

October 5, 2020

City of Aurora
Attn: Heather Lamboy
15151 E. Alameda Pkwy
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: **Third Submittal** – Aurora Crossroads Preliminary Plat (Infrastructure Site Plan)

Application Number: **DA-2231-01**

Case Numbers: **2020-6021-01**

Dear Ms. Lamboy:

Thank you for taking the time to review our third submission for Aurora Crossroads Infrastructure Site Plan along with City staff. Valuable feedback was received on September 3rd, 2020 and changes have been detailed on the following pages. Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to reach out by phone, 303-892-1166 or by email, awenlund@norris-design.com

Sincerely,
Norris Design



Allison Wenlund
Senior Associate

Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please provide a landscape plan with the next submittal.
- Update the plans to reflect new hydrant locations
- Please ensure that all sidewalks along arterial roadways meet a minimum of 10' walk to provide appropriate access.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. No comments were received from the community.

Response: Thank you.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Please include a landscape plan with the next submittal. Before the Preliminary Plat can be approved, a landscape plan must be provided.

Response: Understood, thank you. A Landscape plan is included with this submittal.

3. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

3A. A landscape plan was requested with the previous set of review comments. It was not submitted with this second submittal. The landscape plan should address the curbside landscape and any proposed detention ponds.

Response: Understood, thank you. A Landscape plan is included with this submittal.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

4. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

4A. Add a note indicating if the storm sewer system is public or private and who will maintain it.

Response: A note has been added stating the storm sewer is public.

4B. The detention pond is required with the first construction - in this case the ISP. There is storm infrastructure that will be draining to the pond. If the pond will be phased, this plan needs to identify that.

Response: The detention pond will not be phased.

4C. Will the N/S storm be constructed with the ISP?

Response: Yes, the N/S storm is included in the ISP. A note has been added stating that the storm main will continue along the eastern property boundary and outfall to First Creek.

Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

4D. Sign dimensions are appropriate in the Civil Plan – Sign and Striping.

Response: Sign dimensions have been updated per redlines.

4E. Traffic Signal Easements are needed for future traffic signals at Gun Club Rd and Colfax Ave (chamfer the radius).

Response: Noted, traffic signal easements will be provided as traffic signal design develops based on cabinet placement/signal poles.

4F. Remove Speed Limit number on ISP. Will be identified in Civil Plans.

Response: Speed limit number has been removed.

4G. Turning lanes are 12' minimum. Please update.

Response: All turning lanes have been updated to 12'.

4H. On existing Colfax Ave, 15' for the side of roadway is ok (thru lane geometry shift is acceptable as 3').

Response: Noted, thank you.

4I. Use graphical no parking symbol for all Parking signage.

Response: Sign has been updated.

4J. On E Colfax Ave, 12' minimum, consider median modification to support needed width.

Response: Median has been modified to accommodate 12' turn lanes.

4K. *Repeat comment:* Show future signalized intersection. Concerns with parking and needed auxiliary lanes for this known location (as identified in the MTIS).

Response: Future signalized intersections are shown.

4L. Add note that signage for the roundabouts will be identified in the Civil Plans.

Response: Note added.

4M. Sign sizes are 30"x30" for single lane approach, 36"x36" for multi-lane approach.

Response: Noted, signage has been updated.

5. **Fire / Life Safety** (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Sheet 4 of 8 / E. Colfax Plan

5A. See comment for new fire hydrant location.

Response: Per coordination with Aurora CIP and due to numerous dry utilities in the E-470 MUE, the hydrant is shown connecting to the internal 12" main instead of tapping off the 60". In addition, the I-70 frontage road will be removed by others in the future.

Sheet 5 of 8 / E. Colfax Plan

5B. This paved turnaround section needs to reflect a note stating that it will support the imposed loads of the fire apparatus up to 85,000 pounds.

Response: Note has been added.

Sheet 6 of 8 / E. Colfax Plan

5C. See multiple comments for new fire hydrant locations.

Response: New fire hydrants have been placed outside of the E-470 ROW and MUE at the intersection of E. 8th Avenue and Gun Club Road and at the western roundabout. Additionally, per coordination with Capital Improvements and Aurora Water hydrant locations have been placed as best as possible to preferred location while tapping off of the 12" on-site water mains rather than direct connections to the 60" water main.

Sheet 7 of 8 / Gun Club Plan

5D. See comment for new fire hydrant location.

Response *New fire hydrants have been placed outside of the E-470 ROW and MUE at the intersection of E. 8th Avenue and Gun Club Road and at the western roundabout. Additionally, per coordination with Capital Improvements and Aurora Water hydrant locations have been placed as best as possible to preferred location while tapping off of the 12" on-site water mains rather than direct connections to the 60" water main.*

Sheet 8 of 8 / Gun Club Plan

5E. See comment for new fire hydrant location.

Response: *New fire hydrants have been placed outside of the E-470 ROW and MUE at the intersection of E. 8th Avenue and Gun Club Road and at the western roundabout. Additionally, per coordination with Capital Improvements and Aurora Water hydrant locations have been placed as best as possible to preferred location while tapping off of the 12" on-site water mains rather than direct connections to the 60" water main.*

6. **Aurora Water** (Ryan Tigera / 303-326-8867 / rtigera@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

6A. Please note that the MUS must be approved prior to the ISP being approved.

Response: *Noted, thank you.*

6B. Utility phasing plan to be shown on plan set as well as the civils.

Response: *The utilities will be completed in a single phase.*

6C. Add note that detention pond is to be constructed in Phase 1.

Response: *Note added.*

7. **PROS** (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / mteller@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

7A. The proposed sidewalks along Gun Club and Colfax are not sufficient for handling the anticipated bike/ped connectivity needs. Both Colfax and Gun Club are important connections between several regional trail networks and this area in particular is an important interchange for the High Plains Trail corridor. Please ensure that all sidewalks along these arterial roadways meet a minimum of 10' walk to provide appropriate access.

Response: *The proposed sections for both Gun Club road and Colfax Avenue were previously agreed upon between the developer and the City. Per correspondence with Victor Rachael on 2/13/20, the Main Street section described in the NEATS report is to be followed for these roadways.*

8. **Real Property** (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

8A. The easements needed should be dedicated by separate document and the existing easements should all be labeled with the reception numbers or other recording information. Contact Andy Niquette (aniquett@auroragov.org) for the easement concerns. Please note that the Preliminary Plat cannot be approved until all the items needed are submitted, fully reviewed and ready to record.

Response: *Easements will be dedicated by subdivision plat. Reception numbers have been added to all existing easements.*

8B. On the noted easements, add "to be dedicated by separate document."

Response: *Easements will be dedicated by subdivision plat.*

8C. There may be a need for an easement to cover the Traffic Signals - confirm this with Traffic Engineering.

Response: Easements will be dedicated by subdivision plat.

8D. Cover the roundabout water line with an easement by separate document.

Response: Easements will be dedicated by subdivision plat.

8E. Add the centerline monument on Sheet 6.

Response: Centerline monument added.

8F. On the roundabout and along Gun Club Rd, there may be a need for an easement to cover the Sidewalks - confirm this with Engineering.

Response: All sidewalks will be covered by ROW and will be dedicated by subdivision plat.

8G. Cover the Gun Club Road water line easement by separate document.

Response: Easements will be dedicated by subdivision plat.

8H. On Gun Club Road, this configuration is not the same as the dedicating document - dedicate this shaded portion by separate document. Contact Andy Niquette to start the process.

Response: The updated ROW will be dedicated by subdivision plat.

8I. Add the centerline monument on the Gun Club roundabout.

Response: Centerline monument added.

9. **Mile High Flood District** (Teresa Patterson / 303-455-6277 / submittals@udfcd.org)

9A. Please see attached letter. (Summarized below)

Response: Comment response letter received. Response to comments will be provided with the Master Drainage Report resubmittal under separate comment/response letter.

10. **CDOT Region 1** (Steve Loeffler / 303-757-9891 / steven.loeffler@state.co.us)

Drainage Comments:

1. The drainage report is missing critical drainage information such as the details for the outlet structure for the proposed detention

Response: City of Aurora Master Drainage Reports do not require outlet structure details. Pond design will be finalized in the Final Drainage Report under separate submittal.

2. The overall impact of the I 70 existing drainage culverts and their conditions and determine if they need to be cleaned or repaired

Response: The Crossroads development will not impact the existing drainage culverts. The proposed development will release flows from the on-site pond at a historical rate.

3. Please have them contact me if they have any question or if they need any additional information

Response: Noted, thank you.

4. Clean the I70 culverts is needed since it is going to have more concentrated flows

Response: The Crossroads development will have concentrated flows directed to the I-70 culverts. The proposed development will release flows from the on-site pond at a historical rate.

Traffic Comments:

5. The followings should be accounted for in the traffic impact study, particularly in the existing, short-term (build-out) and long-term traffic:
 - A couple new interchanges are planned to be built close to the project site: I-70/Picadilly and I-70/Harvest.
 - Gun Club Road to be removed upon completion of I-70/E-470 system ramps.
 - The approved travel demand model for CDOT is DRCOG. NEATs can be used as a supplemental model such as for sensitivity analysis.
 - Trip distribution will change significantly with the new interchanges, removal of a Gun Club Road, the completion of I-70/E-470, etc.
 - Therefore, this TIS is misleading. Further review will be done, after TIS has been revised.

Note: E-470 is not a CDOT facility.

Response: Fox Tuttle was directed by the City staff to utilize NEATs for the City streets and trip distribution. We have worked together with City staff to adjust distribution and account for future infrastructure, as appropriate. The latest traffic study includes the Colfax/Harvest intersection to reflect traffic going to/from I-70 via the Harvest interchange. Per discussions with City staff, we were advised that the timeline for the E-470/Colfax/I-70 changes are unknown and to not include in the traffic study.

Right Of Way Comments:

6. Regarding the ROW, the only CDOT roads in the immediate vicinity are I-70 and Colfax Ave (I-70 Frontage Road). I have uploaded the ROW plans from Project I-70-4(62) from 1972 which show the A-lines.
Response: We did not receive the ROW plans from the City of Aurora. We will coordinate with CDOT and show the A-lines on future submittals.

7. The older ROW plans from 1956 show A-lines along the entire CDOT ROW east of Gun Club Rd, but the subsequent ROW plans from 1964 and then 1972 do not show A-lines for the first line course (heading northeast from Gun Club toward Colfax), but then does depict A-lines for the rest of the ROW as you move east along Colfax to Powhaton.
Response: Noted, thank you. We will coordinate with CDOT and show the A-lines on future submittals.

Permits Comments:

8. Please see comments from RoW relative to the Access Control Lines flanking E-470 & I-70. It is peculiar that this line lies along the south edge of the Frontage Road. This means any (proposed) access to/from the Frontage road must receive FHWA clearance and is more involved than a standard access request.
Response: Noted, no access points are proposed to the Frontage Road.

9. Plans need to show the existing & proposed lane configuration of the I-70 Frontage Road at the "Colfax" intersection. The Frontage Road will be for the interim, the only continuous E-W local roadway to Powhoton & beyond. There does not appear to be any E-W crosswalk of Gun Club where this connection occurs. At the Gun Club-Frontage Road-Colfax intersection, we prefer type I-B ADA ramps opposed to the type 1-A now illustrated. I have multiple other questions –clarifications requested on the preliminary plat. (See Red-lines 2-sheets)
Response: The frontage road will not be modified with this development. Roadway construction will begin at the eastern curb return of I-70. There is no existing walk along the north or south half of Colfax Road west of the proposed development so east-west ADA ramps have not been provided.

10. We repeat previous advisory remark that the Gun Club Diamond interchange has a limited life span expectancy as it is programmed to be removed upon full completion of the Picadilly-E-470-Harvest interchange complex. Also, that any signing oriented to the highways must adhere to the State Rules for Outdoor Advertising.

Response: Noted, thank you.

11. May have additional comments upon receipt of a revised TIS.

Response: Noted, thank you.

12. Request a resubmittal to review. Need to see the I-70 Frontage Road and PA's under consideration - that lend understanding to phasing. Secondly, need to see where CDOT RoW exist, apart from E-470. This is relevant to permitting, authority and standards. Beware, an Access Control Line (A-line) will exist along both limited access highways. None of the above was shown in the infrastructure plans.

Response: Noted, we will coordinate with CDOT on permitting. The A-line will be shown on future submittals.

13. When CDOT received the referral for the Crossroad Infrastructure Master Plan in May, we were provided infrastructure improvement plans that had no context, in terms of land use and phasing. later we received the master TIS, and other zoning documents. Not all CDOT specialty units have completed their review.

Response: Noted, thank you.

14. ROW plans show extent of E-470 influence and authority, including most of the I-70 Frontage Road. Any work in CDOT RoW is by permit.

Response: Noted, thank you.

15. Signs oriented to the interstate must adhere to the State Rules for Outdoor Advertising.

Response: Noted, thank you.

Master TIS (Pages 4-5)

16. Incorrect statement that E-470 is a CDOT facility. The E-470 Authority is its own taxing entity. The limited access Tollway is not subject to CDOT access code, and we believe it is not classified as an NR-A facility.

Response: Updated text.

17. The I-70 Frontage Road is for the most part, a CDOT facility and is classified as F-R. This roadway has much longer connectivity than stated extending east to the Monahan-Airpark interchange and also connects to the Powhatan Road overpass. Much of the Frontage Road flanking the Crossroads property is within ROW owned by E-470 who would have permitting authority.

Response: Updated text.

Interchange Status

18. Peculiar that the master TIS does not acknowledge the major System Level Study associated with the interchanges of Harvest and Powhatan interchanges. The E. A. refresh that accompanies these Interchange Access Request (IAR) and State 1601 process also includes the new braided ramp system to improve the system-to-system I-70/E-470 interchange. Upon completion of the Harvest and Powhatan interchanges, the existing diamond interchange at Gun Club Road & I-70 is to be decommissioned and removed. Currently, this diamond interchange is the closest access to the interstate system and the Master TIS appears to overlook its relevance in the short term. We have noted that a hospital is under consideration to locate on

this property under phase 1 but it is not stated if it is to be a trauma center. In the near term, assuming both new interchanges advance to construction, access to Crossroads from the interstate will be more out-of-direction than what currently exist. We noted that Crossroads assumes full buildout by 2030.

Response: The latest traffic study includes the completion of the Harvest Road interchange, but as discusses in Response #5 adjustments for future changes to the E-470/Colfax/I-70 intersection was not included per direction from City staff. The trip distribution assumes a relatively small percentage of trips would utilize E-470 which would easily be redistributed and accommodated to future infrastructure.

19. Traffic distribution and patterns illustrated in figures 8A & 9A clearly show high volumes of traffic coming and going from Gun Club Road north of the realigned Colfax. We are unclear why this master TIS overlooks/omits the existing I-70/Gun Club Rd diamond interchange immediately north of the property. We noted the study assumes three hotels and significant commercial in addition to the hospital use. Once the diamond interchange is removed, we believe much of that traffic will seek alternate access to and from the freeway. The master TIS does not appear to take this into account.

Response: The trip distribution was originally matching the assumptions of the nearby Horizon Development and has since been adjusted and approved by City staff. The TIS does not assume the removal of the diamond interchange per direction of City staff.