



December 7, 2017

Stacey Nerger  
Town of Parker  
Community Development Department  
Town Hall  
20120 East Mainstreet  
Parker, CO 80138

RE: **Trails at Crowfoot Filing 1**  
**Case #SUB17-039**

Dear Ms. Nerger,

CVL Consultants of Colorado, Inc. has considered comments from Parker Colorado Engineering Department, Douglas County Department of Community Development, Parker Water and Sanitation District, SCO Consulting LLC, Urban Drainage and Xcel Energy for the referenced project. We have restated the comments below and addressed them per the italicized responses.

**PARKER COLORADO ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

**Alex Mestdagh, P.E. Engineering Services Manager**

**David Aden, P.E. Traffic Engineer**

**Jacob James, P.E. Stormwater Manager**

**Kurt Patrick, P. E. Stormwater Engineer**

**Tyler Sandt, Development Review Engineer**

**General Comments:**

1. Comment: The applicant will be required to financially secure all Public Improvements via Subdivision Improvement Agreement. Security shall be cash or letter of credit at 110% of the construction cost of these items. The Town's standard Subdivision Agreement template will be provided to the applicant for review. When all applicable exhibits have been completed and approved, a full draft will be assembled and provided to the applicant. The Engineering Department anticipates inclusion of the following specific conditions related to infrastructure obligations.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: The Developer shall construct Bayou Gulch Road through the Property as on-half (1/2) of a full principal arterial roadway section, including all necessary auxiliary, acceleration, and deceleration lanes, in accordance with the approved construction documents and the Town's Roadway Design Criteria and Construction Manual, and shall construct all grading necessary to accommodate the future full width principal arterial.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: The Developer shall pay to the Town one-half (1/2) the cost to design and construct the future median and associated median improvements for Bayou Gulch Road through the Property.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: The Developer shall construct North Pinery Parkway through the Property as a full residential boulevard collector roadway, including all necessary auxiliary, acceleration, and deceleration lanes, in accordance with the approved construction documents and the Town's Roadway Design Criteria and Construction Manual.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: The Developer shall pay to the Town One Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$125,000), which payment is one-half of the cost to design and construct a traffic signal at the intersection of Bayou Gulch Road and Crowfoot Valley Road. The Town shall use these funds only for the purpose of installing this traffic signal when warranted, as determined by the Town.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: The Developer shall pay to the Town Two Hundred Thousand dollars (\$200,000) which payment is the cost to design and construct a traffic signal at the intersection of North Pinery Parkway and Crowfoot Valley Road. The Town shall use these funds only for the purpose of installing this traffic signal when warranted, as determined by the Town

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: The Developer shall pay to the Town Two Hundred Fifty thousand Dollars (\$250,000) which payment is the cost of design and construct a traffic signal at the intersection of Bayou Gulch Road and Scarlet Sage Avenue. The Town shall use these funds only for the purpose of installing this traffic signal when warranted, as determined by the Town.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: The Developer shall pay to the Town Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$250,000) which payment is for the future traffic signal at the intersection of North Pinery Parkway and Bayou Gulch Road. The Town shall use these funds only for the purpose of installing this traffic signal when warranted, as determined by the Town.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: The Developer shall construct the necessary improvements to Lemon Gulch associated with the regional detention pond, in accordance with the approved construction plans, and shall cause the improvements to be accepted into the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District's Maintenance Eligibility Program.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

### **Final Plat**

2. Comment: Please clarify the ultimate Bayou Gulch right-of-way width at the intersection of Bayou Gulch and Crowfoot Valley. Each additional land on arterial roadways requires 15

additional feet of ROW. Town staff was unable to determine how 158 feet of ROW was reached.

***Response: ROW has been modified to 162' which is 120' plus 15 additional feet on each side plus an additional 12' for the dual left turn per coordination with the town.***

3. Comment: Please reference Section 4 in the *RDCCM* for additional right-of-way requirements at intersections and revise the plans accordingly. It appears the plans are showing Bayou Gulch receiving an additional 12 feet of ROW per lane at Scarlet Sage and N Pinery PKWY. The Town requires 15 feet per additional lane.

***Response: The ROW has been coordinated with the town to 15' per additional lane.***

4. Comment: Sidewalk easements should be dedicated to the Town over any sidewalk outside of the right-of-way.

***Response: Sidewalk easements have been added to the plat***

5. Comment: Show sight easements and sight triangles (even those that do not require an easement) on the plat.

***Response: Sight easements and sight triangles have been added to the plat.***

6. Comment: Add the following notes to the plat:

*“Within the sight triangles, as shown, limited landscaping shall be allowed but no solid structures or trees will be permitted. Solid structures shall include, but not be limited to, fences, mailboxes, and utility boxes. Landscaping within the sight triangles will be limited to shrubs and plantings that at maturity will be no taller than two feet. Landscaping within the sight triangle shall be maintained by the property owner or appropriate association.*

*“Blanket drainage easements are hereby dedicated to the Town of Parker over and across Tracts A, B, E, And I for the purpose of accessing, maintaining, and repairing stormwater management improvements including, but not limited to, inlets, pipes, culverts, channels, ditches, hydraulic structures, riprap, detention basins, forebays, micropools, and water quality facilities in the event that the property owner fails to satisfactorily maintain or repair said facilities.”*

***Response: Notes have been added to the plat.***

7. Comment: The future filings in this development should be platted as unbuildable tracts with the Filing 1 plat. Please make the necessary revisions and add the following note, with the appropriate tract designations, to plat:

*“Tract (x, y, z...) are hereby established as a parcels to be re-platted in the future into buildable lots. At such time as a replat is approved for this tract, public improvements associated with the resulting lots will be determined by a signed and financially secured subdivision agreement with each replat application. No portion of the tract shall be developed, including but no limited to, staking, overlot grading, or the erection of any structure, temporary or otherwise, until the property is re-platted and/or site plan approval is obtained, except as allowed for in the Trails at Crowfoot Filing 1 Construction Plans”.*

***Response: The future filings are now platted as unbuildable tracts and the note has been added.***

## **Public Improvements Cost Estimate**

8. Comment: Please reference the Cost Estimate template in Appendix B of the *RDCCM*. Include only the costs associated with public streets and trails (earthwork and materials), storm sewer, drainage channel, and detention ponds.

***Response: Cost Estimates revised to the format shown in the template.***

## **Landscape Plans**

9. Comment: On future submittals, include a visual scale and ensure no trees are proposed within 7 feet of any storm sewer infrastructure.

***Response: Visual scales are present on all landscape plans and proposed trees locations have been adjusted to not be within 7 feet of any utilities.***

10. Comment: Show sight triangles on the landscape plan and ensure no trees or landscape above 2 feet are proposed within the sight triangles. Please only show sight triangles for the interim condition.

***Response: Sight triangles have been added and labelled on plans for interim conditions only. No landscape within triangles exceeds a 2 ft. height. Note has been added that any trees located within site triangles shall be pruned so that the canopy of tree is 8 ft. minimum height.***

## **Traffic Study**

Comment: Please see Traffic Study comments on eTrakit.

***Responses Below***

Per discussions between the Town and Developer, the southeast corner of Bayou Gulch and North Pinery (PA-44) will be developed as commercial. Please revise the study assumptions to reflect this.

***Response: Traffic study will be updated to assume this.***

It doesn't look like any traffic has been assumed for the future school site. This should be included to allow for determination of ultimate right-of-way needs related to necessary auxiliary lanes around the school site. The Town will require that the developer construct a dedicated left turn lane from eastbound Scarlet Sage Avenue to northbound Alpine Phlox Street to accommodate future school traffic in this area. This is considered infrastructure necessary to support the overall development, which includes the school site. Any other turn lanes needed to support the school site will be handled with that project and will not be the responsibility of the developer.

***Response: Left turn lane from Scarlet Sage Ave to Alpine Phlox Lane has been added. School traffic has been included in the traffic study.***

The peak hour volume of EB right turns on North Pinery at Rose Mallow appears to require a dedicated right turn lane per CDOT Access Code. Please add to the report and construction

plans/plat. The peak hour volume of SB right turns on Bayou Gulch at Shasta Daisy appears to require a dedicated right turn lane per CDOT Access Code. Please add to the report and construction plans/plat.

***Response: Right turn lane from N Pinery to Rose Mallow Ave has been added to the plans and report and additional ROW has been dedicated.***

The peak hour volume of WB right turns on Scarlet Sage at Bayou Gulch appears to require a dedicated right turn lane per CDOT Access Code. Please add to the report and construction plans/plat.

***Response: Right turn lane from Scarlet Sage to Bayou Gulch has been added to the report and plans and additional ROW has been dedicated.***

I also wanted to point out that the traffic study appears to be assuming a 40 MPH posted speed on Pinery PWKY when it will be signed at 35 MPH. Some of the tapers can be reduced as a result.

***Response: Tapers have been modified along N Pinery Parkway.***

See ROW exhibits.

***Response: ROW has been modified per coordination with the Town.***

### **Construction Plans**

11. Comment: Please add the Town's engineering signature block to the Area Utility plan sheets in the Water and Sanitary set.

***Response: The Town's engineering signature block has been added.***

12. Comment: Per Town criteria, please reference Section 4 in the DCOT *State Highway Access Code* in regards to auxiliary lane requirements for Crowfoot Valley Road. This roadway is classified as a "non-Rural Arterial" (NR-B) with a 50 MPH posted speed limit – please revise the acceleration and deceleration lanes accordingly.

***Response: The Auxiliary lanes have been modified to the requirements of the CDOT State Highway Access Code.***

13. Comment: Remove all hatched striping.

***Response: All Hatched Striping has been removed from the plans.***

14. Comment: Provide 2' x 10' crosswalks at all no local-local intersections.

***Response: Crosswalks have been added to the plans at all non local-local intersections.***

15. Comment: Remove all arrow striping at intersection except for turn arrows.

***Response: All arrow striping has been removed except turn arrows.***

16. Comment: Revise any storm profiles where the 2-year HGL is not in the pipe. Note that the Town can be flexible with this criterion near outfalls (i.e. Storm Lateral 17, Sheet 53).

***Response: Storm profiles have been revised.***

17. Comment: Please include major and minor HGL's on all storm sewer profiles.

**Response: Major and minor HGL's have been added to the plans.**

18. Comment: Inlet 12 is called out but not shown on Storm Lateral 4.

**Response: The inlet has been added to the plans.**

19. Comment The low tailwater basin details shown on Sheet 68 should be on the 'Crowfoot Drainage Channel' sheets they are called out on.

**Response: All pipes are now discharging into drop structure stilling basins directly. (Low tailwater basins not necessary.)**

20. Comment: Please use the Town's updated street sign and manhole details. These have been uploaded to eTrakit.

**Response: The street sign and manhole details have been updated.**

21. Comment: Coordinate with Town staff regarding the phasing of the storm sewer. Developed flows must be routed to a pond via storm pipe. The Town will not accept the FES shown at Bayou Gulch and N Pinery PKWY.

**Response: Filing 1 plans are revised to address this problem. The storm outfall and pond have been added to Filing 1.**

22. Comment: Only show the signing and striping for Filing 1 in the signing and striping plan. Please also remove 'ultimate' signs from the plan.

**Response: Ultimate signs have been removed and only signing and striping for filing 1 is shown.**

23. Comment: Please coordinate design parameters of the 6'x6' box culvert with the drainage report sizing calculations.

**Response: UD-culvert sheet added to drainage report. All culverts are designed per Town of Parker criteria.**

24. Comment: Add the 100-year HGL to 6'x 6' box culvert on page 52.

**Response: The 100 year HGL has been added.**

25. Comment: Add a check structure on Lemon Gulch downstream of the regional detention pond outfall as previously discussed. This will also be subject to Urban Drainage review for maintenance eligibility.

**Response: The check structure has been added.**

26. Comment: Increase the limits of VH riprap protection at the 48" pipe outfall at channel station 11+50 to 3' vertically along the channel banks.

**Response: A headwall has been added, the pipe length shortened, and the rip rap extended.**

27. Comment: Please provide reduced scale plan views of each drop structure showing detailed existing/proposed grading contours, pertinent spot elevations, limits of riprap and

cutoff walls, appropriate sizing dimensions, and limits of proposed sculpted concrete. Also, please show variability in the steps of the concrete to discourage straight edges on each step.  
**Response: 1" = 10' scale added for each of the 6 drop structures. Please refer to the tables on sheets 81 and 82 for the above requested drop structure information.**

28. Comment: Please modify the 48" RCP and 36" RCP outfalls at station 11+50 to a headwall/wingwall configuration to eliminate the exposed pipe condition that will result from the currently proposed pipe/FES configuration.

**Response: A headwall has been added, the pipe length shortened, and the rip rap extended.**

29. Comment: Please show the 100-year water surface elevation on all channel plan views.

**Response: 100-year WSEL has been added.**

30. Comment: Please show the limits of the proposed drop structures on all plan views of the channel.

**Response: Specific drop structure detail sheets have been added to show all limits of the drop structure. Limits of drop structures also added to all plan view sheets.**

31. Comment: Adjust the 36" pipe outfall to terminate in the stilling basin for Drop #1.

**Response: 36" pipe outfall now terminates in the stilling basin.**

32. Comment: Redirect the 30" pipe outfall in the Drop 4 basin to Drop #3 stilling basin.

**Response: This revision would raise the outfall pipe 4', which means the HGL will increase 4'. Also, the change decreases the slope in the pipe from 3.56% to 2.5%. With the reduced slope and higher HGL, the system 'busts' upstream. No change has been made.**

33. Comment: Please show the drop structures stilling basins in the profile for the channel.

**Response: Stilling basins now shown in the profile.**

34. Comment: Please show the drop structure stilling basins in the details on sheet 66 as a sump with the adjacent downstream channel elevated above the stilling basin.

**Response: Depressed stilling basins used.**

35. Comment: Please adjust the grading contours of the proposed channel to reflect the actual condition of the proposed drop structures.

**Response: Contours revised to show the drop structures. However, the contours are for visual representation only. CVL provided drop structure details with a table for the contractor to build from.**

36. Comment: Please call out the channel bend radii to ensure it is in conformance with Urban Drainage Criteria (no smaller than 2 times the 100 year width).

**Response: Channel bend radii shown. Channel is well within criteria.**

37. Comment: Show erosion control blanket in the channel and banks up to the 100-year depth to protect the seed in the establishment period. Also call out topsoil stripping and

replacement along the channel and regional detention pond slopes, and if adequate topsoil is not generated it will need to be imported to amend the channel and banks.

***Response: Erosion control blankets have been shown. Callouts have been added.***

38. Comment: Please refer to the west channel as Crowfoot Gulch and place callouts on the drawings.

***Response: West channel has been changed to Crowfoot Gulch.***

39. Comment: Please show the 100-year floodplain in Lemon Gulch for the regional detention pond outfall AND the offsite water line crossing. Indicate the water line depth for the offsite water line crossing of Lemon Gulch and also show erosion control blanket on the slopes of the channel. Also provide permits from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers for the work within Lemon Gulch for the regional detention pond outfall, check structure, and the offsite water line crossing.

***Response: Complete. See Overall Drainage Map Sheet 1A***

Please reference Section 7 in the *Town's Storm Drainage and Environmental Criteria Manual* in regards to the following comments; note that these comments apply to all ponds in the development:

40. Comment: Provide an outlet structure plan view per Figure 7.5 Please revise dimensions to comply with the detail.

***Response: The Pond outlet structure has been updated.***

41. Comment: The Town would prefer that the outlet pipe invert be at the bottom of the secondary chamber as shown in Figure 7.5.

***Response: Outlet pipe cannot be revised in some locations due to slope constraints. Any area below outlet invert will be filled with concrete to avoid standing water.***

42. Comment: Show the minimum 4" initial surcharge elevation on the outlet structure profile.

***Response: Initial surcharge elevation has been added.***

43. Comment: Add manhole steps to the micropool.

***Response: Manhole steps have been added.***

44. Comment: Please use the most updated UDFCD detention workbook to evaluate the need for a 100-year restrictor plate.

***Response: Ponds are sized using CUHP/SWMM methodology (preferred method for areas greater than 110 acres) that provides slightly different values than UD-Detention spreadsheets.***

45. Comment: Add a note to the outlet structure profile stating that "no gap shall be present at the top of the structure between the well screen and the orifice plate."

***Response: Note has been added.***

46. Comment: Add the diagonal standard bar grated ‘trash rack’ shown in Figure 7.5’s micropool.

**Response: Trash rack has been added.**

47. Comment: Show the topsoil cover and type 2 bedding material thicknesses on the emergency spillway profile.

**Response: Topsoil and bedding material thickness have been added.**

48. Comment: Show the direction of flow on the emergency spillway profile.

**Response: The direction of flow has been added.**

49. Comment: Ensure the embankment width is the minimum 10 feet.

**Response: Grading revised to show minimum 10’ embankment.**

50. Comment: Callout the riprap being extended 10 feet upstream of the wall.

**Response: Callout has been added.**

51. Comment: Please revisit the WSE’s shown on the emergency spillway profiles. The Pond A detail shows the 100-year and the emergency overflow elevations as the same.

**Response: The WSE’s have been modified.**

52. Comment: The maximum inlet grate size is 3’ by 4’.

**Response: Pond outlet structures have been revised.**

53. Comment: Show WSE’s on pond layout sheets.

**Response: The WSE’s have been added to the pond layout sheets.**

54. Comment: Callout type 2 bedding material under the outlet structure, forebay, and trickle channel.

**Response: Type 2 bedding has been added.**

55. Comment: The Town requires 4% minimum pond bottom slope tying into the trickle channel; the pond details show 2%. Please revise,

**Response: Ponds revised per City of Parker criteria.**

56. Comment: Provide maintenance access details per Figure 7.4.

**Response: Maintenance access details have been added.**

57. Comment: Please add a forebay detail per Figure 7.1. Ensure a maintenance access ties into the forebay walls as shown. Each pond must provide access to the forebay(s) and outlet structure.

**Response: Forebay detail has been added.**

58. Comment: Provide an internal access ramp in the forebay.

**Response: An internal access has been added.**

59. Comment: Show pond details at a specific scale.

***Response: Details added per Town and UDFCD criteria.***

60. Comment: Please revise the orifice plate to have 3 vertical holes per UDFCD criteria.

***Response: Orifice plate has been updated.***

61. Comment: Please evaluate the need for energy dissipation, or baffles, in the forebays.

***Response: Forebay energy dissipation details added.***

62. Comment: Specify the grates to be used on the outlet structure, coarse bar or standard bar grating. Refer to Figure 7.5 in the Town of Parker Storm Drainage and Environmental Criteria Manual.

***Response: Notes have been added.***

63. Comment Show profile and details of detention pond outlet pipe, low tailwater basin, etc.

***Response: Profile details have been added.***

64. Comment: Soil riprap thickness should be 2 X D50.

***Response: Soil riprap thickness has been revised.***

65. Comment: show a detailed plan view of the detention pond on a separate sheet including trickle channel slope, and pond bottom slopes. Refer to Figure 7.3 for pond bottom grading requirements.

***Response: Separate sheets added for Pond A. Trickle channel and other relevant details provided for all ponds.***

66. Comment: Include storm sewer infrastructure details.

***Response: Storm infrastructure details have been added.***

67. Comment: Add note 17 to the Storm Drainage and Infrastructure Notes: Pipe bells shall not be cast into manhole bases or inlets.

***Response: Note has been added.***

### **Stormwater Review Comments**

The following comments concern drainage, erosion and sediment control, and non-point source pollution control issues for the subject property. They are based upon our review of the submittal documents against the criteria presented in the Town of Parker's, *Storm Drainage and Environmental Criteria Manual (SDECM)*, as revised, February, 2014. Additional regulatory and planning documents were utilized in the review, and are referenced in the comments where appropriate.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

### **Final Drainage Report**

68. Comment: The Town does not have slope requirements for storm pipe. However, the minimum flow velocity in each pipe should not be less than 5 ft/s. Please ensure all storm sewer meets this criteria.

**Response: All pipes maintain minimum velocity criteria of 3 ft/s.**

69. Comment: Please revise the drainage maps so that all areas of the map can be seen. For example, none of the sheets show the east side of the Bayou Gulch – North Pinery intersection.

**Response: Drainage Map D6 & D7 added to address comment.**

70. Comment: The ‘General Concept’ on page 5 lists 2 groups of sub-basins draining to Pond D and none to Pond C.

**Response: Drainage report updated.**

71. Comment: Please include units in the pond summary tables on pages 6 and 7.

**Response: Units have been added.**

72. Comment: Remove any references to ‘be provided with Final Drainage’ since this is the final report.

**Response: All callouts to final drainage have been revised.**

73. Comment: Please revisit the pond details; the values shown in the pond calculations do not correspond with those shown on the details.

**Response: All pond callouts and details now correspond.**

74. Comment: Please use the most recent UDFCD detention workbook for pond calculations and sizing.

**Response: UD-Detention sheet is used to calculate EURV & WQCV. CUHP/SWMMM is used to calculate 100 year volume.**

75. Comment: Please verify that the values shown in the UD inlet calculations match those shown in Standard Form SF-3, Storm Drainage System Design. For example, design point 1C shows 13.5 cfs for direct runoff and 73.0 cfs total runoff on form SF-3 in the major storm. The inlet calc sheet shows a Q peak required of 32.0 cfs.

**Response: Comment addressed through discussion with the city.**

76. Comment: Verify 100-year pond release rates.

**Response: Pond release rates have been verified.**

77. Comment: Add drop structure sizing calculations showing adequate protection from the hydraulic jumps, seepage cutoff wall depth sizing, overturning, and sliding resistance. The smaller drops may be subject to the simple sizing parameters following Urban Drainage Criteria, however, the larger drops will require additional calculations.

**Response: All drops are less than 5 ft that follows simple sizing parameters outlined in UDFCD criteria. In addition, all drops are analyzed in HECRAS. Please refer to channel sheets for more details.**

78. Comment: Please amend the drainage report to indicate that a floodplain development permit will be required for all work within the Lemon Gulch floodplain.

***Response: Note added under floodplain section.***

79. Comment: Please show the drainage maps with basins delineated as a backdrop for the SWMM routing figure for easy correlation of the CUHP/SWMM set up and routing information.

***Response: Maps have been revised.***

80. Comment: Please show the rating curves used in SWMM for the proposed detention ponds.

***Response: Rating curves have been added.***

81. Comment: Provide analysis for the back lot swale that drains to Pond C.

***Response: Analysis has been added.***

### **Sediment and Erosion Control**

82. Comment: Split all CBMP plans into an Initial Plan and an Interim/Final Plan.

***Response: All CBMP plans have been split into Initial Plan and Interim/Final plans.***

83. Comment: Clearly specify how phasing or staging for this project will work. Will the entire site be overlot graded at once, will this be phased according to the erosion control stages?

***Response: The grading will be phased according to the erosion control stages to keep the total area disturbed under the 40 acre maximum.***

84. Comment: Once the detention ponds are on line, any areas still in a rough graded state will need to drain to a TSB prior to draining to the detention ponds.

***Response: TSBs will remain in place until all rough grading is completed.***

85. Comment: Add ALL Town of Parker CBMP Notes and Details to the plan set.

***Response: All Town of Parker details have been added to the plans.***

86. Comment: All areas of disturbance need to be included within the LOC (storm outfalls, grading work, etc.)

***Response: LOC have been modified to include all areas of disturbance.***

87. Comment: Show outfall locations, depths, and volumes for TSBs.

***Response: Outfall locations, depths, and volumes have been added to the plans.***

88. Comment: Ensure silt fence is shown down-gradient of all disturbance, construction fence may only be used when up-gradient of all disturbance.

***Response: Silt fence has been verified to be down gradient of all disturbances and construction fence has been verified to be up gradient of all disturbances.***

89. Comment: Show debris and trash control on all streets in and adjacent to the site.

***Response: Debris and trash control have been added to the plans.***

90. Comment: Show erosion control blanket on both sides of the trickle channel in the detention pond.

***Response: Erosion control blanket has been shown on both sides of the trickle channel in the detention ponds.***

91. Comment: Show erosion control blanket on slopes steeper than 4:1.

***Response: Erosion control blanket has been shown on slopes greater than 4:1 except in future lots, which is only temporary grading.***

92. Comment: Specify the type of inlet protection.

***Response: Types of inlet protection have been specified in the plans.***

93. Comment: Show portable toilet protection in multiple areas.

***Response: Portable toilet protection has been added to the plans.***

94. Comment: Show rough cut street control on all roadways prior to paving.

***Response: The following note has been added to all CBMP sheets in the plan set: "All street cuts shall be controlled per the Rough Cut Street Control Detail. See BMP Details."***

95. Comment: Show surface roughening on all subdivision blocks.

***Response: Surface roughening has been added to all subdivision blocks.***

96. Comment: Show seeding, mulching, and crimping on all proposed subdivision blocks, parks, etc.

***Response: Seeding and Mulching has been added to all subdivision blocks.***

97. Comment: Show stabilized staging areas connected to VTCs where possible.

***Response: Stabilized Staging Areas have been added to all stages in the CBMP plans.***

98. Comment: Show temporary irrigation in all areas of permanent native vegetation that are not already served by permanent irrigation. Ensure that the temporary irrigation is also shown on the landscape plans.

***Response: Temporary irrigation will be shown on a separate irrigation design as a full site plan rather than per filing.***

99. Comment: Add note stating that it may be necessary to provide back of sidewalk protection and back of curb protection once home building has started.

***Response: The following note has been added: "It may be necessary to provide back of sidewalk protection and back of curb protection once home building has started."***

100. Comment: Add note stating: Install ECB in tree lawn after installation of curb and gutter and sidewalk. Typical throughout subdivision.

***Response: The following note has been added to the plans: "Install ECB in tree lawn after installation of curb and gutter and sidewalk, typical throughout subdivision."***

The submittal is not in general conformance with the Town of Parker's *Roadway Design and Construction Criteria Manual* and *Storm Drainage and Environmental Criteria Manual*. The submittal must be revised and re-submitted for review. All submittals should be through the Town community Development Department, accompanied by a letter that responds to each comment herein. Direct submittals to the Engineering Department will not be accepted.

## **DOUGLAS COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

### **Addressing Comments:**

Comment: Addresses will be proposed at time of residential plat submittals.

***Response: Acknowledged, addresses of the proposed irrigation meters have been added to the address plats.***

### **Engineering Comments:**

Comment: CVL needs to coordinate the Bayou Gulch Road and intersection design with Atwell. Currently Atwell has the east two lanes designed to the boundary between Cielo and the Trails at Crowfoot. CVL is proposing a lane transition from the east lanes to west lanes at the intersection of Shasta Daisy St. The two sets of engineering plans need to coordinate between themselves.

***Response: CVL and Atwell now coordinate between plans. CVL will transition Bayou Gulch Road from the west half section to the east half section just north of Cielo and will build an interim intersection at Shasta Daisy Road that extends to the east half section.***

### **Planner Comments:**

Comment: Thank you for providing the opportunity for Douglas County Community Development to provide comment. Douglas County Planning Services has reviewed the project for consistency with the Town of Parker and Douglas County Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) and Comprehensive Development Plan. The proposal is within Region 1 of the Town Urban Growth Area and is required to comply with Section 5.0 of the IGA. Following review of the development requirements within Section 5.1, the proposal appears compliant with the IGA requirements for development within the Urban Growth Area adjacent to a Community Separation Buffer Area.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

## **DOUGLAS COUNTY ASSESSORS OFFICE 20 - Marian Woodward**

1) Sheet 1: dedication statement first line has typo "od" instead of "of."

***Response: Typo has been fixed.***

2) Sheet 2: plat note #8 has incorrect totals for # of lots and tracts

***Response: Note 8 has been updated.***

3) Sheet 2: Tract Summary table shows ownership by Metro District, but there is no dedication or acceptance on the plat, so ownership will stay with owner/developer.

***Response: This has been revised.***

4) Sheet 3: Section corner of 3/4/9/10 is labeled as Parcel 1 Point of 'Beginning', but it should say 'Commencement.'

***Response: This has been revised to Commencement.***

5) Sheet 4: Overview layout of Sheets 15 & 17 doesn't match parcel configurations on individual pages (overview shows more lots than the detailed sheets).

***Response: The sheets have been revised.***

## **PARKER WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT**

### **Drayton Sanderson, Engineering Technician**

- Comment: Submit an executed Standard Improvement Agreement with all required exhibits.

***Response: Standard Improvement Agreement is being prepared by the town and will be submitted.***

- Comment: A wet stamped and signed Engineers Estimate with a 20 % contingency must be submitted for verification and District approval. The approved document will be an Exhibit for the Standard Improvement Agreement and Letter of Credit.

***Response: A wet stamped engineers estimate has been provided with this submittal.***

- Comment: A letter of credit or Cash in Lieu based on the approved Engineers Estimate must be submitted before final approval is granted.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

- Comment: A copy of the signed/recorded Final Plat must be provided to the District prior to construction plan approval.

***Response: A copy of the signed and recorded final plat will be provided.***

- Comment: All easements must be called out and shown on the plans as well as the Plat. The District requires single utility easements to be 30-foot exclusive PWSD easements and multiple utilities to be 50-foot non-exclusive PWSD easements (with 10-foot separation between any utility). ALL easements must be done by separate document (on the District's Standard Easement Agreement) regardless if they are done by Plat.

***Response: All easements are called out and shown on the plans and plat.***

- Comment: Submit completed PWSD Plan Requirements Checklist with the next submittal to ensure all plan requirements have been met. Checklist is available online at [www.pwsd.org](http://www.pwsd.org).

***Response: A complete checklist has been provided with this submittal.***

- Comment: List all fittings on overall utility and plan and profile sheets with numbers (manholes, blow offs, gate valves, butterfly valves, fire hydrants, air release valves, tie in locations, etc. i.e. TC-GV1 or TC-MH1).

***Response: All fittings have been called out on the plan and profile and overall utility sheets.***

- Comment: Please add an additional sheets to the plans in a smaller scale that show the entire overall utility plan in three sheets or less.

***Response: Additional sheets have been added.***

- Comment: Please send a full size paper copy of the plans for PWSD to review on the next submittal.

***Response: A full size paper copy of the plans has been included with this submittal.***

- Comment: Please revise the labeling & callouts. On sheet 10 the sanitary sewer line is called out as a 16" PVC WL.

***Response: Sanitary callouts have been revised.***

- Comment: On sheet 37 & 38 the plans show the proposed sanitary sewer main having an 18" DIP main tie into a 12" PVC main, then the 12" main ties into the 8" existing sanitary sewer stub out. As discussed in our meeting, please verify the size of the existing stub out. It is not an 8" main as shown on the plans; PWSD believes it is either a 24" or 27" main and stub-out. At the location the 18" proposed sanitary sewer main ties into the 12" main, please upsize the line to an 18" main from TC-SSMH-OS47 to the existing stub-out/tie-in location.

***Response: The lines have been revised.***

- Comment: PWSD does not like to use DIP for sanitary sewer mains due the corrosive nature of sanitary sewer flows and gases. Please consider using SDR-35 or SDR-26 PVC instead of DIP.

***Response: DIP was not intended, callouts have been revised to PVC.***

- Comment: On sheets 3, 8 & 9 please call out the LF of the proposed 16" DIP water main and add it to the materials list.

***Response: LF of DIP watermain has been called out and added to the materials list.***

- Comment: Please ensure the materials list on the cover sheet is correct and up to date. PWSD feel there are missing services lines on the materials list. Please review and ensure the linear feet of the proposed various sizes of main is accurate on the materials list.

***Response: Materials list has been revised.***

- Comment: Please show and call out on the overall utility plans what lots will require water and sanitary sewer service lines to be installed in this filing. Include the lot numbers and the filing number.

***Response: Service tables have been shown giving lot number, block number, filing, and stationing of the services to be installed with this filing.***

- Comment: Please callout PRV in the necessary locations.

***Response: No PRV is necessary for the Trails at Crowfoot site per the submitted master utility report.***

- Comment: Please show and call out in the plans & profile sheets what manholes will be outside drop manholes. Please note PWSD does not permit an inside drop manhole to have a drop greater than 18”.

***Response: No drop manholes are proposed.***

- Comment: Manholes over 20-feet in depth will require an intermediate platform. Please clearly label intermediate platforms on all manholes greater than 20’ in depth on the plan & profile sheets.

***Response: Intermediate platforms have been added to manholes over 20-feet in depth.***

- Comment: On sheet 8 please callout the proposed 16” X 12” reducer on the water main.

***Response: Callout has been added.***

- Comment: No more than one fire hydrant and/or 15 lots may be out of service with the closing of two or more valves.

***Response: Valves have been added to meet this requirement.***

- Comment: On sheet 6 additional gate valves are needed at the intersection of N Pinery PKWY and Rose Mallow St to insure no more than one FH is put out of service. An additional gate valve will need to be added on the West end of N Pinery PKWY just to the West of the fire hydrant near Crowfoot Valley Rd.

***Response: Valve has been added.***

- Comment: On sheet 4 on Scarlet Sage Ave in the stub-out location to the East, move the gate before the stub out terminates. This will make it easy to shut down when the main is continued to the East.

***Response: Valve has been moved.***

- Comment: Manholes must be installed at a distance not greater than 400’ in separation. On sheet 13 MH2 to MH3 is greater than 400’. Please add a manhole.

***Response: Manhole has been added.***

- Comment: On the profile sheets there are multiple instances where the storm sewer line crossing is miss labeled as a water line (WL). Please refer to sheet 18 profile view as an example. Please ensure all lines are correctly called-out.

***Response: Mislabeled crossings have been revised.***

- Comment: On sheet 26 please look at the sanitary sewer alignment. PWSD feels it may be possible to reduce the number of manholes (possibly up to 4 manholes) between MH170 to MH243.

***Response: Number of manholes has been reduced.***

- Comment: On sheet 28 including additional sheets there are no station or elevation numbers called out for the manholes, instead it is callout as ???, ???, ???. Also the 6” water line crossing is not called out in the plan and profile on sheet 28.

***Response: Missing stationing has been revised.***

- Comment: Please create a water and sanitary sewer service table that shows stationing information for each lots water and sanitary sewer service line.

***Response: A service table has been added to the plans for services being installed with this filing.***

- Comment: All proposed water main lowering’s are required to have low point blow off valves called out on the plans per PWSD standards. Please call out all necessary blow off valves in the plan and profile sheets.

***Response: Low point blow offs have been added to the plans.***

- Comment: Please call out all 6” water line crossings in the plans.

***Response: All 6” water crossings have been called out in the plans.***

- Comment: On sheet 7, there are no manholes called out, please callout and label all manholes.

***Response: All manholes have been labeled.***

- Comment: On sheet 38 MH47 in the profile, the callout is incorrect. The plans view shows two invert-ins going into the manhole yet in the profile only one invert is called out. Please call out all inverts into manholes.

***Response: All manhole invert callouts have been labeled on the plans.***

- Comment: On sheet 26, storm crossings are called out in the profile but not in the plan view. Please ensure that all relevant crossings are shown in both the plans view and profile view. Also the water line crossing at approximately STA 22+10 is not called out.

***Response: Filing 9 storm sewer has been shown for reference. Waterline crossing has been called out.***

- Comment: Please ensure that ROW and/or PWSD easements are called out on all relevant sheets. Please note, if ROW has not been dedicated before installation of PWSD infrastructure, temporary PWSD easements will be required.

***Response: All ROW and PWSD easements have been called out.***

- Comment: All water main stub-outs to future filings are required to have temporary blow-off valves.

***Response: Temporary blow offs have been added to all future filing stub outs.***

- Comment: The high point in the water main will require air-vac valves to be called out in the plan and profile sheets and installed to PWSD standards. Please see PWSD water specification section 4.2.6.

***Response: Air-vac valves have been called out at all high points in the water main.***

- Comment: Callout irrigation tap sizing and the proposed 5 location on plans including the overall utility plans.

***Response: Irrigation tap sizing and addressing has been shown on the plans.***

- Comment: Please add all necessary PWSD details sheets to the plans. For example PWSD sanitary sewer detail sheet S3.5 Cast in Place Manhole Base Detail is missing.

***Response: PWSD details have been added to the plans.***

- Comment: Provide a physical address for all proposed irrigation taps on the Landscape/Irrigation Worksheet in the space provided.

***Response: Addresses has been added to worksheets.***

- Comment: ET based Smart Irrigation Controllers with rain sensors are required on all projects. Choose a controller from the Districts approved ET Controller list and specify the manufacturer and model number on the irrigation worksheet.

[www.pwsd.org/pdf/Conservation/AvailableSmartIrrigationControlTechnologies.pdf](http://www.pwsd.org/pdf/Conservation/AvailableSmartIrrigationControlTechnologies.pdf)

***Response: Per conversation with Daryl at PWSD, currnet hunter controller is acceptable as it is a new smart controller on the market.***

- Comment: Please note that PWSD has listed multiple comments based on our specification for this review. Please note that it is the engineering firm's responsibility to ensure that all water and sanitary sewer plans conform to PWSD specifications. All comments must be addressed with a response let during the next submittal.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

### **SCO CONSULTING, LLC**

**Steve Ormiston, Consultant to DCSD**

Comment: DCSD has previously commented on preliminary plan for this project and has no further comments.

***Response: Acknowledged.***

### **URBAN DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT**

**Morgan Lynch, PE, CFM, Watershed Services Manager**

1. Comment: Please add the following note to the construction plans:

*The Urban Drainage and Flood Control District will conduct site visits during the project construction within or near the channel to observe construction for conformance with the approved plans and specifications. Please contact Mike Sarmiento, UDFCD construction manager (303-455-6227), [msarmiento@udfcd.org](mailto:msarmiento@udfcd.org) to schedule a preconstruction meeting. All structural and grouted boulder work require 48-hours prior notice to any construction or concrete placement. Standards and specifications for all outfall and channel work can be accessed at [www.udfcd.org](http://www.udfcd.org) under the References section. Failure to notify may result in project ineligibility.*

***Response: Note has been added to the plans.***

2. Comment: For the 48” RCP discharging into Lemon Gulch, please include a plan and profile with flow, velocity and Froude Number at the proposed outfall. Please extend the profile to the centerline of the major drainageway.

**Response: Profile added with all relevant details.**

3. Comment: Please provide details for the FED, detailing the cutoff wall, and proposed soil riprap.

**Response: These details have been added to the plans.**

4. Comment: Please confirm the riprap proposed at the outfall is sized for hydraulic conditions in Lemon Gulch. Type VL may be easily moved under minor storm conditions by the flow and velocity in Lemon Gulch.

**Response: Riprap has been upsized per flows in Lemon Gulch.**

### **XCEL ENERGY**

#### **Donna George, Contract Right of Way Referral Processor**

Comment: Public Service Company of Colorado’s (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the final plat for **Trails at Crowfoot Filing No. 1**. For future planning and 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 and that they are depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats:

Minimum ten-foot (10’) wide dry 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.

For alley-type lots, six-feet (6’) wide dry utility easements within the lots for natural gas facilities including space for service trucks to drive and eight-feet (8’) wide dry utility easements within the lots for electric facilities including space for transformers, pedestals, and cabling are required. If gas and electric are within the same trench, a ten-foot (10’) wide dry utility easement is required, not to overlap any wet utility easement.

**Response: Acknowledged.**

Comment: As the project progresses, the property owner/developer/contractor must complete the **application process** for any new gas service via FastApp-Fax-Email-USPS (go to: <https://www.xcelenergy.com/start, stop, transfer/new construction service activation for builders>) It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

**Response: Acknowledged.**

### **TOWN OF PARKER PLANNING DEPARTMENT, Stacey Nerger**

[snerger@parkeronline.org](mailto:snerger@parkeronline.org)

#### **Final Plat:**

1. Comment: Please refer to the attached “redline” comments within the Final Plat for staff’s requested changes.

Complied: Yes No Response:

**Response: Acknowledged.**

2. Comment: The Town recently adopted new language to be used as the Surveyor’s Certificate. Please use the following language:

*I, (name), a professional land surveyor licensed to practice land surveying in the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that the survey of (plat name) was made by me or directly under my supervision on or about the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_, and that the survey is based upon my knowledge, information and belief that all monuments exist as shown hereon; it has been prepared in accordance with applicable standards of practice, that mathematical closure errors are less than 1:50,000 (second order); and that said plat has been prepared in full compliance with all applicable laws of the State of Colorado dealing with monuments, subdivisions or surveying of land and all provisions, within my control, of the Town subdivision regulations. This survey is not a guaranty or warranty, either expressed or implied, and the accompanying plat accurately and properly shows said minor development plat and the survey thereof.*

*I attest the above on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of 20\_\_.*

*(Signature) \_\_\_\_\_*

*(Name) \_\_\_\_\_, P.L.S. # \_\_\_\_\_*

*For and on behalf of (Company Name) Surveyor's seal shall appear with this certificate.*

Complied: Yes No Response:

**Response: Surveyors Certificate has been updated.**

3. Comment: Please change all lots on the plan to be Tracts. All tracts which are designated for future construction shall have notes on the plat which state they are unbuildable. Tracts for open space purposes will have a separate plat note about being for open space purposes.

Complied: Yes No Response

**Response: Lots have been changed to tracts and notes added.**

4. Comment: Please ensure that all open space tracts meet the requirements outlined within the Amended and Restated Stroh Ranch/Hess Ranch Annexation Agreement (Southern Property). Based on the Annexation Agreement, open space shall be conveyed on the southern parcel in 31 separate tracts based on the exhibits.

Complied: Yes No Response:

**Response: Open space tracts now meet the annexation agreement except open space 24 which has been divided into 2 tracts – one in filing 1 and one in filing 9.**

5. Comment: Please add a note to the plat which states that all tracts for future development are being platted as an unbuildable tract. The note shall read as follows:

Tracts ABC are hereby established as unbuildable tracts and shall require a replat for future development. No portion of this tract shall be developed, which includes earthwork, surface improvements or the erection of any structure, temporary or otherwise, except as provided in the construction drawings and the associated subdivision agreement approved by the Town of Parker as park of Trails at Crowfoot Filing No. 1.

Complied: Yes No Response:

**Response: Notes have been added.**

6. Comment: Please add a note to the plat which states that all tract for open space are being platted as an unbuildable tracts. The note shall read as follows:

Tracts ABC are hereby established as open space tracts. No portion of these tracts shall be developed, which includes surface improvements or the erection of any structure, temporary or otherwise, with the exception of underground utility easements which include the installation of underground utilities to connect Planning Areas with utilities which include, but are not limited to, water and sewer mains, stormwater mains, electrical, telephone and cable television and as identified within the associated subdivision agreement approved by the Town of Parker as park of Trails at Crowfoot Filing No. 1.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response: Notes have been added.**

**Landscaping Plan:**

7. Comment: Please refer to the attached “redline” comments within the Landscape Plan for staff’s requested changes.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response: Revisions to plans were made per staff’s request. Please see individual sheet responses below:**

**Sheet L0.0-** All landscaping along Crowfoot Valley Rd. will need to be identified or mention when this landscaping will be added.

**Response: ROW landscaping along Crowfoot Valley Road is not included on the Filing 1 Landscape Plans but will rather be developed with construction of Crowfoot Valley Road’s ultimate build-out at a future date by others. However, additional trees have been added near the major intersections at Crowfoot Valley Road in areas that won’t be disturbed when the ROW is widened at a future date.**

**Sheet L1.0-** All open space tracts which are dedicated as part of Filing No. 1 shall be landscaped in accordance with the Town's open space requirements. Please provide landscaping for all open space tracts. Please identify all landscaping that will be added along Crowfoot Valley road.

**Response: ROW landscaping along Crowfoot Valley Road to be developed with construction of Crowfoot Valley Road ultimate build-out at a future date. All open space tracts have been landscaped in accordance with Town’s open space landscape requirements with the exception of tracts with passive open space. These tracts with passive open space that are disturbed by construction are to be re-seeded with native seed and returned to their “original natural state where possible and appropriate” per Goal 10 of the town’s Open Space, Trails and Greenway’s Master Plan.**

**Sheet L1.1-** All open space tracts which are dedicated as part of Filing No. 1 shall be landscaped in accordance with the Town's open space requirements. Please provide landscaping for all open space tracts.

**Response: All open space tracts have been landscaped in accordance with Town’s open space landscape requirements with the exception of tracts with passive open space. These tracts with passive open space that are disturbed by construction are to be re-seeded with native seed and returned to their “original natural state where possible and appropriate” per Goal 10 of the town’s Open Space, Trails and Greenway’s Master Plan.**

**Sheet L1.2 -**These existing trees are to remain correct? If so, please add “to remain”.

Is this landscaping being completed within filing 1 or 9?

When is the landscaping along this side of the road to be completed?

**Response:** *“Existing trees to remain” note has been added. Note has also been added that landscape outside of the ROW on east side of Bayou Gulch to be completed in as part of Filing 9 Landscape Plans. Future landscape to be completed as part of the ultimate roadway condition will be built as a future date by others. Monument landscaping shall remain as currently shown because it is being completed as part of Filing 1 Landscape Plans.*

**Sheet L1.3** - Please remove the fence off of this plan unless the fence will be constructed as part of Filing 1. Please add what the groundcover will be located behind the sidewalk within this area.

**Response:** *Fencing shall remain as currently shown because it will be constructed as part of Filing 1 Landscape Plans. In regards to groundcover located between sidewalk and rear lots on west side of Bayou Gulch Road, note has been added stating “areas disturbed by grading to be seeded per engineering drawings”. Temporarily irrigated native seed will be installed behind the sidewalk and permanently irrigated native seed will be installed in front of the sidewalk and along the ROW in this area.*

**Sheet L1.10**-Please add a note to this sheet for the limits of landscaping within this filing.

**Response:** *Note has been added to show Filing 1 limits of work.*

**Sheet L1.11**- With which filing is the median and streetscape in these areas being constructed?

**Response:** *Landscape has been added to the median and tree lawn to be included in Filing 1 Landscape Plans.*

**Sheet L1.12**- Please identify the location of the Parker Lights and provide a detail of these lights within this plan set.

**Response:** *Light pole locations have been added to plans and identified. Note has been added to refer to engineering plans for details and specifications.*

**Sheet L1.13** – Landscaping is required in all open space tracts dedicated by Filing 1.

**Response:** *All open space tracts have been landscaped in accordance with Town’s open space landscape requirements with the exception of tracts with passive open space. These tracts with passive open space that are disturbed by construction are to be re-seeded with native seed and returned to their “original natural state where possible and appropriate” per Goal 10 of the town’s Open Space, Trails and Greenway’s Master Plan. However, additional trees have been added near the major intersections at Crowfoot Valley Road in areas that won’t be disturbed when the ROW is widened at a future date.*

Please identify the location of the Parker Lights and provide a detail of these lights within this plan set.

**Response:** *Light pole locations have been added to plans and identified. Please refer to engineering plans for details and specifications.*

**Sheet L2.0** – Please only include the fence detail that is fencing that will be constructed as part of Filing No. 1. If fencing not constructed as part of filing 1, please remove.

**Response:** *Both open rail cross buck fence detail and privacy fence detail will remain on plans as they will be constructed as part of Filing 1.*

**Sheet L3.0** – This will be considered a sign and will require a separate sign permit.

**Response:** *PCS acknowledges that a separate sign permit will be required and will be submitted following the approval of the final landscape plans.*

**Sheet L3.1** – All signage will require a separate permit.

**Response:** *PCS acknowledges that a separate sign permit will be required.*

8. Comment: Please add notes showing where the limits of Filing No. 1 are. This could include notes stating “No a Part of this plan” or “To be completed as part of Filing No. ??”.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response:** *Notes have been added on individual sheets differentiating between Filing No. 1 limits and other work to be completed as part of future filings.*

9. Comment; Per the Town of Parker Construction Specification and Design Considerations of Parks, Trails and Streetscapes 1 “Parker Light” is required for every 100 – 150 linear feet within the median planter beds. Lights shall be provided to meet this requirement within all median planter beds. Please identify where these lights will be located. In addition, please provide a detail for this light within the plans.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response:** *Light pole locations have been added to plans and identified. Note has been added to refer to engineering plans for details and specifications.*

10. Comment: All open space tracts which are dedicated as part of Filing No. 1 shall be landscaped. Please provide landscaping for all open space tracts dedicated as part of Filing No. 1.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response:** *All open space tracts have been landscaped in accordance with Town’s open space landscape requirements with the exception of tracts with passive open space. These tracts with passive open space that are disturbed by construction are to be re-seeded with native seed and returned to their “original natural state where possible and appropriate” per Goal 10 of the town’s Open Space, Trails and Greenway’s Master Plan.*

### **Crowfoot Valley Road:**

11. Comment: The Town will require an 8 foot sidewalk to be constructed along Crowfoot Valley Road. Please show the sidewalk to be constructed along Crowfoot Valley Road. This sidewalk will need to be constructed along the entire frontage of Crowfoot Valley Road.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response:** *Sidewalk, landscape & full build-out of Crowfoot Valley Road will not be completed as part of this development. This should be completed when Crowfoot Construction Documents are completed. Filing 1 Plans have been revised to show a 12’ wide trail further away from Crowfoot Valley Road as an interim condition.*

12. Comment: Streetscape will need to be provided along Crowfoot Valley Road in accordance with the Town’s landscape requirements. Please add this landscaping to the landscape plans for Filing No. 1. In addition, landscaping will need to be provided along the entire frontage of Crowfoot Valley Road and any areas which will be future right-of-way within Crowfoot Valley Road will need to be vegetated.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response:** *Streetscape landscaping along Crowfoot Valley Road to be developed with construction of Crowfoot Valley Road ultimate build-out at a future date.*

### **General:**

13. Comment: A draft subdivision agreement is being written. As soon as the agreement is completed a copy will be forwarded to the applicant.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response: Acknowledged**

14. Comment: Please submit a separate cost estimate for the streetscape and the tract landscaping that will be completed as part of Filing No. 1. These cost estimates are included within the Subdivision Agreement.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response: A separate cost estimate for streetscape and tract landscaping has been provided as part of Filing No. 1.**

### **OUTSIDE REFERRAL AGENCY COMMENTS**

15. Comment: Please address all outside referral agency comments with a written response. Copies of these comments can be found within the case file in TRAKiT.

Complied:  Yes  No Response:

**Response: All monuments have been moved out of the easements per the F1 Landscape IREA comments.**

### **RE: Trails at Crowfoot Filing 1 Engineering Memo\_R1**

Landscape Plans

9. On future submittals, include a visual scale and ensure no trees are proposed within 7 feet of any storm sewer infrastructure.

**Response: Visual scales are present on all landscape plans and proposed trees locations have been adjusted to not be within 7 feet of any utilities.**

10. Show sight triangles on the landscape plan and ensure no trees or landscape above 2 feet are proposed within the sight triangles. Please only show sight triangles for the interim condition.

**Response: Sight triangles have been added and labelled on plans for interim conditions only. No landscape within triangles exceeds a 2 ft. height. Note has been added that any trees located within site triangles shall be pruned so that the canopy of tree is 8 ft minimum height.**

If you have any additional questions please do not hesitate to contact me directly at 720-249-3588

Sincerely,

**CVL Consultants of Colorado, Inc.**

Brian Wilson PE