoria will be eligible for park space if the same design is implemented as the segment between 23rd and 25th.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Amenities to be included within the Peoria section are outlined in Form J on Sheet 21, and the design will be consistent across all perimeter street trails, as per the Urban Design Guidelines.
11K.	Comment:	Identify and label ALL park spaces separately on Form J. For example: <i>Racine Pocket Park 1</i> 1.5 acres <i>Open turf area, benches, trash receptacles, bike racks, security lighting, Shelter, half basketball court</i> <i>Racine Pocket Park 2</i> 1.2 acres <i>Open turf area, bike racks, playground, trash receptacles, benches, security lighting, public art</i>

	Response:	Tryba Response: Form J included on Sheet 21, outlining all park amenities, along with the Urban Design Guidelines Draft, to be submitted to the city for reference with the GDP submission.
11L.	Comment:	Total area highlighted along Ursula was permitted as park space under previous GDP and will continue as such; however, it must be amenitized or redesigned at a level of quality similar to or greater than Peoria Linear Park.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Ursula Street Park is planned to be designed with the same level of amenities or greater than the Peoria Linear Park, as outlined in Form J and the Urban Design Guidelines Draft, which will be submitted to the city for reference with the GDP submission.
11M.	Comment:	Fitzsimons Linear Park is eligible for park space however, it must be amenitized or redesigned at a level of quality similar to or greater than Peoria Linear Park.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Fitzsimons Linear Park is planned to be designed with the same level of amenities or greater than the Peoria Linear Park, as outlined in Form J on Sheet 21 and the Urban Design Guidelines Draft, which will be submitted to the city for reference with the GDP submission.
11N.	Comment:	Approval of 24th, 25th, and Racine park spaces contingent upon approval of stormwater detention by AW and drain time within 24 hours.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Approval of stormwater detention by Aurora Water and the PROS department was agreed upon during the 02/05/2025 PROS Memorandum Meeting, with the detention time deferred to Aurora Water standards.
11O.	Comment:	Remove the entire paragraph regarding Generals Park and Central Green on Sheet 11 as the project is exempt from open space requirements. In addition, General's Park can only satisfy the first 402 DU's, or 2.65 acres of Neighborhood Park and 0.97 acres of Community Park and Central Green does not qualify towards meeting parkland dedication requirements.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note referencing Generals Park and Central Green has been removed per comment.
11P.	Comment:	Insert into Section 2.7(1): No parks under 5 acres shall be dedicated to the city for ownership.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note has been added to Section 2.7(1) per comment.
11Q.	Comment:	Insert into Section 2.7(3): Transit Station Areas are exempt from open space requirements
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note has been added to Section 2.7(3) per comment.
11R.	Comment:	ADD into Section 2.7(5): Land dedication credit for SUPs may be issued by PROS when in conformance with the site design criteria presented in Section 6.13 of the PROS D&DC Manual. Despite the applicability of SUP criteria within designated areas described in paragraphs F and G of page 12 of said manual, a minimum three (3) acre neighborhood park may, at the discretion of PROS, be required when a development introduces more than one thousand (1,000) residents into a part of the city that is underserved by neighborhood parks. The decision will be based on an analysis of the magnitude of new residents' park needs and the ability of

		proposed SUPs to serve these needs, the quantity of existing park facilities within one-half (1/2) mile service radius of the development, the size of the development, the population density, and the feasibility of integrating a three (3) acre park into the mix of proposed land uses
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note has been added to Section 2.7(5) per comment.
11S.	Comment:	See other redlined corrections to sheet 11.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Notes have been addressed accordingly per redlines.
11T.	Comment:	Linear park credit will be given for private property areas only. ROW does not receive credit, typ.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Linear Parks are not located within ROW and located on Private Property in order to receive park credit.
11U.	Comment:	Confirm with Aurora Water that water quality is allowed in the ROW.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Water Quality is to be located within Private Property.
12. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)		
12A.	Comment:	Thank you for identifying four potential public art sites on the plan. A formal public art plan should include a timeline, budget, map identifying potential locations, prescient images, and a narrative description of goals. While elements of a public art plan are included in a variety of documents, we would like to see this coalesce into a formal public art plan that can be submitted, reviewed and approved.
	Response:	Tryba Response: A discussion was held with the Public Art Department on 03/09/2025 to review the roles of the GDP, Urban Design Guidelines, and Public Financing in identifying, establishing, and implementing public art within the campus. Note #6 on Sheet 9 has been added to outline the allocation of funds for artwork implementation, which will be coordinated with park construction.
13. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / jd hensley@@aurorak12.org)		
13A.	Comment:	No additional comments at this time. However, please keep the previous review comments in mind as discussions proceed. Provide an update on these items with the next submission.
	Response:	Tryba Response: As discussed on 03/12/2025, with Joshua Hensley (APS), the FRA acknowledges the significance of workforce development and early learning initiatives in fostering connections between the campus and the broader community. To support this effort, an MOU will be developed in coordination with APS and participating FIC partners to ensure the alignment of programs with planned Aurora Public Schools developments. These initiatives will enhance student engagement with STEM opportunities throughout the campus.