

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



June 6, 2023

Steven Marshall
Transport Colorado LLC
1331 17th Street, Ste #1000
Denver, CO 80202

Re: Third Submission Review - Transport Colorado – Sub-Area 2 – Master Plan
Application Number: **DA-1793-05**
Case Number: 2005-7008-06

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for your recent submission. 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. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission as feasible. Ensure that Traffic comments are obtained as none were provided at the time of this review.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a comment response 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 at, 303.739.7541 or rrabbaa@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Rachid Rabbaa, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Jennifer Carpenter – LAI Design Group 88 Inverness Circle East, Building J, Ste. #101 Englewood, CO 80112
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1793-05rev3.rtf



Third Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Tab # 8 missing Form D and MP Standard Notes. (Items 2)
- Tab # 13 Provide a section for Quail Run Drive. Identify the required improvements for on the section See the comments and redlines from Engineering regarding the PIP. (Item 4)
- Please contact the reviewer directly for comments. Traffic Engineering. (Item 5)
- See the attached comments from CDOT. (Item 10)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Rachid Rabbaa rrabbaa@auroragov.org / 303-739-7541 / PDF comment color is teal.

1. Community Comments

1A. Please see the CDOT comments. PDF

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Tab #8 – Land Use Map Matrix

2B. Missing 2 pages: Form D and MP Standard Notes

Tab #13 - Public Improvement Plan.

2F. See comments 5D to 5I below from Engineering.

3. Zoning, Land Use Comments, and Transportation Issues

3A. No additional comments.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

4. Civil Engineering Reviewed by: Julie Bingham, jbingham@auroragov.org / 303-739-7403 / Comments in **green**.

Tab 8 MP. Land Use Map, Matrix, and Standard Notes.

4A. This is 114' feet of ROW.

4B. This is not fully existing.

Tab 11 Landscape Standards

4C. There are no 8-lane roads.

Tab 13 (PIP)

4D. Provide a section for Quail Run Drive. Identify the required improvements for on the section.

4E. Why aren't improvements to Quail Run Drive adjacent to PA-3 being provided?

4F. There should be a trigger identified for the design of the bridge and a trigger identified for the construction of the bridge.

4G. This is in direct conflict with what page 37 of the MTIS says about 48th. It includes 48th as a short-term background improvement to support background traffic even without the development of Subarea 2.

4H. Include Cavanaugh Rd. improvements in this list. Identify the sidewalk for Quail Run Drive on the east side on this list.

4I. Include the sidewalk for Quail Run Drive on the east side on this list.

5. Traffic Engineering

Reviewed by: Carl Harline / charline@auroragov.org / 303-739- 7584/ Comments in **gold**.

5A. *Please contact the reviewer directly for comments. Do not resubmit until the Traffic comments are obtained and the revisions incorporated into the resubmittal and the comment response letter.*

6. Aurora Water Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / cballard@auroragov.org / Comments in **red**.

6A. No additional comments.



7. Parks and Recreation (PROS) Reviewed by: Curt Bish / 303-739-7131 / cbish@auroragov.org

7A. No additional comments.

8. Environmental Planning- Land Use: Reviewed by Maria L. Alvarez / malvarez@auroragov.org

8A. No comments.

9. Department of Transportation: Reviewed by Steve Loeffler / steven.loeffler@state.co.us

9A. Comments are attached. Respond to each major item specifically in your comment response letter and make revisions as necessary.

9B. A comment response letter should be included in future referrals.

STATE OF COLORADO

Traffic & Safety

Region 1

2829 W. Howard Place

Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Project Name: **Port Subarea 2 - Transport Colorado**

Print Date:

Highway:

Mile Marker:

Environmental Comments:

For ANY ground disturbance/work within CDOT ROW---

Required:

Arch/History/Paleo:

Since this is a permit, a file search for Arch, Paleo and History is required. If the file search identifies anything, a more extensive report will be required. If nothing is identified, then the file search should be sufficient. For the file search contact:

Cultural/History File Search: <https://www.historycolorado.org/file-access> Email: hc_filesearch@state.co.us

Paleo File Search: Colorado University Museum of Natural History - Email: jacob.vanveldhuizen@colorado.edu and <https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>

The ECIS will be used to support HazMat requirements.

Non-historic 4f does not apply.

If any non-historic 6f properties will be impacted or disturbed applicant shall coordinate with Veronica McCall veronica.mccall@state.co.us

Info for Applicant/Contractor:

The Permittee shall complete a stormwater management plan (SWMP) which must be prepared with good engineering, hydrologic, and pollution control practices and include at a minimum the following components: qualified stormwater manager; spill prevention and response plan; materials handling; potential sources of pollution; implementation of control measures; site description; and site map.

In addition, the Permittee shall comply with all local/state/federal regulations and obtain all necessary permits. Permittee shall comply with CDOT's MS4 Permit. When working within a local MS4 jurisdictional boundary, the permittee shall obtain concurrence from the local MS4 that the local MS4 will provide construction stormwater oversight. The local MS4 concurrence documentation shall be retained with the SWMP.

Clear Zone: It is the responsibility of the engineer/architect who stamps the plans to ensure that: any new landscaping/trees are outside of the clear zones for any State Highway/CDOT ROW and that the new landscaping/trees do not interfere with site lines from any State Highway/CDOT ROW.

Landscape: Any new or changes to existing landscaping within CDOT ROW must be reviewed and approved by CDOT. Landscaping plans should be submitted and should include details of all proposed plant species and seed mixes/ratios

12/20/2022: Environmental review is pending the receipt of the file search results for Arch, Paleo and History.

Traffic Comments:

The TIS still didn't include US-36 and I-70. With no details how this will impact those facilities in interim. This will cause operational and safety issues if those facilities are not improved to accommodate the traffic that this site is going to produce.

Jason Igo 5/30/2023

The previous comments in November were not addressed or replied back too.

Jason Igo 1/3/2023

The warehouse trip generation seems like it is a little low. The Data center was a little high so it might work out.

This TIS doesn't include US-36 and I-70 in the traffic analysis. Manilla already hooks into both of these corridors. If Quail run is not built traffic will be diverted to that location. Up to a 81% of the traffic is headed to I-70 based on Figure 4. That is over 10,000 vehicles per a day.

We need to see this analyzed and wait till Manilla and Quail Run interchange improvements are fully established before allowing this development to be built or at least have a threshold for when the existing network will breakdown.

Jason Igo 11/3/2022

Resident Engineer Comments:

I have no comment at this time.

KMD_5/26/23

KM_11/1/22_Any work within CDOT ROW shall follow CDOT Standards and Specifications

Permits Comments:

We last reviewed highway improvements in this area under the name of "Transport". Comments were previously offered yet the response to comments from LAI dated 12/7 says "No comments from CDOT" That is an inaccurate statement.

Back in June 0221, we asked for a final Public Improvement Plan (PIP) for the Transport project - particularly those sheets (table 2) with the notes-details (timing of) and plans for SH 36 RoW improvements. It is generally easy to recognize when improvements are proposed along SH 36, but more unclear when off-site improvements at the Manila / I-70 interchange are called for. We have previously cautioned that the existing interchange ramp terminals are substandard for oversized-vehicles, that potential MIMR may be needed for interim improvements. This proposal for grading would suggest some of those larger construction related equipment may be coming through. Contractor should the CDOT oversize-overweight office accordingly if permits (in addition to access, utility and special use) may be required. Discussions for building a new interchange at Quail Run has not been formally initiated and would need to come from the City, Counties and possibly both.

The TIA that was provided for review is lacking in many respects.

TIA and Plans provided totally omit any discussion – information relative to the off-site improvements needed to address the traffic to be generated. For example:

- No mention of SH 36 ? Colax is planned as an arterial roadway and how much E-W traffic might be placed upon this roadway and the improvements that will be necessary & warranted are overlooked. All connections to SH 36 will be further complicated by the RR Crossing and PUC coordination that will be necessary.
- No mention of the timing to initiate a new Quail Run interchange at I-70 including the NEPA, design, funding and construction under the 1601 / IAR process. Not even a mention to assist in the funding of what is involved,

yet the TIA shows most of the traffic to use this non-existent interchange.

- No mention of the timing to improve the rural Manila interchange at I-70 including the NEPA, design, funding and construction under the 1601 / IAR process. This interchange will clearly be relied on to handle traffic in the short term.

- If "Port Subarea 2" is reliant on an earlier TIA and Public Improvement Plan approved for Transport, the TIA fails to ID those off-site improvements or discuss the timing of their construction. In particular, additional lanes and intersections outlined along SH 36 and at both I-70 interchanges. We also noted that two future overpasses are anticipated of the RR at Manila & Quail Run flanking the intersections at SH 36, and both intersections are anticipated to be signalized in the short term. As inferred above (and below under the PIP) there is no acknowledgement or commitment to these off-site roadway improvements needed and warranted. CDOT would prefer that all such commitments and pending permits be made by the City (not a metro district) who in-turn would cover maintenance responsibilities since these locations are not currently covered by a contract maintenance agreement.

- Section IV of this TIA (V) discusses and acknowledges how the 2018 NEATS refresh did not account for the traffic this development is now anticipated to generate. The numbers outlined in figures 4-10 show huge traffic load increases on Manila and Quail Run. The TIA recommends 4 lanes for both (Quail Run is currently non-existent south of SH 36) and yet the TIA recommends for long terms improvements that: *"All future intersections will be determined at the time of parcel platting but are expected to have one inbound and one outbound lane at each access point:"* The TIA says nothing in the short term regarding how to make assessments or offering commitments for the off-site roadway lane improvements needed to handle the sheer volume of traffic, plus the bullet items listed above.

The PIP tab 13 generally speaks to the on-site and immediately adjacent roadway network. It relies heavily on the first phase of Transport to build the off-site improvements to the south necessary to accommodate all of the traffic to and from Sub Area 2. What appears omitted from this PIP is the fail safe "what if" those off-site networks are not in place? Will the City withhold site plan & plat approval until these off-site improvements are built? I am particularly focused on SH 36 and connections to I-70 which are not even mentioned in this PIP. Generally, it is inappropriate to assume these off-site improvements will be 100% funded "by others".

RS 12-27-22

I have no comments at this time as it appears no work will be done in the CDOT ROW. RLW Oct 21 2022

Any utility work in the CDOT ROW requires a CDOT Utility permit. RLW December 22 2022

I have no comments at this time as it appears no work will be done in the CDOT ROW. RLW Oct 21 2022

Any utility work in the CDOT ROW requires a CDOT Utility permit. Any landscaping in the CDOT ROW requires a CDOT Landscaping permit. RLW May 19 2023

5-26-23 No comment AE 5-26-23

Other Comments:

5-30-2023 Resubmittal should include a comment response letter.

--Steve Loeffler, 5-30-23