



April 27, 2020

City of Aurora
Planning & Development Services
Attention: Stephen Rodriguez, Planning Supervisor
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 5200
Aurora, Colorado 80012
Ph: 303.739.7186

**Re: TransPort Colorado – FDP Sub-Area #1 (Tab #5)
Response to 3rd Comments for 4th Submittal**

Dear Mr. Rodriguez,
We have reviewed your 3rd round of comments for Transport Colorado Sub-Area #1. Attached within are our responses to those comments.

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please identify a street network, which includes addressing pedestrian and bicycle circulation, for this development. This is a conceptual plan and streets can be finalized later.
RE: Acknowledged - It is the intent of Transport to sell large lots of 80 to 160 acres that have access to public right of way streets and thus the need to show internal streets will be unnecessary. However, each parcel when platted may have the need to provide more than one access and/or internal circulation as necessary to meet fire and other health safety/welfare requirements of the City of Aurora. These internal circulation patterns will be appropriately shown on the CSP for each parcel.
- See the comment redlines from Engineering (many are repeat comments), Traffic (contact directly), Aurora Water, Life Safety, and Parks.
RE: Completed
- Please contact the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) for any comments.
RE: Completed

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

1. Community Comments

1A. No additional comments were received from surrounding neighborhoods.

RE: Acknowledged

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Tab #1 Letter of Introduction

2A. Please incorporate the Sign Program language in the LOI. Repeat comment.

RE: Completed



2B. Repeat comment: This plan although conceptual, does not adequately show road circulation and connectivity within the site. Please see the previous comment redlines on the plan. Please understand that the plan is conceptual and that the final roads and connectivity may change. You stated in the response letter that it has been removed from the tab, however, it is still part of the tab.

RE: Acknowledged - It is the intent of Transport to sell large lots of 80 to 160 acres that have access to public right of way streets and thus the need to show internal streets will be unnecessary. However, each parcel when platted may have the need to provide more than one access and/or internal circulation as necessary to meet fire and other health safety/welfare requirements of the City of Aurora. These internal circulation patterns will be appropriately shown on the CSP for each parcel.

3. Zoning, Land Use Comments and Transportation Issues

Open Space, Recreation, and Land Dedication

3A. Tab 9 – Please continue to work on this. It appears that no modifications were made to this sheet/plan. The Sub-Area Master Plan must identify a complete pedestrian network and circulation plan. The one submitted is too general.

RE: Acknowledged - It is the intent of Transport to sell large lots of 80 to 160 acres that have access to public right of way streets and thus the need to show internal streets will be unnecessary. However, each parcel when platted may have the need to provide more than one access and/or internal circulation as necessary to meet fire and other health safety/welfare requirements of the City of Aurora. These internal circulation patterns will be appropriately shown on the CSP for each parcel.

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

RE: Acknowledged

4. Landscape Comments

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

4A. All previous comments were addressed in resubmittal.

RE: Acknowledged

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

5. Civil Engineering

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

PIP

5A. Page 1 - The sub-area master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage report is approved.

RE: This is understood. Per previous discussions with staff and MHPD, we have modified the MDR as detailed in the MHPD comment responses below and the minutes from the GoToMeeting held 3/20. Accordingly, we wish to submit the ISP and PDR for review and comment so we can subsequently submit the SWMP for review and approval to obtain the grading permit as we discussed with the COA review team and ODA.



5B. Please remove Autocad SHX text items in the comment section. Please flatten to reduce select-ability of the items.

RE: Autocad SHX text items have been removed and the file has been flattened.

5C. Page 5 - Discuss providing cores for existing roads to verify existing pavement can meet traffic loading requirements. If existing pavement section does not meet current requirements, reconstruction will be required.

RE: The text regarding providing cores has been relocated within the document and expanded upon.

5D. Page 6 – Provide documentation from the PUC that the triggers identified for rail crossings are acceptable.

RE: We have discussed this with the Colorado Public Utility Commission (PUC), and they cannot make a statement of acceptability at this time because they cannot know how future PUC Boards or staff may rule on such an issue. The City of Aurora should consider that the timeframe for construction of a grade-separation at either the Quail Run Road or Manila Road crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) is dependent upon the level of vehicular traffic crossing the UPRR tracks which is influenced by the economic climate as TransPort Colorado, the Rocky Mountain Rail Park, the Colorado Air and Space Port, and other land is developed. Land use types, their densities and their locations will determine how much vehicular traffic crosses the UPRR tracks when considering other travel routes that are available. The need for a grade-separation will be based on the progression of the varying development projects and the level of vehicular traffic that crosses the UPRR tracks will need to be monitored as new projects occur. As guidance, an exposure factor calculation can be used to gauge the approximate timeframe for construction. Considering that these crossings will be somewhat urban in nature as development occurs, the number of trains per day multiplied by the number of vehicles crossing the tracks will need to approach 85,000 before a grade-separation is needed. As an example, it's our understanding that there currently are only three trains that traverse this area on a daily basis. As such, over 25,000 vehicles per day would need to cross the UPRR tracks before a grade-separation is required. That timeframe will likely be past the Year 2040. The development review process for the City of Aurora can be the mechanism that monitors vehicle traffic levels to ascertain the grade-separation timeframes.

5E. There is not adequate description as to the timing of the channel improvements identified as PA-37.

Sheet 1

RE: The text regarding the timing of the channel improvements in PA-37 has been expanded upon.

5F. No rise certificate or CLOMR required for roadway improvements in floodplain. If this portion of the site is not annexed at the time of the roadway construction, and IGA is required regarding roadway maintenance.

RE: It is understood that a no-rise or CLOMR will be required. If this portion of the site is not annexed, an alternate route running north along Quail Run Drive will be provided for secondary access.

6. Traffic Engineering

Reviewed by: Brianna Medema ccampuza@auroragov.org / bmedema@auroragov.org 303-739-7309 Comments in gold.

TIS

6A. Please contact the reviewer directly for comments. No redlines were received by staff.

RE:



PIP

6B. Please contact the reviewer directly for comments. No redlines were received by staff.

RE: We have attempted to contact the reviewer for comments. None have been received to date.

7. Aurora Water

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

Master Utility Report

Please address redline comments:

7A. Page 11 – Please see the comment redlines regarding ownership of the interim system by the City at the discretion of Aurora Water.

RE: Text has been added regarding ownership of the interim system.

7B. Please see other minor redline comments.

RE: Redline comments have been addressed.

8. Life Safety

Reviewed by: William Polk / wpolk@auroragov.org / 303-739-7371 Comments in blue.

Please see Marked-Up (In Blue) FDP for Specific Comments.

RE: Acknowledged.

PIP

Sheet 23

- Please revise the following statement, " temporary fire station being provided in a portion of a proposed onsite building." Revised the statement by including a statement that identifies the developer providing and constructing the temporary fire station. Also, include a statement that identifies that the temporary fire station shall be constructed when the Fire Chief or designee deems necessary.

RE: Text regarding the temporary fire station has been revised.

- Please identify what road(s) will serve as the required second point of access to the site from Imboden RD West. Sheet 27

RE: The note has been revised to identify the second point of access.

- Please identify what road(s) will serve as the required second point of access to the site from Imboden RD West.

RE: The notes have been revised to identify the second point of access.

9. Parks and Recreation (PROS)

Tab #9, Open Space, Circulation & Neighborhood Plan – The proposed detention pond location is not reflected in the configuration of the open space. Does the calculated acreage of the open space in PA-36 except out the pond? To reiterate a previous comment: stormwater infrastructure is not eligible for public land dedication



credit for open space purposes. The PIP indicates that a detention pond is to be located within PA-36, but there does not appear to be any allowance for that use. Clarification is needed. Revisions may be necessary to ensure that enough qualified acreage for open space purposes will be provided to satisfy the minimum dedication requirement.

RE: Revised and completed

Tab #9, Form J – Document the decision for landscaped medians to be maintained by the metro district.

RE: Revised and completed

10. Mile High Flood District (MHFD)

Reviewed by: Teresa Patterson 303 / 455-6277

10A. Comments:

Project Name:	Transport Colorado MDR, Transport Sub-Area 1 FDP and Drainage Letter (RSN #s: 1364323, 1382119, 1364149, and 1370496)
Location:	Transport Colorado Development
Drainageway:	Crooked Run, Newcomb Gulch, Henry David Draw

This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to maintenance eligibility of major drainage features, in this case:

- Drainage Improvements and Regional Detention associated with Crooked Run, Newcomb Gulch, and Henry David Draw

The District has received several referrals for Transport Colorado. This comment letter provides comments for all of these submittals, as the comments are primarily focused on the Transport Colorado Master Drainage Report (MDR), which impacts the information shown for Sub-Area 1 and other overall Transport Colorado submittals. We have the following comments to offer:

- 1) On January 2, 2020, the District met with the design team and Aurora for Transport Colorado. During that discussion, it was determined that the MDR should provide sufficient analysis to determine adequate stream corridor based on a detailed geomorphic analysis. The District provided comments in January on the geomorphic report provided. While that analysis was helpful, it was conceptual in nature and more supporting information was needed. The current MDR lacks clear evidence supporting the planned corridor widths, and the widths provided are the same as the previous iteration. Please help us understand how the geomorphic analysis has been carried out to a more detailed level.

RE: A follow up meeting was held on March 20 between MHFD, COA, CVL, and 5 Smooth Stones (5SSR). In that meeting it was agreed that CVL would provide the Crooked Run channel profiles and cross-sections developed for the PDR as a supplement to the MDR. Additionally, 5SSR developed a Basis of Design Memo to include as an appendix in the MDR. These documents should provide the necessary information to support the channel widths shown in the MDR.

- 2) Several comments regarding channel design indicate that location and number of drop structures will be determined at a later stage in the design. However, these factors are important in determining the space reserved for the stream corridor. The District is open to meeting with the design team to discuss the structures and help determine the best location and use of them.
RE: There are currently no drop structures proposed for Crooked Run. Drop structures may be required along other channels based on the difference between the existing and required reach stability slope. These will be determined at the preliminary and final drainage design level with the proposed grading for individual sites. We will coordinate the number and location of drops with MHFD.
- 3) If the design team would prefer not to provide more detailed supporting information for stream corridor widths, then a wider stream corridor must be shown and assumed on the MDR. If Aurora allows it, another option may be to provide assurances in the MDR and other conceptual-level documents that the stream corridor widths shown may change if further analysis warrants it.
RE: As noted above, additional information will be provided to MHFD to supplement your review of the MDR and channel widths.
- 4) During the meeting on January 2, 2020, detention design was discussed. Based on that discussion, the District had understood that the following design choices were made:
- All WQ would be handled upstream of regional detention basins
 - Off-line regional detention basins would handle flood control and EURV
 - In-line regional detention basins would be flood control only

While this is acceptable for drainageways with less than one square mile tributary, this is no longer the intended design for several drainageways based on the MDR. The District recommends reverting back to the original design intent where the one square mile tributary threshold is exceeded.

RE: The design has been updated to reflect items a., b., and c. above. Refer to the meeting minutes from the GoToMeeting held 3/20.

- 5) The MDR states that detention facilities will have a 12-hour EURV drain time and a 24-hour WQCV drain time. Based on the District's discussion with Aurora, we do not believe this is Aurora's expectation. Please discuss and confirm appropriate drain times with Aurora to ensure compliance with their requirements.
RE: Per the meeting minutes for the GoToMeeting held 3/20, all ponds will drain in 40 hours to satisfy FAA criteria. Specifically, the following drain times will be achieved:
1. Full spectrum ponds will be designed to COA criteria and drain the WQCV in ~24 hours, the EURV in ~12 hours, and the 100-yr in ~4 hours. There are only 2 ponds of this type.
 2. Offline regional ponds will drain the EURV in ~32 hours and the 100-yr in ~8 hours. The WQCV will be detained offline and will drain in 40 hours max.



3. Inline regional ponds will have WQCV+EURV ponds offline with the WQCV draining in ~28 hours and the EURV draining in ~12 hours.

11. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)

11A. No comments received to date. Contact directly for comments

RE: Acknowledged

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

Sincerely,

Jennifer Carpenter
Associate Principal