

November 27, 2024

Mr. Scott Barnett, P.E.  
Cottonwood Water and Sanitation District  
58 Inverness Drive West, Suite 100  
Englewood, Colorado 80112

RE: Crown Point F1 AMD 20 L4E – Land of Sushi  
CWSD Submittal Comments Response

Dear Mr. Barnett,

Please find below our responses to the Cottonwood Water and Sanitation District review comments to the Construction Documents facilitate your review, we have included the original comments (key issues and numbered comments) in italicized font and have provided our responses in bold.

## **General**

- 1. Provide a formal comment response letter to the following comments as there are number of them that were not addressed between the previous submittals that have significant impacts to the proposed site.*

**Response: Comment Response letter being provided with this submittal.**

- 2. Irrigation drawings will be required with the next submittal, a fourth submittal will not be accepted without these drawings included.*

**Response: Irrigation drawings have been included in the CWSD CD set.**

- 3. Provide the Water Fixture Analysis for the project supporting the one inch tap and meter sizing. We require an AWWA M22 format for the analysis, signed and stamped by the MEP engineer.*

**Response: Water Fixture Analysis has been included for the site and included with this submittal.**

- 4. Show all proposed easements on the Overall Utility Sheet*

**Response: Proposed easements have been added to the overall utility sheet.**

## **Utility Cover Sheet (U.0)**

- 5. Irrigation sheets have been requested in prior submittals and have yet to be provided to the District. The District is accommodating this submittal but further submittals will be rejected outright without these plan sheets.*

**Response: Irrigation sheets have now been included with this submittal.**

- 6. Update the Civil Engineer and Engineers signature block as necessary. We received submittals from Matthew Pepin and worked through comments with Scott Brown previously but want clarification on who will be the actual PE of record for these plans.*



**Response: Scott Brown will be the engineer of record. Plans are to reflect this throughout.**

7. *Update the District address to 58 Inverness Drive East, Suite 100, 80112*

**Response: Address has been updated to 58 Inverness Drive East, Suite 100, 80112.**

**Utility Site Plan (U.2)**

8. *Show and annotate the irrigation tap location.*

**Response: Added irrigation connection to tap.**

9. *Show and annotate the irrigation tap and meter size.*

**Response: Added irrigation tap and meter size annotation.**

10. *Show the irrigation meter pit location.*

**Response: Added meter pit location.**

11. *Show the foundation limits of the monument sign.*

**Response: Monument sign has been relocated to not be in conflict with sanitary sewer line.**

12. *There is still a second gate valve shown on the fire hydrant line with no annotations. Provide information as to why they both are necessary or remove the duplicate as previously requested.*

**Response: Removed the duplicate gate valve on fire line.**

13. *The District signature block is only required on the Cover Sheet, remove it from all other sheets as necessary.*

**Response: Removed District signature block from all sheets except for the Cover Sheet.**

14. *The 4-inch Fire line has been removed. It does not appear you are attempting to use the stub outs provided and existing. You will need to include a Demo Plan showing their removal to the main. Show details on how this will be done.*

**Response: Added saw cut limits and note in regards to the demo of the existing 1” domestic stub and the 4” fire service line. Both will be removed back to the main and capped.**

15. *The Water Responsibility chart still includes errors that should be corrected. To be clear, the Contractor will install the Fire Hydrant.*

**Response: The Water Responsibility chart has been updated to have general contractor installing all wet utility work.**

16. *Note 9 should read “All WATER IS TO BE 4.5’ DEEP, MINIMUM”.*

**Response: Added note 10 to Utility notes to read, “ALL WATER IS TO BE 4.5 FEET DEP, MINIMUM.”**

**Water Plan (U.3)**

17. *Show curb stop valve location and label it. Since this is on an existing stub, will this be relocated?*

**Response: We are no longer utilizing the existing domestic to stub. The use requires a 1-1/2" service line. The existing service line will be removed and a new 1-1/2" line will be tapped off the 8" main. A curb stop has been added on the new service line.**

18. *If a curb stop is proposed on the 1" domestic service then extend the proposed copper to begin at the valve rather than the middle of the existing copper.*

**Response: No longer connecting domestic to the existing stub. New 1-1/2" copper line added.**

19. *Dimension the spacing between the fire hydrant line and the fire service line.*

**Response: Spacing dimension between fire hydrant line and fire service line has been added.**

20. *There are two gate valves on the fire hydrant line, please label the one that will be constructed on this line. If both are to be constructed, then label accordingly.*

**Response: Removed a gate valve on the fire hydrant line.**

21. *Remove the bend in the Fire Hydrant line. If this can't be removed then provide adequate reasoning as to why it can't be.*

**Response: Fire hydrant line has been revised to not have any bends in it.**

22. *The domestic water service line enters the building on the northwest corner. The Fire Service line enters the building on the southeast corner. As there is supposed to be an inside meter setting, do you want the Domestic line to enter the building on the southeast corner where there appears to be a mechanical room planned as well?*

**Response: Domestic water service line has been revised to enter at the south center of the building into the utility room for the building.**

23. *There are a number of details that have not been included in this set, review the standard details provided by Cottonwood and include them as necessary and remove any unused details. It is the responsibility of the design team to include the necessary information and details to construct what they are proposing.*

**Response: Details have been updated per comment to reflect the design.**

**Water Details (U.4)**

24. *Remove duplicate details.*

**Response: Duplicate details have been removed.**

**Utility Cover Sheet (U.5)**

25. *The sanitary service will need significant revisions. There appears to be 3” clearance from the proposed monument sign to the center of pipe and 12” clearance from the proposed wall to the center of pipe. We recommend relocating the monument sign and moving the sanitary service line a safe distance away from the retaining wall so the owner would be able to maintain it in the future.*

**Response: Monument sign has been relocated to avoid any clearance issues with services. Monument now west of existing SS manhole.**

26. *The S-29 cleanout has 1.15’ of cover, revise to provide adequate cover.*

**Response: All cleanouts have been revised to show adequate cover.**

27. *The S-29 cleanout feeds upstream in this line, it should be located to allow the portion between the cleanout and the existing manhole to be jetted, revise.*

**Response: S-29 has been removed and there is a connection directly to the manhole. Full line can be jetted from the existing manhole.**

28. *All of the cleanouts will require revisions, there is no 0.2’ drop across a cleanout.*

**Response: Cleanouts have been revised to no longer have a 0.2’ drop across a cleanout.**

29. *Dual cleanouts will be required on the service line as it enters the building, show and label them.*

**Response: Dual cleanouts have been added to the service line where it enters the building.**

30. *Manhole S-14 has an invert in that is lower than the proposed invert out, revise.*

**Response: Manhole S-14 inverts have been updated to have invert out to be 0.2’ lower.**

31. *Manhole S-15 manhole connection and inverts will need to be verified prior to the approval of this design. The sewer in this area is rather deep and will likely require a drop structure at the elevation proposed. A profile for this maybe more appropriate.*

**Response: Multiple attempts to locate the existing manhole have been made and it is now believed that the manhole does not exist. The plans have been revised to state the manhole is proposed. The line from Cottonwood has an assumed elevation from the design which is being reflected in the manhole callout.**

32. *Grading improvements will be made around the manhole lid so that it isn’t buried again in the future. The proposed grades in this area appear to be fairly steep.*

**Response: Manhole now being proposed and rim elevation will be set to finished grade.**

33. *The existing manhole appears to be in close proximity to a proposed wall, can the manhole structure be maintained without undermining the proposed wall if excavation is required around it?*

**Response: Proposed landscape wall will have shallow footing and not loadbearing. The maximum height is 2.1'. The maximum wall height has been added to the plans. Additionally the sanitary sewer has been shifted off the sidewalk.**

34. *Show the dual cleanouts on either side of the grease trap and label accordingly. This comment was acknowledged as revised and yet they are still not shown or called out in any way.*

**Response: Dual cleanouts have been added to either side of the grease trap and are now labeled.**

35. *The manhole connection should be called out as cored in the existing manhole.*

**Response: Manhole is now being proposed as new / proposed.**

36. *Remove unused details and include any others that may be necessary. It is the responsibility of the design team to include the necessary information and details to construct what they are proposing.*

**Response: Details have been updated per comment to reflect the design.**

37. *Remove Cottonwood detail CTWD-198S, this type of connection is not allowed in commercial use.*

**Response: CTWD-198S has been removed from the detail set.**

38. *Show total area (SF) of irrigated landscape.*

**Response: Information is included on the irrigation sheet IR2.0 which has been included with this submittal.**

39. *Trees are not allowed within the limits of the District Easements. Confirm the plantings meet the easement requirements. Grasses and small ornamental shrubs are OK.*

**Response: Confirmed only shrubs and grasses are located within the District Easement.**

Thank you in advance for taking the time to review this application. We look forward to working with you towards approval of this development proposal.

Sincerely,  
**GALLOWAY**



Scott Brown  
Sr. Technical Project Manager  
ScottBrown@GallowayUS.com