



October 8, 2020

BrieAnna Simon
Associate Planner
Town of Parker
20120 E. Mainstreet
Parker, CO 80138

RE: Douglas 234 Filing 6 Minor Development Plat – Engineering 2nd Review

Ms. Simon,

Please accept this letter as our response to engineering comments on the Douglas 234 Filing 5 Minor Development Plat Engineering 2nd Review as provided in the letter dated September 30, 2020. Responses to these comments are included in blue beneath the original comments.

MDP Minor Development Plat

1. It appears hatched area is intended to represent the multi-use easement but is being called out as a PWSD easement in the legend.
RESPONSE: The hatched area is intended to represent the limits of the 50' non-exclusive PWSD easement that is being dedicated by separate document. The multi-use easement overlaps the PWSD easement as they need to be dedicated by separate documents.

CP Road and Storm Construction Plans

2. Please confirm that it is not the intention to grade separate the lots. The overlott grading plan shows several cross-sections with berms that are not reflected in the contours.
RESPONSE: On the grading plan, in order to show interim grading patterns, we have added cross-sections showing where interim berms will be constructed consistent with the diversion ditches on the GESC plan sheets. As each lot is developed, the berms would be removed and on-lot drainage control measures will be constructed by each individual lot user.
3. Revise the “shark tooth” striping to be perpendicular to the direction of travel as shown below:
[image]
RESPONSE: We have revised the plans to provide the shark tooth striping consistent with the Figure 3C-1 detail example provided.
4. The Town requires trench drains on all collector roadways, please show trench drains per the Town detail on the south side of Red Sky and adjust the cost estimate accordingly.
RESPONSE: In accordance with email correspondence with Town engineering, there is nowhere to outlet the trench drains and the Town advised to disregard this change.

CE Public Improvements Cost Estimate

5. Add the crosspan being installed on Hess Road to the cost estimate.
RESPONSE: We have removed the crosspan Hess Road, crosspans are not allowed at arterial intersections. The hatching shown is indicative of the proposed pavement patch limits.
6. Revise the HMA line to assume 7-inches of asphalt and adjust the unit cost accordingly.
RESPONSE: We have revised to 7" accordingly. We have adjusted unit prices per the following comments.
7. Revise the base course line item to assume 12-inches of depth and adjust the unit cost accordingly.
RESPONSE: We have revised the base course assumption to 12" as requested.
8. Please revisit the unit costs for the roadway line items as they seem very low.
RESPONSE: We have reviewed unit costs against bid estimates for this project from contractors, please see updated unit costs attached.
9. The storm sewer improvements are private and do not need to be included in the cost estimate.
RESPONSE: We have removed the drainage costs from the estimate.
10. Add line item for demolition.
RESPONSE: We have added a line for demolition as requested.
11. There appears to be an error in the cost calculation for the 4" Solid Double Yellow Striping line item.
RESPONSE: We have updated calculations and the cost appears correct now, please see updated cost spreadsheet.

TS Traffic Study Comments

12. Traffic study comments will be coordinated directly with the applicant.
RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

SR Stormwater Review Comments

Road and Storm Construction Plans

1. Sheet 21: INL-11 still shows a rim elevation several feet above the top back of curb.
RESPONSE: We have corrected the surface which was drawn incorrectly, please see the updated plans attached.
2. Sheet 21: The SD20 profile structures or grades have seem to be shifted and the structure rims are shown several feet up in the area, please correct as originally shown.
RESPONSE: We have updated the surface which had shifted incorrectly, please see the updated plans attached.

3. Sheet 21: The SD10 & SD20 plan view should show the proposed pipe extending all the way to the existing inlet. Additionally, the existing inlet should be referenced as being removed in this view.

RESPONSE: We have updated plan view to clearly show the pipe extending to the Type D existing inlet. We have added a label to the inlet to be removed in plan view.

Grading and Erosion Control Plans

INITIAL CBMP PLANS

1. It appears the existing contours are no longer showing on the initial CBMP plan, please re-add.

RESPONSE: We have added the existing contours back, please see updated plans attached.

2. Include the proposed storm sewer connecting to the inlet on Red Sky Drive within the LOC and provide SF around the disturbed area.

RESPONSE: We have included the inlet connection on Hess Road within the LOC and updated the SF limits.

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

Sincerely,

Jack Scanlon, PE
Principal Project Engineer
RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY