

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



July 30, 2019

Steven Marshall
Western Transport, LLC
625 East Main Street Suite #1028
Aspen CO 81611

Re: Initial Submission Review - Transport Colorado – Sub-Area Master Plan 1
Application Number: **DA-1793-04**
Case Number: 2005-7008-03

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on Monday, July 1, 2019. We reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Your submission lacked many items that are required as part of a Framework Development Plan. Specific information is provided in this review letter to help offer guidance for the second submittal. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Friday, August 16, 2019.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. I can be reached t, 303.739.7186 or srodrigu@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Stephen Rodriguez, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Jennifer Carpenter – LAI Design Group 88 Inverness Circle East, Building J, Ste. #101 Englewood, CO 80112
Susan Barkman, Neighborhood Services
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1793-04rev1.rtf



Initial Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- See comments from external agencies Xcel Energy, Colorado Department of Transportation and Tri-County Health Department.
- All Waiver requests (if applicable) need to include justification to be properly analyzed by staff.
- Please identify a street network, which includes addressing pedestrian and bicycle circulation, for this development.
- See the comment redlines from Landscaping, Engineering, Traffic, Real Property, Aurora Water, Life Safety and Parks.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

1. Community Comments

1A. No comments were received from surrounding neighborhoods. See the comments attached to this letter from CDOT and Tri-County Health regarding the proposal. No comments were received to date from Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD) or Adams County.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Tab #1 Letter of Introduction

2A. There seems to be contradictory information in your submittal regarding waivers. If you are requesting any waivers, please include all justifications for the waivers. At the time these are received, staff will perform an analysis of each request. Are the proposed changes/additions to the permitted uses table what you are considering as “Waivers?” Please clarify.

Tab # 2 DA Form with Attachments

2B. Please clarify for staff what the mineral lease information provided means. Is there the potential for Oil and Gas development in Sub-Area 1?

Tab # 4, Natural Features Map/Existing Conditions Map

2C. Please clarify if there are any of the following: streams, lakes, pond or wetlands that need to be identified on the Existing Conditions Map; easements, power lines, railroad rights of way; wildlife habitat, existing vegetation, significant views of the Front Range, designated open space areas and public parks.

Tab 8 – FDP Sub-Area 1 Conceptual Plan

2D. This plan although conceptual, does not adequately show road circulation and connectivity within the site. Please see the comment redlines on the plan.

Tab #10 Urban Design Standards

2E. The Primary Signage (monument sign) proposed exceeds what is allowed in city code regarding height. Is this proposed to be a waiver? Please clarify. Please note that all waivers require justification.

2F. Please include with your monument signs illustrations any dimensional standards that are *within code allowances* or reference code requirements. Signage typically includes high-quality materials such as brick or stone for the base and a common design theme across sign types. The proposal should also address wayfinding signage.

2G. Exterior Building Lights are required to be downcast. Please show the aforementioned on your Lighting Standards sheet.

2H. Per Section 146-1104(D) of City code outdoor storage of any type shall be screened with a visual barrier that adequately conceals material from the view of residential areas, public rights-of-way and trail or trail corridors. Outdoor storage shall be behind required front setbacks. Please include this note in Tab 10.

Tab #11 Landscape Standards

2I. Please see redline comments and comments in the landscape section below. The recommended approach for landscaping and other FDP requirements is that city code shall apply unless you are proposing alternative or enhanced approaches which would be identified in the FDP. Please consider revising your landscape standards in this manner as a means to clarify expectations for future developers.



Tab #14 Adjacent Neighbor/Abutting Property Owners

2J. Please verify that your list includes all of the required adjacent property owners. In looking at the map, do the areas in yellow represent abutting property owners? If so, it appears that all of the abutting property owners were not notified. See redlines on Tab 14.

3. Zoning, Land Use Comments and Transportation Issues

3A. Please identify your goals for internal site circulation for large industrial sites. Typically, this will address your goals for employee and visitor traffic relative to truck traffic, and your approach for the primary internal circulation routes. Primary internal routes should be street like with limited access and back out situations and pedestrian sidewalk and landscaping.

3B. Include street names to any and all internal/local and surrounding streets. The internal streets can be conceptual and are required to be shown on the Planning Area and Land Use maps. Also, please verify how you meet the required minimum percentage of public land/space required in all FDP's.

3C. Transportation – The internal street circulation, layout and connections are not acceptable. See redlines in Tab 8.

3D. Are there any marijuana grow facilities planned for the development? If so, there are specific regulations/requirements associated with these types of facilities. Please advise.

Open Space, Recreation, and Land Dedication

3E. In Tab 9, identify a complete pedestrian network and circulation plan throughout the development.

Street Sections –

3F. Continue to work with Porter Ingrum regarding the required avigation easements for the Master Planned development. (Re: Jason Mann email dated 7/19/19)

4. Landscape Comments

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

4A. Kelly K. Bish, PLA, LEED AP/ Kbish@auroragov.org/ (303) 739-7189/PDF comments in teal.

- **Form G Matrix**

Everywhere the Matrix references Article 14, it should also reference Tab 11.

- **Parking Lot/Loading Dock Buffer**

Change the wording to remove “or” from the buffer description.

- **Trail Corridors**

What is the width of the buffer being provided and the required plant quantities?

- **Chapter 146- Article 14**

Please update the landscape section to remove any references to residential standards as it is understood that no residential will be taking place within Transport.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

5. Civil Engineering

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

PIP Sheet 1

5A. Comments from the overall Transport FDP Amendment have not been addressed. Most of the comments contained here are the same as the overall PIP.

5B. Please put the exhibits at the back of the document.

5C. Half of the median will not be constructed. Either construct the entire median or just construct the curb.

5D. The FDP will not be approved by public works until the Master Drainage Study has been approved. There may be additional analysis required with the drainage report submitted with this sub-area.

5E. Add street names to the relevant sections.

5F. If this is to be emergency access only, it will need to be gated. If it will be open for the public to use, 2 lanes (min 24') with curb and gutter will need to be constructed.

5G. There is no 84' three lane collector in S1.3. Please make sure you are using the most recent updates to the Roadway Manual.



5H. Include intersections that were identified in the Traffic Study for future signalization. Include a note that references the City's Traffic Signal Escrow Ordinance.

5I. The current condition of the Manila Road interchange does not support truck traffic. The interchange improvements will likely be required with any development.

Sheet 2

5J. Cores showing adequacy of pavement are required for existing roads such as Imboden to ensure the existing sections meet traffic demands and loading. If they do not meet standards, reconstruction will be required.

5K. Traffic demands by any planning area may trigger improvements to Manila Road, the rail crossing or the interchange. Specific triggers need to be identified to address this, typical for each planning area.

Sheet 3

5L. Channel is described in narrative, but not shown as improved even though the culverts are called out, typical multiple planning areas.

Page 4 Narrative

5M. Cores showing adequacy of pavement are required for existing roads such as Imboden to ensure the existing sections meet traffic demands and loading. If they do not meet standards, reconstruction will be required.

Page 5 Narrative

5N. The interim section is only 23'. If this is to be emergency access only, it will need to be gated. If it will be open for the public to use, 2 lanes (min 24') with curb and gutter will need to be constructed.

5O. Specific triggers need to be identified for these improvements.

Page 7 Narrative

5P. This channel is described in multiple planning areas as conveying offsite flows, but not identified as "proposed" until PA-15.

Page 9 Narrative

5Q. Existing channel?

Page 11 Narrative

5R. This narrative does not discuss the full spectrum pond shown on-site.

Page 20 Narrative

5S. The channel south of 32nd Avenue is never highlighted as being improved nor is it discussed at any point in this narrative.

5T. No channel improvements are indicated on the exhibit.

6. Traffic Engineering

Reviewed by: Carlie Campuzano / ccampuza@auroragov.org / 303-739-7309 Comments in **gold**.

TIS – Previous comments not incorporated. Do not submit another Master Plan Sub Area or update to the FDP without updating.

6A. See the numerous comments on the TIS regarding trip generation, signal warrant analysis, lane configurations, intersection control, access, traffic volumes and phasing.

6B. See additional comments throughout TIS.

Reviewed by: Brianna Medema / bmedema@auroragov.org / 303-739-7336 Comments in **gold**.

PIP

6C. Sheet 2 - For all of these Planning Areas, improvements of roadways not fronting the Planning area may be required, pending update & review of TIS. See NEATS for laneage vs ADT thresholds. See TIS guidelines for LOS thresholds for intersections and improvements to offsite (of PA) intersections may be required for any of these PA's.

6D. Cover Page for Narrative - Additional comments will be supplied once Traffic Comments on TIS had been incorporated. Traffic Volumes, roadway laneage, intersection laneage, potential signalized intersections, overall geometry, and may other items may be modified. Conformance with LOS NEATS (based on ADT) may be discussed (additional lanes may be needed in multiple locations) and COA TIS Guidelines will be required.

7. Real Property

Maurice Brooks/ mbrooks@auroragov.org / 303-739-7294 Comments in **magenta**.

7A. No comment redlines.



8. Aurora Water

Casey Ballard // (303) 739-7382) Comments in red.

Master Utility Report

8A. Please address numerous redline comments.

1. Include the following language in the proposed system section:

The use of groundwater wells requires a separate water agreement and approval from the City Council. Approval of this Master Utility Study does not constitute approval of groundwater well use or well location.

PIP Sheet 1

8B. Replace “as necessary” with “ as required by the City of Aurora.”

8C. Additional conversations have been had regarding water main sizing. Please ensure those discussions and comments are reflected in this utility study and any other utility studies for the Transport Colorado Development.

8D. Storage tank should be on a looped portion of the water mains to ensure fire service.

Sheet 2

8E. Any water mains under roads that are to be constructed should be constructed with those roads.

8F. The City is in discussions with Metro Waste Water regarding the box elder basin. Comments regarding this statement and the sanitary sewer situation for this area may be provided in later reviews. The applicant will be kept aware of any developments regarding this item.

"Aurora Water and Metro Wastewater Reclamation District are working collaboratively on a feasibility study to develop a regional approach for development in the Box Elder Basin. The study will evaluate the anticipated water supply demands within the Basin, anticipated timing of future water supply demands, the resulting wastewater flows, and the engineering infrastructure options to meet demands/flows with the intent of developing a solution such as a reuse facility to keep wastewater flows within the Box Elder Basin."

Sheet 3

8G. Extend water mains along the frontage of any proposed planning area or project. Typical for all phases.

Sheet 9

8H. See previous comments regarding water main extensions.

Page 5 Narrative

8I. Update water main size based on previous comments.

Page 8 Narrative

8J. Adjust water mains required for each planning area based on comments on the plan sheets.

9. Life Safety

Reviewed by: John J. Van Essen / jvanesse@auroragov.org / 303-739-7489 Comments in blue.

9A. Please see Marked-Up (In Blue) FDP Tabs for Specific Comments. Thank You!

Master Utilities Plan:

- Please revise sheet 41 to read: “Fire Department”.

TAB 8: Sheet 2:

- Please update the Land Use Matrix and the Map to reflect the 2.5 acres for the Fire Station; 1.75 acres for the Temporary Fire Station and the 10' x 10' (100 square foot area) for the Whelen Warning System.
- This information will be determined during a meeting you can schedule with Mike Dean by calling 303-739-7447 or emailing mdean@auroragov.org. At this meeting we can determine the locations for all fire department needs.

TAB 8: Sheet 3:

- A new note will be needed in this area to address the manner in which the permanent, temporary fire stations and Whelen siren systems will be provided. The specific wording will be determined in the previously stated separate meeting with Fire/Life Safety. Please call Mike Dean at 303-739-7447 or email mdean@auroragov.org.

**TAB 13: PIP Sheet 1:**

- The use of "interim condition/life safety access" roadways cannot be supplemented without Public Works approval. If allowed, the section shown below must be labeled as a fire lane easement, dedicated and constructed to the Public Works specifications for a fire lane easement. An additional note will be required within a phasing plan to state when the required public roadway will be installed and the dedicated fire lane removed.
- Please label Fire Lane Easement on all appropriate sheets.
- Fire/Life Safety concurs with the note Arora Water put on the Water Tank.

TAB 13: PIP Sheet 2:

- No matter the size of the water line underneath the roadway, fire hydrants will be required on alternating sides of the street being constructed. See 2015 IFC, Appendix B and C.

TAB 13: PIP Sheet 2:

- Fire hydrants will be required along all roadways on alternating sides of the proposed street systems regardless of water main sizing.

TAB 13: PIP Sheet 7 & 8:

- Please add "looped".
- Fire hydrants will be required along all roadways on alternating sides of the proposed street systems regardless of water main sizing. Note: Please correct on all appropriate sheets.

TAB 13: PIP Sheet 13:

- See life safety comments reflected in Exhibit 5.

TAB 13: PIP Sheet 14:

- Add: To be determined at time of CSP submittal.

TAB 13: PIP Sheet 120

- The city of Aurora will not be responsible for the costs associated to the construction of the Temporary Fire Station. A separate meeting with the applicant, ODA staff, Fire Department and Fire/Life Safety is needed to solidify requirements in this area. Please contact Mike Dean at 303-739-7447 to schedule an appointment.

10. Parks and Recreation (PROS)

Reviewed by: Chris Ricciardiello / cricciar@auroragov.org / 303-739-73xx

1. The proposed trail should be located within the Open Space & Drainage planning areas to enhance the trail user experience and to also potentially double as a maintenance road for access to the drainage corridor. It is unclear whether that is the intent as shown in the Open Space, Circulation & Neighborhood Plan and on other land use maps for this submittal. This should be made graphically clear by shifting the dotted line to the right to fall entirely within the respective planning areas.
2. All open space areas shall be shown in the FDP as individual planning areas.
3. Specify the programmatic use of and planned facilities at the proposed land dedication areas. For example, a description for PA-36 and PA-37 should be added that describes the proposed trail, including its width and surface treatment. Also, will any complimentary site furnishings, such as benches, trash cans, etc., be provided along the trail?
4. Provide triggers for construction of the trail (in the open space-drainage corridor) in Form J. Be sure that they are stated in the PIP as well.
5. Stormwater infrastructure is not eligible for land dedication credit. Therefore, the acreages in column D of Form J should not include the area comprising the detention ponds.



11. Xcel Energy / Donna George / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com /303-571-3306

11A. See the attached letter

12. Urban Drainage (UDFCD)

12A. No comments received to date.

13. CDOT

Reviewed by: Marilyn Cross

13A. See attached letter. Drainage comments will be provided by August 5th.

14. Adams County

14A. No comments received to date.

15. Tri-County Health Department

15A. See attached letter.

16. RTD

No comments on the project as RTD has no service in this area.

17. E-470 Public Highway Authority

17A. At this time E-470 Public Highway Authority has no comments. **Please advise if we can be of further assistance. For any question please contact Chuck Weiss at 303.537.3420 or cweiss@E-470.com**

18. Century Link - See attached letter.

Reviewed by: Karen Caime

18A. No objections to the submittal.



Right of Way & Permits

1123 West 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223
Telephone: **303.571.3306**
Facsimile: 303. 571. 3284
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

July 26, 2019

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

Attn: Stephen Rodriguez

Re: Transport Colorado Master Plan Sub Area 1, Case # DA-1793-04

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the documentation for **Transport Colorado Master Plan Sub Area 1**. To ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development, PSCo requests that the following language or plat note be placed on the preliminary and final plats for the subdivision:

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

PSCo owns and operates existing electric distribution facilities in several areas of the proposed project area and requests that they are shown on all plan sets.

As the project progresses, the property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. The Builder's Call Line is 1-800-628-2121. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 to have all utilities located prior to any construction.

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



July 17, 2019

Stephen Rodriguez
City of Aurora Planning and Development Services
15151 E. Alameda Parkway
Aurora, CO 80012

RE: Transport Colorado Master Plan Sub Area 1, DA-1793-04
TCHD Case No. 5720

Dear Mr. Rodriguez,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Master Plan Sub Area 1 for the Transport Colorado development with heavy rail industrial, data center, warehouse, aerospace manufacturing, and mixed commercial uses located at the northwest corner of Colfax and Manila. Tri-County Health Department (TCHD) staff previously reviewed the application for the Framework Development Plan Amendment, and responded in a letter dated June 4, 2019. After reviewing this application, TCHD has the following comments.

Sewer Service

The applicant's engineer, CVL Consultants, have prepared a Master Utility Report (Report), dated April 2019. The report states: "The approach taken by the project will to provide just-in time delivery of infrastructure to support the development. Because there are many unknowns regarding timing and users, the design will need to be revised and reevaluated throughout the development of the site.

Section 2.4 of the Report addresses the Proposed Wastewater System. Section 2.4 states: "Initially, parcels will be served by ISDS." TCHD notes that the current regulatory term for ISDS is now Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS.) Consequently, we recommend that the term ISDS be replaced with OWTS, where applicable.

Table 1-ISDS Loading, in section 2.5.1 of the Report, provides values for OWTS for Planning Areas in Sub-Area 1. The average daily flow for all planning areas ranges from 1889 gallons/day to 21,260 gallons/day. However, Table 2-On Site Flows, indicates substantially higher flow values, with ranges from 107,748 gallons/day to 1,182,779 gallons/day at full buildout.

TCHD does not support the use of OWTS, for the following reasons:

1. OWTS are limited to a maximum design flow of 2000 gallons/day. Systems larger than 2000 gallons/day are classified by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) as "Domestic Wastewater Treatment Works"

(DWWTW). Based on the flow values from Table 1 and 2, we anticipate that the OWTS will not be adequate to accommodate the wastewater flows and DWWTW will be necessary.

2. Our experience is that OWTS constructed as “temporary” facilities typically become permanent, even if public sewer subsequently becomes available. This is due to the financial and logistical challenges of connecting to central sewer, even if central sewer lines are available in proximity to the facility.
3. The provision of central sewer service with centralized collection systems and DWWTW to Transport Colorado will be more protective of the groundwater within the Denver Basin Aquifers than OWTS. Under a central system, wastewater is collected and delivered to a DWWTW that has a discharge permit and regular monitoring to demonstrate compliance with the permit. The discharge permit limits are determined based on the assimilative capacity of the receiving water(s). In addition, there is a higher level of assurance that the DWWTW is being properly maintained and operated by certified operators and a management entity.

Water Service-Initial

Drinking water contaminated with pathogens can cause a variety of illnesses in humans. It is important to protect source water from contamination, and to treat drinking water to eliminate pathogens before it is provided for human consumption.

Section 3.6, System Analysis states: “Initial users on site will be served by groundwater wells and a tank. As mentioned above, it is anticipated that the first 100-300 acres will be served by wells, a tank and pumps installed at the high point of the site.”

If the water system is classified by CDPHE as a Public Water System, it will be regulated and all applicable regulations will apply. The definition of a public water system is: “a system for the provision to the public of water for human consumption through pipes or other constructed conveyances, if such system has at least fifteen service connections or regularly serves an average of at least 25 individuals daily at least 60 days per year.” (CDPHE Water Quality Control Commission Regulation No. 11). The applicant shall contact the CDPHE Drinking Water Section at (303) 692-3500 or <https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cdphe/drinking-water> to determine requirements for the drinking water system.

If the water system for the facility is not a regulated system, and water service will be by a private well, we recommend that precautions be taken to protect users.

Individual well owners have primary responsibility for the safety of the water drawn from their own wells. Well owners with questions about wells or well water can call the Wellcare® Hotline operated by the Water Systems Council, a national organization focused on well systems not regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act., at 888-395-1033 or online at www.wellcarehotline.org.

The well owner may want to consider having the well water analyzed for a number of contaminants as a baseline of the water quality. A baseline water quality analysis is valuable for future reference in the case of possible contamination. Certain parameters such as coliform bacteria and nitrate, pH and Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) are recommended to be analyzed annually as these can indicate possible breaches in the well. The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), Laboratory Services Division can assist you with water analyses. The CDPHE offers individual water tests as well as testing packages to choose from depending on your needs. The CDPHE laboratory web site is located at: <https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cdphe/water-testing>.

TCHD recommends that the applicant provide additional information about whether the initial system(s) will consist of private unregulated wells or CDPHE regulated systems. This information will better inform the applicant about the compliance costs associated with regulated systems and the potential risks posed by unregulated systems.

In Section 3.6, Table 3 Water Demands, indicates large water demands. TCHD understands that these values may apply to “full buildout”; however, we are concerned about the adequacy of the Denver Basin Aquifers to support the water demands. Consequently, TCHD recommends that the applicant provide an analysis by a groundwater hydrologist of the capacity of the aquifers to demonstrate adequate capacity.

Water Service-Long Term

The Report does not discuss the provision of water for longer term. If the City of Aurora will provide the water, we recommend that this be clearly mentioned in the Report, and that the City of Aurora provide a “will serve” letter indicating that they will provide water to the development.

Environmental Site Assessments and Remediation

The application materials included a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared by CTL Thompson, and dated January 24, 2019. The assessment revealed evidence of the following:

- Oil/Gas Wells
- Petroleum-contaminated soils
- Solid Waste Disposal Areas
- Waste Tires
- Historical gasoline tanks
- Railroad lines
- Possibility of buried asbestos debris
- Dry or abandoned wells

TCHD recommends that the site be remediated to remove the above described hazards. For more information, the operator may contact the Colorado Department of Health and Environment Voluntary Cleanup Program at (303) 692-3320 or the Hazardous Waste Corrective Action Unit under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) at 303-692-3368.

On-Site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) – Abandonment

Proper wastewater management promotes effective and responsible water use, protects potable water from contaminants, and provides appropriate collection, treatment, and disposal of waste, which protects public health and the environment. There is a possibility that unused On-Site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) exist on the subject property. Any existing OWTS that is not in use shall be abandoned in accordance with Regulation No. O-17, Section 6.8. TCHD must be notified in writing once the system has been properly abandoned. For more information, or to submit the notification, the applicant may contact the TCHD Aurora Office, 15400 E. 14th Place, (303) 341-9370. More information is available at <http://www.tchd.org/269/Septic-Systems>.

Well Abandonment

Any well that is no longer being used, must be properly plugged and a Well Abandonment Report (GWS-09) must be filed with the Colorado Division of Water Resources. Please visit the DWR web site at <http://water.state.co.us/groundwater/wellpermit/Pages/WellAbandonment.aspx> for more information.

Please feel free to contact me at 720-200-1575 or kboyer@tchd.org if you have any questions on TCHD's comments.

Sincerely,



Kathy Boyer, REHS
Land Use and Built Environment Specialist III

cc: Sheila Lynch, Dylan Garrison, Warren Brown, Michael Weakley, TCHD

STATE OF COLORADO

Traffic & Safety

Region 1

2829 W. Howard Place
Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Project Name: **Transport Colorado**

Print Date:

Highway:

Mile Marker:

Drainage Comments:

Environmental Comments:

For any interchanges, intersections, access and/or work within CDOT ROW the following technical reports will be needed:

- Bio (T&E/Wetlands)
- History
- ISA
- Arch
- Paleo
- SWMP
- Any applicable permits

7/8/2019: Same comments as above.

Traffic Comments:

Overall - The TIA was slightly hard to understand what your final intention for the report was. It seemed like you put three different analysis together but didn't really tie them together. It made sense when we met. The document just needs to be clarified on what the objectives are and the conclusion needs to wrap those up as a package. It might make sense of a combined scenario 1 and 2 also.

DRCOG is the travel demand model that we use. Please add language that would describe what that model is showing and how that information might have impacted your analysis.

We understand that you do not know what the build out is. Yet some assumption stated on build out year would be useful in both the full site and the different scenarios.

There is some strange things when you compare the existing traffic counts with the background future counts. The existing traffic on US-36 is 1600 vehicle daily trips. The Background future daily traffic is less than that. What is going on in that location to lower trips? Manila Rd in the background future north of US-36 is supposedly 3500 daily volumes. Yet existing is only 300 daily volumes. Is that really going to change that much from today if this development doesn't go in?

Figure 7 is the existing land use. It would be good to have proposed map in this document.

Table 1 should have ITE codes and floor to area ratios (FAR). The industrial FAR is 15% and the ware house is 7%. That is really small comparatively to other sites that we have seen. Put your assumptions on why these are so small.

Internal Capture and Pass-by trips percentage seem really high. The Colorado State Access code has direction on what to use.

Figure 8 Site distribution seems really off. It is strange that there is no percentages for US-36 west of site. Yet on figure 9 there is site traffic on US 36 west of Imboden Rd. It would be good to explain a little more that went into coming up with this trip distribution. This graphic should also include all the sites and not just the main site.

Figure 9 Has some questionable traffic volumes on the roads. Peterson Rd and Schumaker Rd both have the same volume but everything seems to be coming from the west. That is also the same for 56th and 64th Ave. The 6100 between Manila and Quail Run seems low unless there is access to Manila and Quail Run that is not shown in this graphic. The volumes to I-70 should be shown since you have a huge amount of trips distributed on I-70.

Section IV.D states an eight lane facility at Quail run. Yet I-70 is only 4 lanes. That does not make since at all. Manilla being a 6 lane facility also doesn't make since as long at I-70 is 4 lanes. All that traffic will not be able to get there.

Section IV.E makes it sound like truckers like roundabouts and that is not true.

Table 3. List Rail Transload facility is used in the land use but not listed in the overall development. That should be consistant.

There is no background traffic volumes for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Provide this information.

Did all of turning movement traffic shown in this report including heavy vehicle? State Highway Access Code stated to count one truck = 3 pce, please revise your traffic volumes thoroughout.

Jason Igo 6/24/19 No change with Revision 2 since there is no TIS attached.

Add project development timelines.

Please provide the Revised TIS per CDOT previous comments.

Susi Marlina 7/22/2019

Resident Engineer Comments:

All improvements to state facilities will need to follow CDOT Standards. CDOT's 1601 process will apply to any interchange modifications or construction of a new interchange. The latest DRCOG model will need to be used for the 1601 processes, the NEATS model is not an accepted model. CDOT is in the process of starting a system level study for the I-70 corridor from E-470 to Strasberg, coordination with Transport will be needed throughout the study. The study is expected to start in Fall 2019 and be completed by Winter 2020. Where a grade separation with the UPRR is planned US36 will likely need to be relocated, please show on the development plan. The current I-70 bridge over Manila is substandard only allowing for a two lane road and maximum of 14.5 feet in height.

Permits Comments:

This referral is for an amendment to the Transport Colorado FDP. CDOT has no comment on the proposed changes to the land use matrix. The Public Improvement Plan shows that there will be impacts to State Highways in the area, including Hwy 36 (Colfax) and I-70. New interchanges or modifications to the interchange will need to be approved through the 1601 process. Any new access to a State Highway will need a State Highway Access Permit.

CDOT will need to review the Drainage Report when it is available. Any grading in the State right-of-way will require a special use permit.

Any proposed construction, utility, survey, or landscaping work within CDOT right-of-way will require a Special Use Permit issued by the Department.

Railroad Crossings will also need to be coordinated with CDOT.

RE: Phase 1 FDP:

This large scale development should be responsible for constructing all roadways to accommodate the projected traffic to be generated. SH 36 is overlooked as an important periphery roadway to this phase and appears to be omitted under the public improvement plan. It is imprudent not to hold this initial phase of this projects' development responsible for improving SH 36 between Imboden & Manila Roads. East & west traffic from this development is expected and anticipated to use (and impact) the State highway. It is not appropriate for the citizens of Colorado or the UPRR to shoulder the cost of highway improvements warranted to serve this project. 4 & 6-lane arterial roadways dropping traffic onto a 2-lane highway (SH 36) is not appropriate without appropriate mitigation. The proposal to improve the arterial intersections (to City of Aurora standards) alone is insufficient. SH 36 is posted at 55 mph, and handles intracommunity traffic. At minimum, auxiliary acceleration and deceleration lanes should be initially anticipated and warranted for truck traffic. Because SH 36 is a state highway and intended to accommodate traffic of commerce, roadway improvements within this RoW will need to be built to CDOT standards.

More specifically:

Tab 1 "Letter of Introduction" C.3.(a) does not ID which roadway cross section is Colfax. Please show. Same comment applies to the paragraph under Traffic called "Arterial Roadway"

Tab 6 element #7 describing (perimeter) vehicular circulation does not address the profile or cross section for SH 36

Tab 13 Same as above. Does not ID any improvements to Colfax/SH36 or provide a cross section.

Page 8 of the public improvement plans states that "All roadways will be constructed per COA standards and specifications." This is not an accurate statement for Colfax/SH 36. Again, the commitment to improve Colfax on the periphery of this +1,100 acre phase of development is omitted. While page 8 specifically pertains to PA10, the same reasoning & comment applies to all PA's within this phase.

Generally:

The existing Imboden/SH 36 intersection will require improvements for handling traffic this property will generate. This intersection currently serves residential properties in the Prairie View Subdivision.

The Manila Road/SH 36 intersection will require improvements for handling traffic this property will generate.

Where Quail Run Rd will connect to SH 36 (be it on the current section line and/or future realignment- not currently platted) will also require improvements for handling traffic this property will generate.

Previously mentioned under the master TIS, improvements at the I-70 interchanges which are off-site to phase 1, will require improvements for handling traffic this property will generate. Currently, these interchanges are not built for industrial scaled development. The 1601 (IAR) process will be utilized to determine the scope of improvements warranted for the volume and type of traffic anticipated.

All improvements mentioned above are by permit. Improvements at interstate interchanges are more complex and will necessitate intergovernmental coordination with both Adams & Arapahoe Counties and FHWA. Improvements at the interchanges will need to be built to CDOT standards.

CDOT does have a rail division managed out of headquarters. Developer is encouraged to contact Rob Martindale 970-683-6249 rob.martindale@state.co.us to understand the nuances, standards and requirements for trucks utilizing existing and the to-be-constructed at-grade RR crossings in close proximity to State Highways. It is not uncommon for highways to require additional length to accommodate a queue for truck

turning movements approaching RR crossings. Review and permitting process from non-local RR can be time consumptive.

The City should assess the capacity of interchanges from which traffic from/to this development is anticipated to use. It is likely that there exists some capacity for (smaller) vehicle traffic without significant improvements. Larger scaled vehicles which may require higher clearances, larger turn radii, etc. will warrant at minimum, a 1601 Minor Interchange Modification Request (MIMR) that must come from the City. The City should consider further restrictions on the types and volume of traffic that early development at Transport Colorado's initial phases might generate until plans for major infrastructure improvements are funded, approved and underway.

I did not see or offer comments on the master TIA that covered subareas 1 & 2 and omitted subareas 3-6. Usually, a smaller version TIS should accompany each phase of development to identify and address the minimal improvements which that phase would warrant. Such a report was not included with this review. A more robust and specific TIS is requested to review including improvements for SH 36 on the periphery of this property.

RS 07-08-19

My previous remarks dated 7-8-19 appear to coincide with the submittal of the the FDP for Sub Area 1. Therefore, remarks for Sub Area 1 still apply. Recent conversations CDOT has conducted with others regarding I-70 corridor interchanges & their 1601 SLS, reveal that this property, plans and traffic are not currently accounted for in their traffic modeling. Recent strategies we have engaged for large-scaled developments is to have an overall master TIS, then sub-TIS for each sub-phase as they come in.

- RS 07-22-19