



September 8, 2020

City of Aurora  
Deborah Bickmire  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300  
Aurora, CO 80012

**RE: DA-1171-76 Gateway Park IV East TIC 2  
Preliminary Plat**

Dear Ms. Bickmire

Thank you for the comments dated July 22, 2020 for the above-mentioned project. In an effort to address your comments concisely and to simplify your review of the plans, we have below summarized your comments and our responses thereto.

## **COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER**

### **CITY PLANNER II**

**DEBORAH BICKMIRE / 303-739-7250 / DBICKMIRE@AURORAGOV.ORG**

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

1. **Submit a Tree Mitigation Plan (Forestry)**
  - *Response: Please refer to arborist letter (reattached for convenience); no trees on-site require mitigation. Please provide rational for why tree mitigation plan is required if no trees require mitigation. All on-site trees are either a prohibited species or impede flows in a drainageway, both of which do not require mitigation within City of Aurora.*
  
2. **Provide looped water (Water)**
  - *Response: A looped water line will be provided at the time of construction of the proposed roadways. We have added a place holder location for said water line loop to the plans showing a tentative location of the water line loop. The final location of the water line loop will be determined in conjunction with roadway construction drawings and on-site development.*
  
3. **Show existing and proposed hydrants (Life/Safety)**
  - *Response: Existing and proposed hydrants have been shown. Final locations to be determined prior to roadway construction.*
  
4. **Minimum Slopes and Maintenance Access (Public Works)**
  - *Response: These have been provided and clarified on the plan set.*

5. Initiate the dedication of easements (Real Property)
  - *Response: Easements will be dedicated at the time of pond development and roadway development which may occur (separately). This strategy was discussed and agreed via email with Darren Akrie on July 28, 2020. The email is attached for reference.*
6. Revise the plan title and eliminate overwrites (Planning)
  - *Response: Has been addressed.*
7. Remit outstanding application fees (Planning)
  - *Response: Acknowledged. Payment has been made and copy of receipt is attached hereto.*

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

### Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1. 1A. Referrals were sent to 12 adjacent property owners, 3 neighborhood associations and 10 outside agencies. Written comments were received from DEN Real Estate, CDOT, Mile High Flood District, Adams County, Xcel Energy and CenturyLink and are included or attached to this letter. Please respond to their comments within the response letter for your next submission.
  - *Response: Acknowledged. We have responded to all referral entity comments and said responses are included herein.*

### Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1. 2A. An invoice for the application fees was sent on June 29, 2020 for \$26,609.96. Please remit the payment prior to the next submittal.
  - *Response: Acknowledged. Payment has been made and a copy of receipt is attached hereto.*
2. 2B. Change the title of the plan set to "Preliminary Plat" and change in the title block on all sheets.
  - *Response: The title of the plan set has been renamed to "Preliminary Plat" in the title block and on all sheets.*
3. 2C. Add a site data block on the cover sheet and remove the "Waivers" block unless there is one being requested with this application.
  - *Response: "Waivers" block has been renamed to "Adjustments" per comments and a site data block has been added to the cover.*
4. 2D. Labels need to be moved so underlying linework is not obscured.
  - *Response: Labels have been moved so the underlying linework is not obscured.*
5. 2E. Label existing conditions and streets.
  - *Response: Has been addressed and shown on the plan set.*
6. 2F. Move the Gateway Park notes and details (Sheet 2) to the end of the plan set.
  - *Response: This has been kept as Sheet 2, as this page also includes the Basis of Bearing.*

7. 2G. Revise the Letter of Introduction to reference the Preliminary Plat and eliminate references to the final subdivision plat.
  - *Response: Letter has been revised to reference Preliminary Plat.*

## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

### TOM WORKER-BRADDOCK / 303-739-7340 / [TWORKER@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:TWORKER@AURORAGOV.ORG)

1. 3A. Lack of vegetation strip separating the sidewalk from traffic does not conform to a city collector standard.
  - *Response: A vegetation strip separating the sidewalk has been provided along the extent of roadways that are intended for the length of the roadway to be constructed in this phase i.e. the roadways will not be constructed under the RTD A-line at this time. In the section of 37<sup>th</sup> that tapers down to fit beneath the existing DEN/RTD undercrossing on 37<sup>th</sup> Ave (future phase), required landscape will be provided by either a sloped embankment or terraced wall within this area. at the time of construction of this phase. A note to that effect has been added to the plan set.*

## LANDSCAPING ISSUES – **Call to discuss this section please**

### CHAD GIRON / 303-739-7185 / [CGIRON@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:CGIRON@AURORAGOV.ORG) / COMMENTS IN BRIGHT TEAL)

1. 4A. Address the following on Sheet 12 – Landscape Notes & Calculations
  - A. Ornamental tree size shall be 2" caliper minimum –
    - a. *Response: Has been updated to 2.5" min caliper, per Gateway Park Standards.*
  - B. Confirm the pond area above the 100-year water surface elevation and modify the table if necessary
    - a. *Response: 100-year water surface elevation has been added.*
  - C. Change the street frontage table to "Curbside Landscape Requirements."
    - a. *Response: Has been addressed*
  - D. Revise table columns.
    - a. *Response: Has been addressed*
  - E. Review the length of Salida Street
    - a. *Response: Has been addressed*
  - F. Add a note stating that the street frontage landscape buffers shall be provided with the future lot development and subsequent site plan submittals.
    - a. *Response: Has been addressed.*
  - G. Add a statement to describe surface materials and free-standing lights.
    - *Response: Acknowledged. Please see landscape notes 6, 7, & 8 for groundcover types and site lighting.*
2. 4B. Address the following on Sheet 13 – Landscape Plan
  - A. Label contours.
  - B. Show all sheet locations in Key Map with an outline for reference.
  - C. Remove tree label if not needed.

- *Response: All items above have been addressed*
- 3. 4C. Ensure all hatch patterns are in the Legend.
  - *Response: All hatch patterns are now shown in the legend.*
- 4. 4D. Add and label the 100-year water surface elevation and easements.
  - *Response: 100-year water surface elevation has been added - please see sheets 16-18.*

## ADDRESSING

**PHIL TURNER / 303-739-7357 / [PCTURNER@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:PCTURNER@AURORAGOV.ORG)**

1. 5A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.
  - *Response: Parcels will be created at the time of platting. Easements for roadways will be provided upon completion of roadway construction drawings and prior to construction. Easements for the pond will be dedicated at the time of the pond reconstruction. The requested information will be provided concurrently with the above referenced work.*

## REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

### CIVIL ENGINEERING

**KRISTIN TANABE / 303-739-7306 / [KTANABE@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:KTANABE@AURORAGOV.ORG) / COMMENTS IN GREEN**

1. 6A. The Preliminary Plat will not be approved until the Drainage Report is approved.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
2. 6B. Add the note provided on the redlines to the site plan notes.
  - *Response: The note provided has been added to the site plan notes.*
3. 6C. Please remove standard details and instead refer to the detail number in the plans.
  - *Response: City standard details will be referenced and not shown.*
4. 6D. Without a final plat, please provide roadway center line data.
  - *Response: Roadway centerlines are on the plans and all bearings and distances for said centerlines have been labeled for both 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Avenues.*
5. 6E. Identify the right-of-way information for all streets.
  - *Response: 35<sup>th</sup> Ave and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave are private streets to be owned and maintained by Sand Creek Metropolitan District. Both will be built to City of Aurora collector street standards and will lie within standard SCMD access easements. No right of way will be dedicated but easements for emergency vehicle access and City of Aurora utilities will be recorded prior to*

roadway and utility construction. Roadways sections and all of the above are noted on the plan set.

6. 6F. Add directional ramps at 37th Avenue and Salida Street.
  - *Response: Curb ramps have been redesigned and shown on the plan set accordingly.*
7. 6G. Include a section for Telluride Street.
  - *Response: No improvements to Telluride are proposed as part of these works. We have not included section to avoid confusion on what works are being undertaken as part of this package.*
8. 6H. There is a 2% minimum slope for swales or an underdrain is required. The pond bottom also requires a minimum 2% slope.
  - *Response: An underdrain is now proposed for the swale and shown on sheet 8 of the plan set.*
9. 6I. Provide maintenance access to the top of the outlet structure.
  - *Response: This now exists, was previously shown on the plan set, and the set has been revised to clarify its location.*
10. 6J. Expand the view of the detention pond on Sheet 10 as noted on the redlines.
  - *Response: The viewport has been expanded on sheet 10 as noted in the redlines.*

## TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

**BRIANNA MEDEMA / 303-739-7336 / [BMEDEMA@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:BMEDEMA@AURORAGOV.ORG) / COMMENTS IN AMBER**

1. 7A. Comments are forthcoming.
  - *Response: Comments have been received and responses thereto are included within this letter.*

## FIRE / LIFE SAFETY

**JEFF GOORMAN / 303-739-7464 / [JGOORMAN@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:JGOORMAN@AURORAGOV.ORG) / COMMENTS IN BLUE**

1. 8A. The 40' fire lane and utility easement is confusing. A portion of the roadway appears to be constructed to a public street standard. This portion of the roadway would not require a fire lane easement. The whole road will be either built to a public street standard or it will be a private street built to a public street standard. The second portion of 37th Ave necks down into a two-way street and appears to be a fire lane easement or rural roadway. Please work with public works to determine what street standard is being used. Once the street standard has been determined please provide that detail. If a fire lane is required all fire lanes shall comply with requirements of the 2015 IFC including to but not limited to fire lane signs and turn arounds.
  - *Response: 35<sup>th</sup> Ave and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave are private roadways designed to City of Aurora collector street standards. The roadways will lie within standard Sand Creek Metropolitan District access easements. Within said SCMD easements will lie a 40' curb to curb emergency vehicle and utility easement granted to the City of Aurora. Temporary turn arounds will be provided until the roads are extended west to access the DEN parcel. All easements will be dedicated prior to roadway construction.*

2. 8B. Show existing and proposed hydrants within 1,000' of the site. It appears there are existing hydrants per the Gateway Park IV Buildings 24 and 25 Site Plan.
  - *Response: These have been included on the plan set. Reference Sheet 3 for existing hydrants along Salida St.*
3. 8C. Life Safety supports the Water department request for looped water supply.
  - *Response: A looped water line will be provided at the time of construction of the proposed roadways. We have added a place holder to the plans for a tentative location of the water line loop. The final location of the water line loop will be determined in conjunction with roadway construction drawings and on-site development.*
4. 8D. Relocate fire hydrants as shown on the redlines.
  - *Response: Fire hydrants have been relocated.*
5. 8E. Bollard protection around hydrants is only required in areas where there is truck traffic.
  - *Response: No hydrants are proposed near truck courts. Bollards for hydrants have been removed.*
6. 8F. Check matchline references.
  - *Response: Matchline references have been corrected.*

## AURORA WATER

### CASEY BALLARD / 303-739-7490 / [CBALLARD@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:CBALLARD@AURORAGOV.ORG) / COMMENTS IN RED

1. 9A. Looping of water is required with the site plan or any domestic use.
  - *Response: A looped water line will be provided at the time of construction of the proposed roadways. We have added a place holder to the plans for a tentative location of the water line loop. The final location of the water line loop will be determined in conjunction with roadway construction drawings and on-site development.*
2. 9B. A utility easement is needed to cover all public utilities.
  - *Response: Required utility easements will provided prior to construction of the roadways as noted on the plan set. .*
3. 9C. Hydrants not within the public ROW require a utility easement. See Section 5.04
  - *Response: All required hydrant easements will be provided prior to roadway construction as noted on the plan set.*
4. 9D. Access must be provided to bottom of the pond and the top of outlet structure.
  - *Response: Required access has been provided and the plan set have been modified to clarify their location.*

## FORESTRY

### REBECCA LAMPHEAR / 303-739-7177 / [RLAMPHEA@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:RLAMPHEA@AURORAGOV.ORG) / COMMENTS IN PURPLE

1. 10A. Trees around the existing round-about by Telluride Street will require protection measures during construction. Any trees that are deemed in good enough condition that will be removed in the current detention pond area and the proposed 35th Ave. will require tree mitigation. Due to the condition of trees on the site, relocation may not be an option. The use of tree equivalents is not permitted to mitigate for tree loss. Tree mitigation is always above and beyond the Landscape Code requirements. Any tree that is removed from this site will either require replacement within the landscape or be mitigated through payment to the Community Tree Fund.
  - *Response: : Please refer to arborist letter (reattached for convenience at the end of this letter); no trees on-site require mitigation. Please provide rational for why tree mitigation plan is required if no trees require mitigation. All on-site trees are either a prohibited species or impeded flows in a drainageway, both of which do not require mitigation within City of Aurora.*
  
2. 10B. When the plan is submitted, please show and label all existing trees on a separate sheet called Tree Mitigation Plan and indicate which existing trees will be preserved or removed. Please include grading on this sheet as well.

Any trees that are preserved on the site during construction activities shall follow the standard details for Tree Protection per the current Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual. Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual. These notes shall be added to the plan.

Please show a tree mitigation chart on the landscape plan taken from the Landscape Manual, Page 29. If payment will be made into the Tree Planting Fund, add another column to the chart indicating the payment amount that will be made. If trees will be planted on the site, please show a symbol indicating trees that are specific to tree mitigation.

- *Response: Tree protection notes from the Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual have been added to the plan. Trees within the roundabout will be protected. Please refer to arborist letter (reattached for convenience); no trees on-site require mitigation. Please provide rational for why tree mitigation plan is required if no trees require mitigation. Site trees are either a prohibited species or impeded a drainageway, both of which do not require mitigation within City of Aurora.*

## PROS

### MICHELLE TELLER / 303-739-7131 / [MTELLER@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:MTELLER@AURORAGOV.ORG) / COMMENTS IN PURPLE

1. 11A. The IGA covers 38th and 40th and does not cover this project. PROS has no comments.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*

## REAL PROPERTY

### MAURICE BROOKS / 303-739-7294 / [MBROOKS@AURORAGOV.ORG](mailto:MBROOKS@AURORAGOV.ORG) / COMMENTS IN MAGENTA

1. 12A. Contact Andy Niquette at [aniquett@auroragov.org](mailto:aniquett@auroragov.org) to initiate the dedication of easements. The process can take 6-8 weeks to complete.
  - *Response: We will initiate easement dedication as a part of construction plan submittal. We intend to proceed with the detention pond first and separately from the roadways. All easements associated with the roadways will be provided as a part of the roadway construction drawings. Process has been clarified with Darren Akrie on July 28, 2020. Refer to attached email.*
2. 12B. Review the entities identified in the signature blocks and revise as appropriate.
  - *Response: We believe the entities on the plans are appropriate as the property owner LIT Pauls Gateway Land Holdings, LLC is agreeing to the obligations incurred by the preliminary plat and SCMD is agreeing to its obligations set forth in the PP e.g. private SCMD roadways – we will be happy to revise if you do not agree.*
3. 12C. Add notes on cover sheet as provided on the redlines.
  - *Response: Notes on the coversheet have been added per the redlines.*
4. 12D. Revise the lot and block references as noted on the redlines:
  - *Response: Lot and block references have been updated.*
5. 12E. Label the boundary of the lots and add the bearings, distances and curve data along the line.
  - *Response: Bearing and distance labels have been added along property lines as well as the centerline of 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave. However, lot boundaries will not be dedicated until the time of roadway construction and site development and will be done by plat.*
6. 12F. Confirm with Aurora Water that hydrant needs to be in a public easement.
  - *Response: Easements for fire hydrants not in a public easement will be provided prior to roadway construction.*
7. 12G. Add the name of adjacent subdivision(s).
  - *Response: Adjacent subdivisions are now labeled.*
8. 12H. Add the scale ratio.
  - *Response: Scale ratios have been added on all sheet.*

## CDOT REGION 1

1. 13A. See the attached comment letter.
  - *Response: Responses have been addressed below*

## **XCEL ENERGY (DONNA GEORGE / DONNA.L.GEORGE@XCELENERGY.COM)**

1. 14A. See attached comment letter.
  - A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the preliminary plat for Gateway Park IV East TIC 2. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing underground electric distribution facilities along Salida Street for street lighting that must be shown on the plans.

PSCo also has existing underground electric distribution facilities along the westerly property line. 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. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

- *Response: Comments appreciated and noted.*

## **DEN REAL ESTATE, PLANNING, AND ENGINEERING**

### **MATT LOVE / MATTHEW.LOVE@FLYDENVER.COM**

#### **DEN Real Estate:**

1. 15A. DEN Real Estate is happy to see the infrastructure site plan submittal for Gateway Park IV East and looks forward to continuing development at the 40th & Airport station.
  - *Response: Thank you for your kind words.*

#### **DEN Planning:**

1. 15B. What was the percentage of trucks used in the modeling? Was there a different rate applied to background versus site?
  - *Response: The traffic study, as originally submitted, included a 2% factor for truck usage based upon the available proposed DEN site development concept showing primarily commercial uses. To address this comment, and assuming 100% warehouse industrial uses on the DEN property, the revised traffic study now shows a 10% truck use factor for both background and local traffic conditions. In either case, the proposed roadways have more than sufficient capacity.*
2. 15C. If possible, please provide a copy of Synchro models.
  - *Response: We can provide you the models. Please reach out directly to Stephen Litsas ([stephen.litsas@kimley-horn.com](mailto:stephen.litsas@kimley-horn.com))*
3. 15D. DEN appreciates that the study includes two long term background scenarios, with one including the full development of DEN property.
  - *Response: Thanks*

4. 15E. Roads that tie-in to the DEN property should not preclude heavy vehicles and trucks.
  - *Response: Understood. Both 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Avenues were appropriately designed to handle heavy vehicle traffic loads and volumes. See response in 15B above. .*

## **DEN Engineering:**

1. 15F. The latest version of the MHFD-Detention spreadsheet should be used, which includes updated point precipitation values for DIA (if those are the intended point precipitation values used for design). The change in point precipitation values may change the total detention volume.
  - *Response: The MHFD-Detention spreadsheet was used. Note that City of Aurora requires different precipitation values from those within the spreadsheet. We have amended the report to utilize the values required by City of Aurora per their comments on preliminary drainage report.*
2. 15G. Hydrologic calculations for the basins tributary to Pond C don't appear to be included in the drainage report.
  - *Response: The calculations that were previously approved under Sand Creek Pond "C" – Final Drainage Report – Amendment 1 and have not changed as a result of these works were not rerun. Calculations specific to TIC2 have been provided within the report. The calculations for these approved areas have been included with Appendix 2 of the report for reference.*
3. 15H. The drainage report narrative indicates that the hydrologic soil group on site is Type B, however, the MHFD-Detention calculations assume 100% Type A soils. This may produce an inaccurate calculation of the total detention volume.
  - *Response: This has been amended to assume 100% Type B soils.*

## **ADAMS COUNTY**

**LAYLA BAJELAN / [LBAJELAN@ADCOGOV.ORG](mailto:LBAJELAN@ADCOGOV.ORG)**

1. 16A. Adams County has no comment on this proposal, as the subject parcel is completely surrounded by the City of Aurora.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*

## **MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT**

**SUBMITTALS@UDFCD.ORG**

1. 17A. We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal and have no comment, as this project does not include any major drainage features. We do not need to receive any future submittals on this project.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*

## **CENTURYLINK**

**LES GUTIERREZ / [LES.GUTIERREZ@CENTURYLINK.COM](mailto:LES.GUTIERREZ@CENTURYLINK.COM)**

1. 18A. Our Engineer has no concerns at this time.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

## TRAFFIC & SAFETY

### JASON IGO

#### Drainage Comments

1. CDOT Hydraulics requires a Drainage Report for this development. We will also need Existing and Proposed Drainage Basin Maps showing flow patterns, flow rates, flow arrows and contour labels.  
*Response: Drainage Report was provided as part of this submission. Outfall rates have decreased 140 cfs to 109 cfs. No alterations of any kind are proposed or required within the or to the existing outfall piping, emergency overflows or to the cattle crossing structure.*

#### Traffic Comments

1. A line in the report was confusing. Are you referring to the Access control line or the train line? For the future development of the parcel to the west. That connection of 37<sup>th</sup> Ave to Airport will need to be vetted thoroughly since you are changing an interchange configuration. The on ramp and off-ramp right next to each other is not preferred due to the probability of wrong way driving. This doesn't impact this report but wanted to mention it.
  - *Response: A-line refers to the RTD Train Line (A-Line) not to the CDOT access control line.*

## RESIDENT ENGINEER COMMENTS

1. Adding the connection of 37<sup>th</sup> to Airport Blvd will trigger the 1601 process since you are modifying an existing interchange
  - *Response: The current project does not include any modification of or connection to the Airport Boulevard interchange. All work ceases east of the RTD train line. If and when the DEN property develops and if and when DEN choses to extend 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue and connect same to Airport Boulevard, the 1601 process will be undertaken, but it is not a part of the current project.*
2. Site plan should show more detail on the proposed connection at 37<sup>th</sup> and Airport. Also please label Airport on plan sheets/key maps.
  - *Response: These works are NOT a part of this project. No work will occur west of the RTD train line as a part of this project. . The proposed connection was included in these discussions and studies in order to fully verify that the collector roadway sections for proposed 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Avenues were adequate to accommodate projected traffic volumes in the event that a future connection to Airport Boulevard may occur.*
3. Is the project planning to do an at-grade or grade separated crossing for 37<sup>th</sup> at the light rail? Please show the proposed crossing and location on the plans. Project should also coordinate with RTD.
  - *Response: A grade separated crossing was negotiated as a part of the RTD A-Line design process. An undercrossing fully funded by Denver Aviation, has been built at the proposed 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing location in full coordination with RTD. The current project does not extend west of the west property line and the undercrossing will only be utilized if and when the Denver*

*Property to the west is developed. The proposed grade separated crossing location is shown on the plans.*

4. Curb ramps at Salida and 37<sup>th</sup> recommend rotating these toward 37<sup>th</sup> so they are aligned directionally toward each other. This will make it easier for visually impaired peds to navigate safely.
  - *Response: Curb ramps on 37<sup>th</sup> Ave have been redesigned per City of Aurora criteria as directional ramps*

**PERMITS COMMENTS**

**RS**

1. It is recognized that this proposal entails changes to the major regional storm pond that has existed on this property for some time. That pond in part, captures outfall emanating from development on the south side of the Interstate. It is unclear at this time to what extent additional pipe work may be needed crossing the interstate. Any work inside of the interstate RoW will require both CDOT and FHWA approval by permit. I suspect Access control lines exist along both north and south side of the interstate. I would anticipate similar access controls (A-lines) to exist along Pena Blvd.

There was no survey of Alta quality provided, nor was a plat. Unable to see-ascertain the location & extent of CDOT RoW and property holdings. The westerly extension of 35th Ave appears to aim at crossing under the RTD 'A-line' bridge. The letter of introduction (page 1) identifies that 35th Avenue "will be extended 200' to the west of the A-line"to access the Denver owned parcel. It is not clear if that is reference to the right of way of the "A-line commuter rail" corridor or if it is in reference to an Access Control line. We believe that due to the system-to-system interchange of I-70 & Pena Blvd, there are A-lines (Access Control Lines) in-place. I believe the parcel to be accessed west of the rail line tracks, in the City/County of Denver, may have development limitations placed upon it and the access via 35th is intended for maintenance purposes only? Please amend both this letter and Infrastructure plan accordingly to clarify the confusion this language creates.

Any signs on this property directed to the interstate must adhere to the State Rules for Outdoor Advertising.

- *Response: the current pond does NOT receive flows from the south side of the interstate but discharges north to south from a an existing fully approve outlet structure, emergency overflow and under interstate 70 through an existing undercrossing known as the "Cattle Pass". No access within any control lines will be needed as all discharge facilities are completed and the discharge rate from the modified and completed pond have been reduced from 140 cfs to 109 cfs.*

*Access to the Denver owned property which lies within the City of Aurora via 35th was coordinated with CDOT, RTD, Denver Transit Partners, City of Aurora, and DIA as a part of the RTD A line construction process. Pier 29 of the RTD A Line was intentionally placed 105' north of the I-70 right of way (Access Control Line) to allow 35th to be fully*

*constructed on private property without affecting any CDOT property. 35th is intended to be a three-lane collector at grade roadway that will provide full access to the south end of the Denver property without in any way affecting I -70. It will not be constructed under the flyover as a part of the currently proposed project and will not extend under the RTD A Line until development occurs on the Denver property. The A-line reference is to the RTD commuter rail line, not to the Access Control Line – we apologize if this jargon was confusing.*

*We understand and will comply with the State Rules for Outdoor Advertising.*

## **SITE PLAN COMMENTS**

### **[1] 1 COVER SHEET**

#### **1. PRELIMINARY PLAT**

- *Response: Relabeled as Preliminary Plat*

#### **2. City of Aurora,**

- *Response: "City of Aurora" has been added to the legal description*

#### **3. All crossings or encroachments into easements and rights-of-way owned by the City of Aurora ("City") identified as being privately-owned and maintained herein are acknowledged by the undersigned as being subject to City's use and occupancy of said easements or rights-of-way. The undersigned, its successors and assigns, further agrees to remove, repair, replace, relocate, modify, or otherwise adjust said crossings or encroachments upon request from the City and at no expense to the City. The City reserves the right to make full use of the easements and rights-of-way as may be necessary or convenient and the City retains all rights to operate, maintain, install, repair, remove or relocate any City facilities located within said easements and rights-of-way at any time and in such a manner as it deems necessary or convenient.**

- *Response: Aurora site plan note #5 changed to match the note provided.*

#### **4. Architectural features (i.e. bay windows, fireplaces, roof overhang, gutters, eaves, foundation, footings, cantilevered walls, etc.) are not allowed to encroach into any easement or fire lane.**

- *Response: Note has been added to cover sheet under "City of Aurora Site Plan Notes"*

#### **5. shouldn't these names be the same name?**

- *Response: Both have been changed to "Sand Creek Metropolitan District"*

#### **6. enter the name of the plat here**

- *Response: Has been updated.*

#### **7. Add the following note: In locations where utility easements overlap drainage easements, only subsurface utilities shall be permitted within the portion of the utility easement that overlaps the**

drainage easement. Installation of above ground utilities within a drainage easement requires prior written approval by City Engineer

- *Response: Note has been added to coversheet under "City of Aurora Site Plan Notes"*

**8. RENAME: PRELIMINARY PLAT**

- *Response: Title block and coversheet has been renamed from Infrastructure Site Plan to "Preliminary Plat."*

**9. make this the last sheet. Gateway park notes are not regulated by the city.**

- *Response: This has been kept as Sheet 2, as this page also includes the Basis of Bearing*

**10. ADJUSTMENTS**

- *Response: Changed "Waivers" to "Adjustments"*

**11. add a site data block**

- *Response: Site block data has been added to coversheet*

**12. remove unless waiver needed. if needed, rename to Adjustments.**

- *Response: Changed "Waivers" to "Adjustments". Will be removed as part of the final submission if none are needed.*

**[2] 2 GENERAL NOTES & CIVIL DETAILS**

**1. Please remove standard details. Refer to the detail number in the plans.**

- *Response: Standard details have been removed.*

**2. It would be better to remove these details and put them in with specific site plans.**

- *Response: Details that span across multiple sheets have been left on this general page, to avoid multiple details within a package.*

**3. Move this sheet to the last.**

- *Response: This has been kept as Sheet 2, as this page also includes the Basis of Bearing*

**[3] 3 OVERALL SITE PLAN**

**1. Trees around the existing round-about by Telluride Street will require protection measures during construction.**

Any trees that are preserved on the site during construction activities shall follow the standard details for Tree Protection per the current Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual. Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual. These notes shall be added to the plan.

- *Response: Tree protection removal notes from the Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual have been added to the sheet.*

Any trees that are deemed in good enough condition that will be removed in the current detention pond area as well as the proposed 35th Ave. will require tree mitigation.

- *Response: Refer to arborist letter (attached). No trees on-site shall require mitigation.*
2. add the Subdivision name.
    - *Response: Subdivision is not proposed at this time. Platting of the property will occur concurrently with site development and prior to roadway construction. The proposed detention pond modifications are planned to occur prior to both platting and roadway construction and the required easements to Sand Creek Metropolitan District and of the City of Aurora will be granted prior to construction of same. See e-mail from Darren Akrie attached hereto.*
  3. Block 1.
    - *Response: Added to label.*
  4. label the boundary of the Lots - add the B&D and curve data along the line.
    - *Response: Bearing and Distance labels have been added along the curve.*
  5. Block 1
    - *Response: Added to label.*
  6. add curve data on the boundary of the Subdivision (typ.).
    - *Response: Bearing and Distance labels have been added along the boundary. Note no internal boundaries will be processed until the development of the roadways.*
  7. add B&D.
    - *Response: Bearing and Distance labels have been added.*
  8. scale ratio?
    - *Response: scale ratio has been added*
  9. Show existing and proposed hydrants within 1000' of this site. It appears these are existing hydrants. See Reference below for Gateway Park IV buildings 24 and 25.
    - *Response: Hydrants are now shown as existing hydrants.*
  10. Add hydrant to this location.
    - *Response: Hydrant has been added to this location.*

11. It appears that 37th and 35th Ave are dead end roads/fire lanes greater than 500'. Therefore, provide a second point of access per the Roadway Specifications Book Section 4.04.1.05 which states: No Cul-de-sac shall be longer than 500 feet unless a secondary emergency access is approved by the fire marshal. The secondary emergency access shall contain a connecting pedestrian path and comply with all life safety requirements. Cul-de-sac length shall be measured from the flow line of the intersecting street to the center of the Cul-de-sac bubble.
  - *Response: These roads will temporarily stop short of crossing under the RTD train line and will not extend under same until the DEN parcel west of the train line develops. At that time, the hammerheads as shown will no longer be needed. The roads will be temporarily be posted as private, dead end roadways.*
  
12. The 40' fire lane and utility easement is confusing. A portion of this roadway appears to be constructed to a public street standard. This portion of the roadway would not require a fire lane easement. The whole road will be either built to a public street standard or it will be a private street built to a public street standard. The second portion of 37th Ave necks down into a two-way street and appears to be a fire lane easement or rural roadway. Please work with public works to determine what street standard is being used. Once the street standard has been determined please provide that detail. If a fire lane is required all fire lanes shall comply with requirements of the 2015 IFC including to but not limited to fire lane signs and turn arounds. TYP. All sheets
  - *Response: See response to Item 8A above. .*
  
13. Looping of water is required with the site plan or any domestic use.
  - *Response: Roadway to be built at time of development. Waterline to be looped at that time.*
  
14. A utility easement is needed to cover all public utilities.
  - *Response: Easements have been added to all public utilities (including proposed fire hydrants).*
  
15. Lack of vegetation strip separating sidewalk from traffic does not conform to a city Collector standard.
  - *Response: A vegetation strip separating the sidewalk has been provided along the extent of roadways, except for where the proposed section tapers down to fit beneath the RTD undercrossing on 37<sup>th</sup> Ave. This is due to the existing width of the undercrossing and to minimize the cut. We intend to provide landscape as part of a sloped embankment or terraced wall within this area, as part of the cut. However, since we are not designing the undercrossing at this time, we have added a note to the plans for future reference.*
  
16. no plat with this. Relabel to Preliminary plat -on all sheets.
  - *Response: Infrastructure Site Plan has been relabeled as "Preliminary Plat" on all sheets*
  
17. add/label adjacent property plat info and zoning, TYP.
  - *Response: Adjacent property info and zoning have been added.*

## [4] 4 DETAILED SITE PLAN

1. please confirm with Aurora Water that this hydrant needs to be in a public easement. X2
  - *Response: Proposed easements have been added around all hydrants but will not be granted until prior to roadway construction.*
  
2. add the name of the Subdivision.
  - *Response: Subdivision is not proposed as part of this project. Any subdivision will occur when roadways are installed.*
  
3. Block 1.
  - *Response: "Block 1" added to label.*
  
4. add the name of the Subdivision.
  - *Response: Subdivision is not proposed as part of this project. Any subdivision will occur when roadways are constructed and on-site development occurs. .*
  
5. Block 1.
  - *Response: "Block 1" added to label.*
  
6. label the boundary of the Lots - add the B&D and curve data along the line.
  - *Response: Bearing and distance labels have been added along the external boundaries. Internal boundaries will not be dedicated until construction of the roadways.*
  
7. scale ratio?
  - *Response: Scale ratio has been added.*
  
8. Bollard protection only required in areas where there is truck traffic. TYP all sheets.
  - *Response: Bollard protection has been removed.*
  
9. If Public Street Cul-de-sac or turnarounds are used provide detail. TYP.
  - *Response: Temporary turnarounds will be provided as a temporary condition, until roadways are extended under the RTA A-Line.*
  
10. Without a final plat, please provide center line data, typical.
  - *Response: Bearing and distance and curve data labels have been added along centerline.*
  
11. add dimensions.
  - *Response: Dimension has been added.*
  
12. hard to read.
  - *Response: Dimensions are now spread out so that they are easier to read.*

13. add ROW width and street classifications, type all streets.
  - *Response: 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave are private SCMD roadways constructed within standard SCMD access easements and therefore no ROW dedication will occur. The width of the SCMD easements are shown on the plans. The SCMD easements will be will be dedicated at time of roadway development.*

**[5] 5 DETAILED SITE PLAN**

1. add the name of the Subdivision
  - *Response: Subdivision is not proposed as part of this project. Any subdivision will occur when roadways are installed.*
  
2. Block 1
  - *Response: "Block 1" added to label.*
  
3. label the boundary of the Lots - add the B&D and curve data along the line
  - *Response: Bearing and distance labels have been added along the external boundaries. Internal boundaries will not be dedicated until construction of the roadways.*
  
4. scale ratio? X2
  - *Response: Scale ratio has been added,*
  
5. Include ROW information
  - *Response: ROW width for Salida Street has been added.*
  
6. Directional ramps are required
  - *Response: Curb ramps have been redesigned as directional.*
  
7. identify what this ties into. what existing condition/width of sidewalk.
  - *Response: Text has been added identifying that the proposed 8' sidewalk ties into the existing 5' sidewalk.*
  
8. is this on this page?
  - *Response: Yes, text has been moved and now points to the shaded section on the keymap that is shown on this page.*
  
9. add ROW width and street classifications, typ all streets.
  - *Response: ROW width has been added to Salida Street. Proposed 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave are private SCMD streets designed to a COA collector standards. SCMD access easement locations and widths for these roadways are shown on the plans and will be dedicated at the time of roadway development.*

## [6] 6 DETAILED SITE PLAN

1. please confirm with Aurora Water that this hydrant needs to be in a public easement. X2
  - *Response: 10' public utility easement has been added for the hydrant but will not be dedicated until time of roadway construction.*
2. label the boundary of the Lots - add the B&D and curve data along the line
  - *Response: Bearing and distance labels have been added along the external boundaries. Internal boundaries will not be dedicated until construction of the roadways.*
3. scale ratio?
  - *Response: Scale ratio has been added.*
4. please move labels so linework is not covered
  - *Response: Labels have been moved so that linework is not covered.*
5. add ROW width and street classifications, typ all streets
  - *Response: ROW for Interstate 70 has been added. 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave are SCMD streets designed to a COA collector street standards SCMD access easements for these roadways will be dedicated at the time of roadway development and are shown on the plans.*

## [7] 7 DETAILED SITE PLAN

1. please confirm with Aurora Water that this hydrant needs to be in a public easement. X2
  - *Response: see response 6.1 above. .*
2. Block 1.
  - *Response: "Block 1" has been added to label.*
3. label the boundary of the Lot and the Tract - add the B&D and curve data along the line.
  - *Response: Bearing and distance labels have been added along the external boundaries. Internal boundaries will not be dedicated until construction of the roadways.*
4. scale ratio?
  - *Response: Scale ratio has been added.*
5. Include the full section of the private street.
  - *Response: Viewport has been widened to show more of Telluride St.*
6. Where is this ramp proposed to connect to?
  - *Response: Connects across Telluride St. Crosswalk currently exists.*

7. label street & identify public or private.
  - *Response: Telluride Street is labeled and identified as private .*
8. move label so linework is not obscured
  - *Response: Label has been moved so that linework is not obscured.*
9. add ROW width and street classifications, typ all streets.
  - *Response: ROW for Interstate 70 has been added. Proposed 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave are SCMD roadways designed to COA collector street standards. SCMD access easements for these roadways will be dedicated at the time of roadway development.*

## **[8] 8 GRADING & UTILITY SCHEMATIC**

1. please confirm with Aurora Water that this hydrant needs to be in a public easement. X2
  - *Response: 10' public utility easements have been added around both hydrants but will not be dedicated until roadway construction.*
2. scale ratio?
  - *Response: Scale ratio has been added.*
3. Life Safety supports Water department request for looped water supply.
  - *Response: Roadway to be built at the time of site development. Water line will be looped at that time. A place holder location has been added to the plan set.*
4. 2% min slope for swale or provide underdrain.
  - *Response: An underdrain will be provided. A callout has been added to the swale.*
5. Hydrants not within the public ROW require a utility easement. See Section 5.04.
  - *Response: 10' public utility easement has been added around the hydrant but will not be dedicated until roadway construction.*
6. move label and use leader to show easement location.
  - *Response: Label has been moved to show easement.*
7. existing or proposed? add reception # or submit easement info to record.
  - *Response: Easement is proposed and will be recorded prior to construction.*
8. move label.
  - *Response: Label has been moved.*

## [9] 9 GRADING & UTILITY SCHEMATIC

1. scale ratio?
  - *Response: Scale ratio has been added.*
  
2. Match line for the grading and utility schematics appears to be sheet 8 not sheet 4.
  - *Response: Matchline reference corrected and now reads "MATCHLINE SEE SHEET 8."*
  
3. Show existing and proposed hydrants within 1000' from the site. TYP All Sheets.
  - *Response: All existing and proposed hydrants are shown.*
  
4. Appears to be an existing proposed hydrant.
  - *Response: Existing proposed hydrant confirmed and added to plans.*
  
5. label street add ROW width and classification.
  - *Response: ROW width has been added to Salida Street. Proposed 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave are SCMD streets designed to COA collector standards. SCMD access easements for these roadways will be dedicated at the time of roadway development.*
  
6. label adjacent plat/lot information TYP.
  - *Response: Adjacent lots are now labeled.*
  
7. add ROW width and street classifications, typ all streets.

*Response: ROW width has been added to Salida Street. Proposed 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Ave are SCMD streets designed to COA collector standards. SCMD access easements for these roadways will be dedicated at the time of roadway development*

## [10] 10 GRADING & UTILITY SCHEMATIC

1. please confirm with Aurora Water that this hydrant needs to be in a public easement.
  - *Response: 10' public utility easements have been added to proposed hydrants but will not be dedicated until roadway construction.*
  
2. scale ratio?
  - *Response: Scale ratio added.*
  
3. Life Safety supports Water department request for looped water supply.
  - *Response: Roadway to be built at the time of site development. Water line will be looped at that time. A place holder loop location and note have been added to the plan set.*
  
4. Maintenance access is required to the top of the outlet structure.

- *Response: Access now exists to the existing outlet structures, will remain and is shown on the plans.*
- 5. 2% min slope for pond bottom.
  - *Response: Acknowledged. This has now been provided.*
- 6. Please include this area in this view.
  - *Response: Viewport has been shifted and now shows the specified area.*
- 7. label.
  - *Response: Easement has been labeled.*
- 8. label.
  - *Response: Easement has been labeled.*

## **[11] 11 GRADING & UTILITY SCHEMATIC**

1. fill this in prior to approval of the Site Plan
  - *Response: Record number not available at this time.*
2. please confirm with Aurora Water that this hydrant needs to be in a public easement.
  - *Response: 10' public utility easements have been added to fire hydrants but will not be dedicated until roadway construction.*
3. scale ratio?
  - *Response: Scale ratio has been added.*
4. Relocate this fire hydrant to this location.
  - *Response: Fire hydrant relocated to the suggested location.*
5. Relocate this fire hydrant to this location.
  - *Response: Fire hydrant relocated to the suggested location.*
6. Access to be provided to bottom of pond and top of outlet structure.
  - *Response: This has been provided.*
7. label.
  - *Response: Easement is now labeled.*
8. label adjacent plat/lot information TYP.

- *Response: Adjacent property is now labeled.*

## **SHEET [12]**

1. Sheet size must be 24"x36".
  - *Response: Adams County requires 18"x24" for Preliminary Plat submissions.*
2. 2" cal.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
3. Confirm the pond size above the 100-year water surface elevation.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
4. Change to 'Curbside Landscaping Requirements'.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
5. Change to Street Description.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
6. (1 Tree/40LF).
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
7. Add note stating that the street frontage landscape buffers shall be provided with the future lot development and subsequent site plan submittals.
  - *Response: Acknowledged. See landscape note #14.*
8. I have measured this distance to be around 1,090'. Please contact me if needed to discuss in further detail.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
9. Duplicate Note of #5 above.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
10. Please show a tree mitigation chart on the landscape plan taken from the Landscape Manual page 29. If payment will be made into the Tree Planting Fund, add another column to the chart indicating the payment amount that will be made. If trees will be planted on the site, please show a symbol indicating trees that are specific to tree mitigation.
11.
  - *Response: Acknowledged*

12. Please show and label all existing trees on a separate sheet called Tree Mitigation Plan and indicate which existing trees will be preserved or removed. Please include grading on this sheet as well.

- *Response: Please refer to arborist letter (reattached for convenience); no trees on-site require mitigation. Please provide rational for why tree mitigation plan is required if no trees require mitigation. All on-site trees are either a prohibited species or impede flows in a drainageway, both of which do not require mitigation within City of Aurora.*

13. reference UDO code section.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

14. spell out.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

15. Add statement about surface materials, ground covers and free-standing lights.

- *Response: Acknowledged. See landscape notes #6-#8.*

## **SHEET [13]**

1. Show all sheets locations with an outline for reference.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

2. Label contours.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

3. Add all hatch patterns used in the legend.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

4. Missing tree symbol?

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

## **SHEET [16]**

1. 12..

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

2. Add and label the 100-year water surface elevation and easements.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

3. Add all hatch patterns used in the legend.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

## **GATEWAY PARK TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY COMMENTS**

## PAGE 1

1. Comments 8.3.20-
  - 1) See comments throughout.
  - 2) Transit factor needs to be included. Anticipated higher transit factor adjustment for hotel.
  - 3) See comments on annual growth rate as so many of the known developments are also included.-
  - 4) Collector roadways have additional criteria (bike facilities) vs locals. Include figure with roadway classification called out 5) Improvements are anticipated to be required along 40th. Coordination with City and County of Denver is anticipated. All other improvements will be evaluated once previous comments addressed.
  - 6) Review % heavy vehicles in Synchro (higher background is expected & site generated has a higher % user)
    - *Response:*
      - 1) Thank you for the review of the Gateway Park - Parcel TIC 2 traffic study. Please see responses throughout this document.
      - 2) Transit factors were included for the hotel and retail uses in the revised study.
      - 3) The annual traffic growth rate was calculated for the area and reduced to 1.5 percent due to all the surrounding development included as background traffic. With adjacent developments included as background traffic, this equates to annual growth rate of 2.4 percent.
      - 4) Classifications of new roadways adjacent to the site have been included in the recommended lane and configurations figures of the revised study. Adequate off-street bike lane / walks have been provided.
      - 5) It is understood that the City and County of Denver will coordinate improvements along 40th Avenue and that other recommendations will be evaluated in more detail by the City of Aurora based on changes to the transit factors, background growth, and heavy vehicle percentages.
      - 6) Based on this area being developed with industrial uses including industrial uses on the DEN property, heavy vehicle usage has been increased from the original 2% to 10 percent for the morning and afternoon peak hours as identified in ITE Trip Generation Manual for Industrial Park. The Proposed roadways can safely accommodate this increase.

## PAGE 1

1. Verify/review this acronym, Denver International Airport has been using the "DEN" for the past year+.
  - *Response: The reference of DIA has been changed to DEN in the revised study.*

## PAGE 8

1. collector or local? based on volumes later on 37th is collector & 35th ave may be local.
  - *Response: 37th Avenue and 35th Avenue are both proposed as collector roadways while Telluride Street has been constructed as a private SCMD roadway to COA local street standards. These classifications have been included in the revised study.*

2. A note is required to be added to the Site Plan indicating responsibility for constructing this Traffic Signal when warranted.
  - *Response: Transportation Engineering Plans have been updated. If and when the DEN property develops and the traffic study for that project requires signalization of the subject intersection, Sand Creek Metropolitan District and/or Den shall be responsible for undertaking construction of this signal. However, as it is clear in the study that the presently proposed project does not create a signal warrant requirement, and neither DEN nor SCMD should be required to enter into a signal phasing agreement at this time. .*

## PAGE 10

1. Add line for Traffic Signal at 37th Ave & Salida St.
  - *Response: Traffic signal at 37th Avenue and Salida Street has been included in the improvements table and is shown to only be needed upon development of the DEN parcel, not with the proposed preliminary plat.*

## PAGE 14

1. add "local" or "collector" based on ADT.
  - *Response: Roadway classifications have been provided in the revised study.*

## PAGE 23

1. This conservative assumption does not match other studies immediately adjacent to light rail station. Please apply different transit factor for each use.
  - *Response: Transit factors have been included for the hotel and retail uses in the revised study.*
2. With all these known adjacent development, what is the effective growth rate.

Maybe able to adjust annual rate down as the known developments are included (remove known trips from the 2% annual growth).

- *Response: The annual traffic growth rate was calculated for the area and reduced to 1.5 percent due to all of the surrounding development included as background traffic. With adjacent developments included as background traffic, this equates to annual growth rate of 2.4 percent.*

## PAGE 26

1. Please justify this - does not appear to match previous pre-apps for this development.
  - *Response: The project proposed at the original pre-app has been cancelled by the end-user. The current zoning for the property is MU2 which allows primarily warehouse distribution uses. Industrial Park is the appropriate land use code.*

## PAGE 35

1. Does this include the DIA/DEN property volumes?
  - *Response: The scenario of not providing a connection to Airport Boulevard does not include the DEN property as background traffic. The references to the DEN development have been included on the appropriate figures and additional clarity has been provided in the text.*

## **PAGE 36**

1. Based on ADT, 37th is a collector.
  - *Response: Roadway classifications are identified in the revised study, both as collectors.*
2. 35th appears to be acceptable as a local.
  - *Response: Roadway classifications are identified in the revised study and 35<sup>th</sup> remains as a collector.*

## **PAGE 43**

1. Clarify if this connection is REQUIRED for the DIA/DEN property to be developed. This connection is not proposed with development east of light rail line.
  - *Response: A connection to Airport Boulevard is not necessarily needed for development of the DEN property as a roadway loop between 35<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> could serve the parcel. It is expected to operate as a LOS D or better during morning and afternoon peak hours in 2040.*

## **PAGE 48**

1. Not appropriate capitalization.
  - *Response: This has been modified.*

## **PAGE 52**

1. Clarify if the DIA/DEN property develops and the connection to Airport Blvd is not allowed, would the Traffic Signal be warranted to build year?
  - *Response: A traffic signal is not expected to be warranted or needed operationally without the DEN development and without a connection to Airport Boulevard. A four-hour vehicular volume warrant has been included for this intersection in the revised study only with both the development of the DEN property and a concurrent connection of 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Airport Boulevard which may or may not occur.*

## **PAGE 53**

1. Include signalization for 2040 under both scenarios.
  - *Response: Signal control was evaluated in the revised study for both scenarios. It should be noted that acceptable operations at the Salida/37<sup>th</sup> intersections using only stop control are expected under scenario 1 ( i.e. no 37<sup>th</sup> to Airport Boulevard) therefore a traffic signal isn't needed under that condition.*

## PAGE 55

1. Left turn pocket discussion for Salida St & 37th (it is provided in Preliminary Plat).
  - *Response: Left turn lanes were recommended and discussed in the original study. Discussion has been added to this section in the revised study.*

## PAGE 56

1. Update this table once background trips & transit mode shift has been completed.
  - *Response: Revised.*

## PAGE 57

1. Add legend at bottom of table for meaning of red & blue text.
  - *Response: Legend for colored text is now included in the revised study.*

## PAGE 61

1. Dedicated right turn lane is needed & provided here.
  - *Response: A northbound right turn lane along Salida Street is not needed at the access for Salida Flex. There is a very low right turn volume projected here. Likewise, an eastbound right turn lane along 37th Avenue isn't anticipated to be needed as the shared through/right turn lane will serve as a defacto right turn lane at the intersection with no to very little through traffic.*

We appreciate your review and approval of these final plans. Please contact me at 720-647-6231 or [Stephen.Litsas@kimley-horn.com](mailto:Stephen.Litsas@kimley-horn.com) should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.



Stephen Litsas, PE, LEED AP  
Project Manager



June 11, 2020

Mike Serra, III  
Sand Creek Metro District  
100 St. Paul Street, Suite 300  
Denver, CO 80206

**RE: Gateway Park TIC 2—Tree Mitigation**

Dear Mr. Serra,

I, Christopher M. Hice, hereby certify that I have reviewed the existing trees for Gateway Park TIC 2 at the southwest corner of Salida Street, and North Telluride Street. Tree mitigation data is based upon; site surveys prepared by Aztec Consultants, Inc. dated April 13, 2020; and field observations performed on June 3, 2020. Tree observation Data that was gathered, includes, species, Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), and tree condition rating (per the guide for plant appraisal, 9<sup>th</sup> edition).

Based on my observations, 67 trees were observed:

- 57 *Populous deltoides* (Plains Cottonwood)
- 10 *Salix amygdaloides* (Peachleaf Willow)

It is my understanding that all trees will be removed based on the proposed improvements to the site and that mitigation may be required by the City. A couple things to note regarding mitigation:

1. Per City of Aurora Landscape Ordinance, Sec. 146-1436. Prohibited Plant Species, Cottonwood, or all *Populous sp.* are prohibited plant species.
2. Per City of Aurora Tree Preservation Policy, Section V. B. Interruption and Maintenance of Drainageways, subsection 2. "The Policy shall not preclude standard maintenance of drainageways necessary to ensure the free flow of storm water."
  - All but one tree on site (a Cottonwood) interferes with the flow of storm water to different levels of severity.

Please review and contact me if you require any additional information.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Christopher M. Hice, PLA, ISA-Certified Arborist (F-5363A)