



November 10, 2023

Michael Walton
Senior Development Review Engineer
20120 E. Mainstreet
Parker, CO 80138

RE: Douglas 234, Filing No. 6, Amendment 1, Lot 4 (SP22-041) – Town Engineering 2nd Review
Comment Responses

Mr. Walton,

Please accept this letter as our response to the 2nd review comments from the Town Engineering, dated October 11, 2023, for the Douglas 234, Filing No. 6 , Amendment 1, Lot 4 application (SP22-041). Responses to comments are included in blue beneath the original comments.

Traffic and Roadway Review Comments

Traffic Impact Study

1. Please note that traffic from the proposed development cannot queue on the adjacent shared access road or impact adjacent properties. Should traffic issues arise the developer will be required to re-analyze and make any necessary improvements to mitigate the issue. Please add text in the narrative acknowledging this within the TIS.

RESPONSE: Comment addressed, see revised TIS.

Stormwater Review Comments

Construction Plans-Environmental General Comments

Please note that a CBMP Estimate will be required and reviewed with the Grading Permit after all CBMP comments have been addressed and the final site plan is near approval.

RESPONSE: Noted. We have provided a CBMP Estimate for this submittal.

1. Please add a note stating – “THE TRUE LOCATION OF THE VTC, CWA, AND PTs MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE TOWN AND THE ECS”.
RESPONSE: We have added the note to all Erosion Control sheets under the Note section.
2. Please add a note stating – “MASONRY WORK PROTECTION IS REQUIRED OFR CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS”.
RESPONSE: We have added the note to all Erosion Control sheets under the Note section.
3. Please add a note stating – “ANY ONSITE BULD FUEL STORAGE REQUIRES A FIRE LIFE SAFETY

PERMIT FROM THE TOWN OF PARKER PRIOR TO INSTALLATION". Contact Randy Capra at 303-805-3136 or rcapra@parkeronline.org for FLS Permit questions.

RESPONSE: We have added the note to all Erosion Control sheets under the Note section.

4. Please show multiple Portable Toilet Protections (PTP), a site this size must have at least 2 at initial phase. Addition PTPs may be needed in the interim and final phases.

RESPONSE: We have added a total of 2 PTP for all phases.

5. Please provide and identify in curb line rock sock protection (4) on Slicer Drive to the southeast, down gradient of site. Follow the Inlet Protection Curb on Grade detail for installation.

RESPONSE: We have added 4 curb in line rock sock protections on Slicer Drive to all phases.

Interim/Final CBMP Plans

6. Please consider moving the Vehicle Tracking Control (VTC) to the north end of Slicer Drive. This configuration helps limit the amount of Stormwater Sheet Flow washing over the VTC and flowing off-site during a rain event. Please provide and identify construction fence along the sides of the VTC to assure the use of the entire 50-foot pad.

RESPONSE: We have revised and moved the VTC pad to the North end of Slicer Drive along with adding and calling out a construction fence along the sides of the VTC for all phases.

Interim/Final CBMP Plans

7. Provide and identify Masonry Work Protection (MWP) on the plans in two locations for Construction of the building.

RESPONSE: We have added two MWP locations to the building.

8. Please remove **ALL Traffic Striping Arrows** from the CBMP Drawings to avoid confusion with the stormwater flow arrows.

RESPONSE: We have removed all traffic striping arrows from the plans.

Construction Plans-Stormwater

1. All storm sewer systems collecting drainage from the proposed drive aisles and parking areas must adhere to the standards and specifications outlined within Section 6.3.3 of the Town's SDECM, including the use of 18-inch minimum RCP and dedication of drainage easements.

RESPONSE: We have updated our plans and revised all storm pipes to 18-inch RCP and dedicated drainage easements for our storm sewer.

2. Please note energy grade lines are not required. Please remove the energy grade lines from the storm sewer profiles for clarity.

RESPONSE: Noted. Energy grade lines have been removed from profiles for clarity.

Drainage Report

1. Provide a direct comparison of the master study impervious value to the proposed impervious value for the site in the narrative for a quick reference to future designers.

RESPONSE: Addressed. A direct comparison of impervious values from master study to proposed Lot 4 study has been included in the narrative.

Please let me know if you have any questions concerning this response letter and/or the enclosed documents.

Sincerely,

RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY

Troy Bales, PE
Associate

cc: Andrew Trietley, Ventana Capital

Enclosure