

STATE OF COLORADO

Traffic & Safety

Region 1

2829 W. Howard Place

Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Project Name: **Parker Pointe**

Print Date: 12/20/2018

Highway:

083

Mile Marker:

56.846

Drainage Comments:

12-13-2017

They need to provide hydraulics/hydrology analysis show any impact to SH83 as a result of the proposed development

provide drainage map to show existing drainage patterns and the proposed patterns

take a closer look at conditions downstream of the development and make sure that the newley concetrated surface flows will be handled properly

the drainage comments has not been addresses

samer 12-19-2018

Environmental Comments:

12/11/2017 There is mapped occupied habitat for Preble's meadow jumping mouse within the portion of the CDOT ROW where the Parker Road widening would take place. Has the applicant received clearance or a permit from the USFWS?

~~12/18/2017 WQ comments attached~~

~~12/26/2017 A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the development by Ground Engineering on October 9, 2017. No Recognized Environmental Conditions were reported in this report. Based on this information, no additional investigation is warranted, and no mitigation is recommended. Therefore hazardous materials is given clearance for the subject permit.~~

~~4/2/2018 Still need response to comments made on 12/11/2017 and 12/18/2017.~~

12/5/2018 Applicant is working with the USFWS for applicable permits.

Traffic Comments:

Schnerer 12-8-17

After a review of the Traffic Study, and accounting for the recent improvements to the east leg of Stroh Rd, I find the conclusions and recommendations of the Study to be acceptable.

Schnerer 3-29-18

No further comments

Schermer 10-3-18

Sheet C5.15 -

Remove Item 8, no diagonal lines

Callout painted median width for left turn lane

Use double yellow lines for the painted left turn median

Sheet C5.16 -

Item 14 - callout 30-10-30 skip line type

Item 5 - The R3-5 sign is incorrect, use sign R3-7R, 36"x36" Add one R3-7R sign at the beginning of the right turn lane.

The signal pole and all related/required equipment in the southeast corner will need to be reset to the new island.

This will require a separate signal plan sheet and will need to be reviewed by CDOT signal staff.

Schermer 12-17-18

The traffic signal equipment issues in the SE island have still not been addressed. How is the signal pole reset? If it is remaining in place, how is the pole caisson adjusted to grade? Pull box resets? Signal head resets for EB traffic to align with the lanes? There needs to be a pedestrian push button and separate pole to cross Parker Rd. There are probably other issues such as traffic signal wiring and fiber optic signal communication lines.

Resident Engineer Comments:

12.11.18 TDM:

- Sheet C5.16, Road Plan @ proposed access point, STA ~49+00; both curb ramps shall be Type 4A (Directional) shall be used at this location.

10.15.2018 TDM:

- Sheet C5.16, 'Traffic Island Detail' (top right of sheet), Construction Note #9 should be a Type 3A curb ramp. Add sidewalk dimension.
- Sheet C5.18 – 5.20 cross sections, median toe-of-slopes shall be 6:1 or flatter.
- Sheet C5.21 -5.25 cross sections:
 - Toe-of-slope grade between back of walk to CDOT right-of-way line isn't provided. Preferably 4:1 or flatter.
 - CDOT Sidewalk M-609-1 should be noted.

03.29.2018 TDM:

Below comments still need to be addressed. Provide updated Civil plans when available.

12.22.2017 - TDM:

- For S. Parker Road, provide the below plans/details once available or once design has advanced:
 - Typical Section
 - Pavement
 - Removals
 - Roadway (widening for accel/decel)
 - Intersection Details (at Stroh and planned access)
 - Signing/Striping
- Detached sidewalk is preferred as this is a 55mph zone.
- Curb ramps within CDOT Right-of-way will be required to follow M&S Standards (M-608-1) (Revised on February 23, 2017)
- Add notation describing curb ramp types.

- Sheet C5.11, Curb ramp Type 4A (Directional) shall be used at proposed access point, as there is no planned sidewalk extending to the east into the development.

Permits Comments:

Extremely imperative that sufficient ROW is reserved for SH 83. Corridor Optimization Plan calls for a 175-ft ROW of SH 83 in this segment. Plans provided to not validate that sufficient ROW is provided. Utility easements abutting CDOT ROW are problematic in the event additional ROW must be obtained. Need to see plans for the ultimate roadway profile showing 3 northbound through lanes, plus the right & left turn auxiliary lanes at Stroh. Illustrations in the TIS (figures 5-12) are unclear if all of this fits within the existing ROW.

The Access Control Plan for SH 83 shows an A-line extending across the front of this property. The same plan shows the existing driveway serving the former Seccord farm ***"revise if property redevelops or if safety operations issues occur"*** Regardless of whether the proposed access is in the same location, a new access permit is required including a request to cross the A-line. It would appear by scaling the plan set provided, only 450-ft of spacing is planned from the proposed new access to the intersection at Stroh. I do not support offering an access with egress in the location proposed of SH 83 for the safety & operational reasons outlined below:

This segment of SH 83 is posted at 55 mph. State Highway access code designates this segment of abutting highway as NR-A. An attached sidewalk is not prudent for such a high-speed roadway facility (snow removal alone is but one reason). A safe pedestrian crossing will be necessary at the access point within SH 83 ROW:

Recommendations #2 & 3 (and 4 & 5) on the TIS are confusing, have typos/omissions and need to be more specific. Is the developer committing to a right-in-only access on SH 83 to avoid a substandard northbound acceleration weave approaching the intersection of Stroh Road (960-ft required)? Recommendation #3 seems correct ***"no traffic will be allowed to exit..."*** - totally confusing where & how patrons leave this property. Any new access onto SH 83 for consideration, needs to be moved to the most southern portion of the site (south side of lot 8A?) to accommodate a more appropriate northbound deceleration/acceleration and weave movement and to lessen the degree of the variance. This would be more consistent with the notation on the Access Control Plan. CDOT recognizes that the 600-ft deceleration approach to a re-positioned southern access would extend south of the property line, which needs to fit within the ROW:

The existing full-turn access constructed south of the property serves the Colorado Golf Property. This access was not utilized due to findings of Prebles mice along Kinney Creek + 15 years ago. Have updated studies been conducted to validate such restrictions are still in place? This proposed development & plat appears to inhibit any option or change of status that might re-open this access. Otherwise, the existing center median cut and left-turn movement on SH 83 south of Kinney Creek is anticipated to accommodate U-turn movements for southbound traffic on SH 83, going to this property. Conversely, to allow egress at the substandard 450-ft spaced access point, would invite traffic to cross over + 4 lanes of traffic to make a U-turn on SH 83 and head south. That potential maneuver is another safety concern.

Provide 2 cross-sections, one at the major Intersection, and one just before/upstream of the new right-in access on SH 83. Show detached sidewalks if the Town is requiring them and the edge of CDOT ROW. CDOT recommends consideration of a right-turn free flow movement and refuge island for pedestrian crossings at Stroh, consistent with the other 3 corners in the interest of shortening signal phasing for pedestrian crossings at this major intersection & improved safety.

Whereby the Town of Parker is an issuing authority, and this property is proposed to be brought under their purview, a meeting is recommended to in part discuss the issues identified above and the appropriate means of resolution.

As advisory: Any work in CDOT ROW is by permit. All private commercial advertising signs oriented to SH 83 must be outside of CDOT ROW and conform to rules for Outdoor Advertising.

~~RS 12-04-17~~

~~A site plan or plat did not accompany this submittal. Unable to ascertain if a design variance is in the making for the auxiliary right turn lane on SH 83 -- approaching the new access point and Stroh Rd. Figures in the TIS does not show the precise placement/location of the new right-in 'only' access being requested on SH 83. We were advised by the Town that the bridge to the south of the property creates limitations to repositioning the new right-in access further south. We were also assured a deceleration lane to be provided, originate near the bridge structure and extending the length of the property to Stroh to accommodate deceleration from 55 mph for both right turn movements. The mitigation measures on pp 9-10 of the TIS #2-6 are rather unclear if that (new) access & deceleration lane is going to be required or provided and its total length. CDOT request to review the access permit (to be issued by the Town?) to ensure appropriate terms-conditions are held -- and if a variance of code and standards is under consideration.~~

~~RS 03-29-18~~

~~Assuming the letter dated 06-25-18 from Perception Design Group that accompanied this revision "*.....that the access location has been resolved and right-in right-out access will be allowed*" is correct, without the need for design waivers, I have no further comment. The Access Permit for the new right in/out is initiated through the Town as an issuing authority; the NTP & design waiver (if required) is through CDOT. Re-work of the Stroh/SH 83 intersection's SW corner is also by access permit, of which needs to be from the Town to CDOT (Town can not issue a permit to itself)~~

~~Other work in CDOT RoW -- including signal modification (if required), landscaping and utility work is by separate permit applications.~~

~~Noted that a storm outfall appears to be directed to the south along SH 83 to Kinney Creek. We ID that the creek area is Prebles Mouse mapped-protected area -- hence why the full turn movement south of the property could not be utilized for access. We mention this to assure that the developer and Town assume full responsibility for all mitigation associated with this new discharge within/flanking our RoW.~~

~~RS 10-02-18~~

Discussions with Douglas County regarding RoW ownership along this parcel gives the County issuing authority for Access permitting. We ask that the permit ID any design waivers approved with respect to NTP plans.

Any work in CDOT RoW is by permit including utilities (pipe crossing, signal modifications) and landscaping. The sidewalk will be part of the Access permit.

- RS 12-19-18