

June 28, 2019

Stephen Rodriguez, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway
Aurora, Colorado 80012

**RE: Stafford Logistics Center (FDP) Framework Development Plan 4th Submittal
Response to 3rd Submittal Comments**

Dear Mr. Rodriguez,

We have reviewed your comments of the Stafford Logistics Center Framework Development Plan (FDP) application and associated plans for the subject project. Attached within are our responses to those comments.

If you require additional information or have any questions about our submittal items, please do not hesitate to call or e-mail me (303) 734-1777 or jcarpenter@laidesigngroup.com. We look forward to working with the City in completing this process in order to contribute to the City of Aurora.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Carpenter
Associate Principal

Initial Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Waiver request
- See the comment redlines from Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Aurora Water, Life Safety, Parks and Forestry
- Please see the comments from Tri-County Health
- CDOT, City and applicant coordination required for the PIP and TIS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Stephen Rodriguez srodrigu@auroragov.org/ 303-739-7186 / PDF comment color is teal.

1. Community Comments

1A. No additional community comments have been received.

RE: Acknowledged

2. Zoning and Land Use Comments

2A. Service Area and Loading Dock Screening (146-915 B9) – Staff will not support this waiver request to city code which states, “Loading docks, on-site storage yards, and all other service areas shall be fully screened from view from all public and private rights-of-way by walls or fences. Such screens shall be of a color and material matching or compatible with the dominant colors and materials found on the façades of the primary building. The screen height shall be of sufficient height to hide the equipment, vehicles, materials, or trash being screened from public view, but in no case shall exceed a height of 10 feet. Chain link fences, with or without slats, shall not be used to satisfy this screening requirement.

RE: Acknowledged

3. Landscape Comments

(Reviewed by: Kelly K. Bish, PLA, LEED AP/ Kbish@auroragov.org/ (303) 739-7189/ PDF comments in teal.)

3A. All previous landscape comments were addressed.

RE: Acknowledged

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

4. Civil Engineering

(Reviewed by: Kristin Tanabe, ktanabe@auroragov.org / 303-739-7306 / Comments in green.)

PIP

4A. On the cover page, move these sheets. Tab 13 is the PIP narrative. There aren't separate documents. The cover page of the narrative should be the first page.

RE: Noted. The PIP narrative is now the cover page of Tab 13.

4B. The PIP will not be approved by Public Works until the master drainage study is approved.

RE: Noted. We have received first round of Master Drainage comments and will be resubmitting shortly.

4C. On page 3, see note regarding that 2 lanes of Picadilly Road are required with the second CSP.

RE: Per additional coordination with the City of Aurora 2 lanes of Picadilly are required with the 3rd CSP to be submitted, upon funding of the Picadilly Interchange, when ADT on existing Picadilly exceeds LOS C as identified in the NEATS Study, or when construction of adjacent developments adjacent to the planned realigned roadway.

4D. On page 4, per the redline comment, an exhibit is needed.

RE: Noted. The exhibits have been updated to reflect the stormwater channel is to be constructed as development east of Lisbon occurs.

4E. On page 5, see comment redline coordination of the second planned CSP and Picadilly Road.

RE: Per additional coordination with the City of Aurora 2 lanes of Picadilly are required with the 3rd CSP to be submitted, upon funding of the Picadilly Interchange, when ADT on existing Picadilly exceeds LOS C as identified in the NEATS Study, or when construction of adjacent developments adjacent to the planned realigned roadway.

4F. On page 6, see comment redline regarding the channel.

RE: Noted. The exhibits have been updated to reflect the stormwater channel is to be constructed as development east of Lisbon occurs.

4G. On page 9, see comment redline regarding PA-11 and detention pond construction.

RE: The Pond and Stormwater Channel are no longer separate planning areas.

4H. On page 9, see comment redline regarding trail, pond and channel area.

RE: It is planned that the trail will be used as maintenance access to the trail and channel and therefore will be installed the time of construction of these items.

4I. On sheet C-1, see comment redline regarding a required connection to Picadilly Road, not a cul-de-sac.

RE: 13th Avenue and Picadilly Road are being shown as a full intersection.

4J. On sheet C-1, see comment redline regarding detention pond/planning area.

RE: The Pond and Stormwater Channel are no longer separate planning areas.

4K. On sheet PA-1, see the comment redline regarding storm sewer, Picadilly improvements, infrastructure per Planning Area and sanitary sewer installation in Lisbon Street as it pertains to narrative and exhibits.

RE: The proposed storm sewer has been added to the legend, a note indicating the Picadilly Road improvements has been added to the exhibits, and the sanitary sewer and watermain installation have been revised to reflect what is required for each planning area.

4L. On sheet PA-3, PA-5 and PA-9, see comment redline regarding channel improvements.

RE: The channel improvements are now indicated as part of PA-3.

5. Traffic Engineering

(Reviewed by: Brianna Medema, bmedema@auroragov.org / 303.739.7646)

TIS

5A. Address CDOT comments in TIS prior to resubmittal.

RE: Comments from CDOT and City of Aurora throughout the TIS have been addressed in the resubmittal.

5B. See intersection signalization comment and redlines regarding auxiliary lane lengths.

RE: Peak hour and four hour signal warrants have been analyzed and auxiliary lane length needs and size have been determined using the CDOT State Highway Access Code.

PIP

5C. Update the drawing on the cover page to show a 4-leg intersection. Update accordingly.

RE: The intersection of 13th Avenue and Picadilly is indicated as a full intersection.

5D. Add "LOS D" to page 4.

RE: LOS D is indicated within the PIP.

5E. On page 8, add ", as long as minimum signal spacing criteria are met which include minimum of 660' spacing, but 95 percentile for queues of left turns will govern and may be more restrictive."

RE: The additional language has been added to the PIP Narrative.

5F. On sheet 13, the connection of this E/W roadway to Picadilly is a requirement, both of Traffic flows and to be considered a public road.

RE: The intersection of 13th Avenue and Picadilly is indicated as a full intersection.

6. Aurora Water

(Daniel Pershing / dperching@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7646 Comments in red.)

Refer to the redlines for additional information.

Master Utility Report

6A. Please address numerous redline comments.

Redline comments include but are not limited to:

1. See comment regarding Horizon MUS showing 12" water main installed in Picadilly. Add verbiage stating coordination with Horizon Uptown is required with this shared waterline in Picadilly.
RE: The MUS has been updated to indicate the 12" watermain to be installed with the Picadilly ROW per the Horizon MUS.
2. See the various other redlines regarding variances for sewer slopes and ISO-Valve.
RE: Noted. All redlines have been addressed.
3. Label every connection on the Water Utility Plan exhibit.
RE: All watermain connections have been noted on the Water Exhibit Plan.
4. Storm Sewer Utility Plan - If storm channel is to be constructed as adjacent properties develop, Show this in the PA boundaries or include at which time the entire channel will be constructed. Typically Storm is not included in the MUS as it is covered by the master drainage report. State that this plan is subject to change as developments come in. Otherwise, all developments will be required to conform or amend this MUS.
RE: The Channel is to be constructed as sites east of Lisbon Street are developed however will be fully constructed in 1 phase. Additional notes indicating the storm sewer exhibit is subject to change has been added to the exhibit.
5. Sanitary Sewer Utility Plan - Please provide contour lines over-laid in this exhibit. Lines can be grayed out to avoid clutter in this sheet. Include a signature block in this exhibit.
RE: Contour lines and a signature block have been added to the exhibit.

PIP

6B. On page 6, include "sanitary to be constructed for planning areas."

RE: Additional language regarding the sanitary sewer to be constructed with individual planning areas has been added to the PIP.

6C. On page 9, see redline regarding PA-12 not being shown on the MUS.

RE: Planning Area 12 has been removed from the FDP.

6D. On sheet PA-1 see the comment redline regarding the MUS stating the mains are to be installed with PA-2.

RE: The exhibits have been revised.

6E. On sheet PA-1 see the comment redline regarding sanitary alignments not being consistent with the MUS. Correct on all associated sheets.

RE: The exhibits have been revised.

6F. On sheet PA-2 see comment redline to differentiate what is installed with PA-1 and PA-2.

RE: The exhibits have been revised.

7. Life Safety

(Fire Life Safety (William Polk/ 303-739-7371 / wpolk@auroragov.org) See blue comments)

RE: The exhibits have been revised.

Tab 8 Comments:

Sheet 1:

7A. Revise this cul-de-sac to a road that extends and interconnects with the adjacent Public ROW in order to address the required 2 points of access and looped water supply requirement. TYP

RE: Completed

Sheet 4:

7B. Remove the Fire Station from the legend. TYP

RE: Completed

7C. After discussions within the COA's Fire Life Safety group, it was determined to eliminate the land dedication request for both the permanent and temporary fire stations. Coordinating with the other land dedication for fire station comments, please revise by removing the fire station land dedication statements.

RE: Completed

7D. Advisory Note: Placement of Whelen Siren System is based on the following: In newly annexed/developing areas of the city, sirens should be sited on every ½ section of ground (320 acres) or 6000 feet apart to provide edge to edge coverage. The exact placement of sirens will be determined by the city of Aurora's Office of Emergency Management to insure that coordinated coverage is provided on a system wide basis. As such, more than one location may be required for this site. The Land Use Matrix must only reflect the general requirements for determining Whelen siren system locations and not point out exact locations.

RE: Completed

Sheet 5:

7E. Replace the following note with this:

III. WHELAN WARNING SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS BESIDES THE OBVIOUS NEED TO PROVIDE EMERGENCY SIREN WARNINGS TO RESIDENTIAL AREAS WITHIN THE CITY, OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS SUCH AS SPORTS FIELDS AND GOLF COURSES, ETC. ARE IMPORTANT AREAS TO COVER WITH OUTDOOR WARNING SYSTEMS. MANY OF OUR SIRENS ARE PLACED ON SCHOOL GROUNDS BECAUSE OF THEIR LOCATION AND POPULATION. THE NUMBER AND PLACEMENT OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN NEWLY DEVELOPED AREAS CAN ROUGHLY GAUGE POPULATION DENSITY. IT IS REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT SOME FUTURE SITES COULD BE ON PUBLIC PROPERTY, SUCH AS FIRE STATIONS, LIBRARIES, GOLF COURSES AND OTHER CITY PROPERTY SO LONG AS THE SITE DELIVERS OPTIMUM COVERAGE AND HAS ADEQUATE ACCESS FOR INSTALLATION AND SERVICE. SITE SELECTION CAN BE DETERMINED BY SEVERAL DIFFERENT METHODS. IN THE PAST, THE POPULATION DENSITY OF THE CORE OF AURORA DICTATED SITE SELECTION TO INSURE OVERLAPPING OR EDGE TO EDGE COVERAGE. NEW DEVELOPMENTS AND FUTURE ANNEXATIONS INTO THE CITY REQUIRES A DIFFERENT METHOD OF DETERMINING SIREN SITES DUE TO OVERLAPPING COVERAGE, OPEN SPACES BETWEEN DEVELOPING AREAS, RECREATIONAL SITES AND POPULATION DENSITIES.

THE FEMA REQUIREMENT FOR THE OUTDOOR EMERGENCY WARNING SYSTEM IS A 60-70 FOOT MONOPOLE TOWER USING AN ALERT SIREN. THE CITY USES THE WHELAN SIREN SYSTEM AND THE LAND REQUIREMENT FOR THE TOWER IS A 10' X 10' EASEMENT. EACH SIREN COVERS APPROXIMATELY 3,000 RADIAL FEET AT 70 DB AND IS TYPICALLY SPACED ONE SIREN PER SQUARE MILE. SOUND PROPAGATION FROM THE WPS-2900 SERIES OMNI-DIRECTIONAL SIREN IS 70 DB AT 3000 FEET WITH THE STANDARD 50 FOOT TOWER (THIS HEIGHT IS AN OSHA REQUIREMENT). THIS DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT TOPOGRAPHY OR OBSTRUCTIONS SUCH AS BUILDINGS. SOME OVERLAP, OR AT LEAST EDGE TO EDGE COVERAGE, IS DESIRABLE, RESULTING IN NEW SIRENS BEING PLACED 6000 FEET OR APPROXIMATELY 1.14 MILES APART ON FLAT GROUND.

IN NEWLY ANNEXED/DEVELOPING AREAS OF THE CITY, SIRENS SHOULD BE SITED ON EVERY ½ SECTION OF GROUND (320 ACRES) OR 6000 FEET APART TO PROVIDE EDGE TO EDGE COVERAGE. THE EXACT PLACEMENT OF SIRENS WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE CITY OF AURORA'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT TO INSURE THAT COORDINATED COVERAGE IS PROVIDED ON A SYSTEM WIDE BASIS.

Please work with the City of Aurora Office of Emergency Management to ensure that coordinated coverage is provided. The Office of Emergency Management can be reached at (303) 739-7636.

RE: Completed

Tab 13 PIP:

Sheet 17:

7F. Revise this cul-de-sac to a road that extends and interconnects with the adjacent Public ROW in order to address the required 2 points of access and looped water supply requirement. TYP

RE: The intersection of Picadilly, 13th Avenue, and the Realigned Colfax Avenue is now a 4 leg intersection.

8. Parks and Recreation (PROS)

(Reviewed by: Chris Ricciardiello / cricciar@auroragov.org / 303-739-7154)

8A. Complete redlines revisions on Form J (Tab 9) prior to mylar submittal.

RE: Complete

9. Forestry

(Reviewed by: Rebecca Lamphear / rlamphea@auroragov.org/ 303-739-7139)

9A. Mitigation details will be provided at the time of CSP.

RE: Acknowledged

10. Urban Drainage (UDFCD)

(Reviewed by: Morgan Lynch / 303-455-6277)

10A. No additional comments.

RE: Acknowledged

11. Transportation

(Reviewed by: Tom Worker/Braddock / tworker@auroragov.org / 303-739-7340)

11A. The revised FDP identifies this Stephen D. Hogan Pkwy) as a "proposed 80 ft. Local ROW." This should be identified as a collector rather than a local.

RE: Stephen D. Hogan Parkway is identified as a 6-lane Major Arterial per the TIS Report.

11B. Regarding the Colfax road section and Picadilly road section, There is on-going discussion between staff and developers in this area about aligning developments with current city planning documents and standards.

RE: Acknowledged

11C. PIP – This should specifically mention that Colfax and Picadilly will have transit stops in the future, specific locations to be identified in future with RTD. PIP documentation should also acknowledge that a mobility hub will be located in the vicinity of Colfax and Picadilly intersection, and that internal site circulation will support walking or biking to the mobility hub.

RE: This language is indicated on the PIP plan as notes 6 and 7. Similar language are included in the PIP Narrative. If additional language is needed please let us know.

12. CDOT

(Reviewed by: Rick Solomon)

PIP and Revised TIS:

Region 1 Permit Unit

Traffic & Safety

2829 W Howard Place

Denver, CO 80204

MEMORANDUM

TO: Steve Rodriguez, Project Manager

FROM: Rick Solomon, Region 1 Permits

DATE: May 21, 2019

RE: Referral Remarks – Stafford Logistics Center

Public Improvement Plan & revised TIS

12A. These remarks from CDOT Region 1 are to the solicitation sent from the City of Aurora earlier this month regarding the phased development of property and associated public improvements.

RE: Acknowledged

12A-1. Drainage Samer 04-09-19 - I have reviewed the attached drainage report, I concluded that there will be no negative drainage impact to Colfax as a result of the proposed 347 acres development. The surface flows will be detained and routed to the proposed regional detention west of the site next to the sports center.

RE: Acknowledged

12A-2. ROW C Young 03-29-19 - CDOT owns an access control line near the area where relocated Picadilly rd meets Colfax as indicated on the Alta Survey. Please ensure the new access does not cross this line. If it is determined by CDOT that the ideal location for the intersection is crossing the a-line, then a revision of access control will be necessary, and a legal description created for that portion of access control to be disposed of.

RE: Acknowledged

12A-3. Traffic Susi Marlina 5/16/2019

Please see my detail comments in the TIS and revise it accordingly. Thanks.

RE: Comments from CDOT and City of Aurora throughout the TIS have been addressed in the resubmittal.

12A-4. Permit Unit R Solomon 05-14-19

Public Improvement Plan / TIS

Correct the typo on Tab 13 regarding the proposed access in the NW corner of the property. The intent is that the access be shared with the property to the west.

The TIS identifies the need for an eastbound auxiliary right turn lane approaching the same proposed access at the NW corner of the property. It should be graphically shown for consistency. Similarly, on page 3 of the text narrative, 3rd bullet, should call out the necessity for auxiliary deceleration and acceleration lanes. (similar to the bullet items immediately above & below it)

RE: Completed

12A-5. The proposed signal at Lisbon Street & Colfax is not consistent with the Access code. Delete that notation (of signalization) from tab 13 and on sheets 1-8 of 12. We believe a ¾ turn movement might work, but with no left turn outbound. Via the 1601 Picadilly interchange process proceeding independently from this review, CDOT has supported the City's efforts to realign Picadilly including advanced analytics of traffic modeling supporting a new 4-way traffic signalized intersection. The realigned location of Picadilly as it is currently shown on this plan, will become the keystone for measuring the ½ mile signal spacing westerly, as prescribed for an NR-A classified highway posted at 55 mph. It is for this reason, the proposed signal at Lisbon is inappropriately spaced.

RE: Signalization is warranted and FHU has received direction from Kirk Allen at CDOT and City of Aurora staff to include signalization at Lisbon and Colfax.

12A-6. CDOT notes that the cross section provided for Colfax shows no multi-use pathway along the south side of the highway. Omitting this public improvement would be contrary to the staff's Transportation comments #15 dated April 1, that the area near Colfax & Picadilly will have transit stops with locations to be determined by RTD. Such pathway for multi-modal proposes & connection to a mobility hub, is appropriate inside the RoW and should be considered by Aurora staff as warranted for eastbound direction of travel. We question if a cross section labeled as RoW "varies" is sufficient to ensure appropriate RoW is dedicated at time of platting. CDOT originally recommended the City's 144-ft Arterial Cross section to accommodate all of the anticipated lanes of travel, paths for pedestrian and bicycles, landscaping, medians, utilities and storm drainage. On-street bike lanes must be dissuaded on a 55-mph highway.

RE: Acknowledged

12A-7. We have noted that PA-12 is identified as a 2.5-acre parcel which seems to match the City Staff's instructions to ID a permanent Fire Station site. We question if this is the ideal location for such a facility given the short-term future of existing Picadilly and the Frontage Road that it connects to. It would be smarter to consider access from the east-west roadway planned through Stafford & Horizon property. We do support keeping this facility off the major arteries of Picadilly & Colfax as emergency responses will interrupt traffic progression.

RE: Acknowledged

12A-8: On pages 5-8 of the PIP text, all auxiliary lanes at the proposed connections to Colfax are by permit. This area is not currently included within the CDOT-COA Contract Maintenance Agreement wherefore any work in CDOT RoW is by permit. Similarly, none of the proposed signals would be under SB 80 and separate permits for signal installation will also be required from CDOT.

RE: Access permits have been included with the conformance letter for Building 1 for both the western right-in/right-out access and the access from Lisbon onto Colfax.

12A-9. On page 8 of the text, PA 10 needs to include the short & long term plans for existing Picadilly & the Frontage Road adjacent to this property. Figure 16 of the TIS identifies for short term peak hour traffic volumes at the existing Picadilly/Frontage Road intersection (#5) warrant:

- A right-turn auxiliary deceleration lane for east to southbound movement.
- An acceleration lane for north to westbound movement.

Access permit from the City should be prepared to make this short-term improvement with assurance that sufficient ROW exists here.

The TIS Figure 16 also identifies significant peak-hour traffic at the existing Frontage Road-Colfax intersection (#4). The Short-term volumes shown warrant auxiliary lanes for:

- East to southbound (currently exist);
- West to southbound; and
- North to westbound movement

These warrants should be identified in the public improvement plan. CDOT would encourage and support

roadway improvement designs which may be adaptable into the eventual relocated Picadilly intersection. We also note that intersection #4 for the short term improvements identified in the TIS are not in the same location as #4 is identified in the TIS for Long Term future volumes. We understand the location of the relocated Picadilly is approximately 150-200 feet west of the current intersection.

***General Remarks-summary:**

The TIS & plan materials project an opening date scenario near the year 2024. We believe the assumptions relative to traffic distribution are incorrect. By anticipating more direct traffic to/from Picadilly from the north side of Colfax, we believe a 4-way intersection at Picadilly-relocated should be effectuated sooner than later. Additionally, how increasing traffic from Horizon to the east makes its way to Colfax needs to be addressed. The repositioned Picadilly-Colfax intersection accelerates the need to revamp the existing Colfax Frontage Road and the existing Picadilly alignment (on the section line) at the NE corner of this property. The background traffic alone warrants short term public roadway improvements on these roadways & their intersections. We recognize the NEATS study but also that it did not examine traffic patterns west of Picadilly. The opening of Picadilly as a north-south arterial, will change the dynamics of the local roadway network and the phasing scheme for this project should be re-examined, including the functional need for relocating Colfax, to serve both this property and the Horizon development to the east.

We discourage any notion of a “temporary” signal at Lisbon until the Picadilly intersection is built. Given that Lisbon is not spaced at the ½ mile interval from the realigned Picadilly, we may consider a ¾ turn movement under a permit application. (no left turns out)

RE: Existing operational issues at the intersection of the I-70 Frontage Road and Colfax should not be the responsibility of Stafford Industrial Park. Operational issues will be addressed with the signalization of the Picadilly and Colfax intersection at the time of the Picadilly realignment in conjunction with the construction of the third building in the Stafford Industrial Park.

12A-10. TIS – See redlined pdf.

Please coordinate with City staff and CDOT to ensure that the resubmittal (PIP and TIS) addresses all com

RE: Comments from CDOT and City of Aurora throughout the TIS have been addressed in the resubmittal.

13. Tri-County Health Department

13. See the attached letter dated May 16, 2019 for the project.

RE: Acknowledged