

July 01, 2022
Merrick Project No. 65120950

Ms. Julia Duncan
Town of Parker
Development Review Division
Town Hall - 20120 East Mainstreet
Parker, Colorado 80138

Re: Compark Village South Filing 1 Amendment 2 – Engineering 3rd Review

Dear Ms. Duncan,

Merrick & Company has reviewed the comments dated June 17th, 2022, regarding the Compark Village South development. The following summarizes Merrick's responses to the comments provided by the Town of Park Development Review Division.

TOWN OF PARKER CIVIL/ROADWAY COMMENTS:
COST ESTIMATE:

1. Please update the project heading that references another project. Please add the Town's standard soft cost percentages – reference Chapter 3 of the Town's Roadway Criteria Manual – and show the required security at 110% of the grand total.
[Response: The project heading that references another project has been revised. The Town's standard soft cost percentages has been added, along with the 110% required security of the grand total.](#)

PLAT COMMENTS:

2. Tract A must be dedicated to the Metro District or other Owners Association. A pond tract must be owned by an entity that will have an ongoing interest in the property.
[Response: Tract A has been dedicated to the Belford South Metropolitan District.](#)
3. Please show the necessary sight triangles from both project access points to Belford Avenue, and all necessary Sight Easements per previous comments. It appears that the linework may have been turned off as labels for these easements appear.
[Response: The applicable sight triangles from both project access points to Belford Avenue within the Plat boundary have been added.](#)

CONSTRUCTION PLANS COMMENTS:
ROADWAY:

4. The referenced intersection sight distance exhibit could not be located on eTrakit. Please re-upload and notify staff, or email directly to Staff.
[Response: The intersection sight distance exhibit was sent over the following day of the last submittal](#)

Employee Owned



5970 Greenwood Plaza Blvd
Greenwood Village, CO 80111



Tel: +1 303-751-0741



hello@merrick.com
www.merrick.com

STORMWATER COMMENTS:

CONSTRUCTION PLANS – ENVIRONMENTAL GENERAL COMMENTS:

5. Please verify extents of Limits of Construction (LOC). Specifically, a portion of proposed linework for Bunny Hop Lane extends past the LOC on sheet C5.3. Please adjust the LOC to incorporate this additional area or alternatively remove this linework if this portion of road is not proposed with this project. Please note that while a response stated this had been addressed, the proposed linework for Bunny Hop Lane still extends beyond the Limits of Construction as shown.

[Response: The LOC has been verified and adjusted to extend beyond all proposed construction activities to include the portion at Bunny Hop Lane.](#)

6. Identify a block for the Inlet Protection for Curb Inlet On Grade (IPCOG) in the legend and provide the block at all appropriate locations on the plan sheet.

[Response: A block for the Inlet Protection for Curb Inlet On Grade \(IPCOG\) has been added to the legend and placed at all appropriate locations within the plans.](#)

INITIAL CBMP PLANS:

7. Provide and identify inlet protection for curb inlet on grade (IPCOG) for the existing inlet in Belford Avenue just downstream of the northeast entrance to the site. The addition of the IPCOG was noted on the Interim/Final sheets, but please note this is required for the initial sheet as well.

[Response: Curb inlet on grade \(IPCOG\) has been added for the existing inlet in Belford Avenue just downstream of the northeast entrance to the site.](#)

INTERIM/FINAL CBMP PLANS:

8. Provide a block for the Inlet Protection Curb on Sump (IPCOS) provided adjacent to building 8.

[Response: A block identifying Inlet Protection Curb on Sump \(IPCOS\) has been added.](#)

CONSTRUCTION PLANS STORMWATER:

9. Two inverts out coded for Manhole EX 1. Revise pipe network to appropriately reflect the correct inverts in and out for all connecting lines.

[Response: The Manhole EX 1 inverts have been revised to appropriately reflect the correct inverts in and out for all connecting lines.](#)

10. Provide a minimum of 0.2-feet of drop from any invert into a structure and the invert out of the structure. Specifically noted as not provided at MH B-11 (EX B-11).

[Response: The minimum 0.2-feet drop from any invert into a structure and the invert out of the structure has been checked and verified, specifically on MH B-11 \(EX B-11\)](#)

11. Provide a detail for the pond forebay which complies with Figures 7.1 or 7.2 of the Town's SDECM. Specifically noted bedding material depth and type, profile view with all pertinent dimensions, and the forebay notch cross section as missing from the details. Please also note the epoxy coated rebar are required for all drainage infrastructure and wire mesh reinforcement is not permitted as shown on the forebay cross section.

[Response: A detail for the pond forebay which complies with Figures 7.1 or 7.2 of the Town's SDECM has been added to the package. Bedding material depth and type, profile](#)



view with all pertinent dimensions, and the forebay notch cross section has been included. Epoxy coated rebar is used instead of the wire mesh reinforcement.

12. Invert into Manhole B-8 from the north is below the invert out of the structure. Revise so that the invert out of the structure is a minimum of 0.2-feet below any invert into the structure.

[Response: The invert below the invert out of the Manhole B-8 structure has been revised.](#)

13. Provide a minimum of 1-foot from the major storm's hydraulic grade line to the finished grade above any storm sewer. Specifically noted as not provided at Manhole B-10.

[Response: A variance request has been included with this submittal package for this comment.](#)

AZTEC COMMENTS:

PLAT COMMENTS:

1. Plat Cover – revise legal description per my comment on 4-28-22 “tract b and that portion of wolf fox street described as follows...”
[Response: legal description has been revised to include wolf fox street](#)
2. Plat Cover – 4
[Response: Revised](#)
3. Plat Sheet 2 – should this course (L55) be an arc as the drainage easement looks like it is intended to intersect the 15' UE
[Response: Revised](#)
4. Plat Sheet 2 – show a tie to the drainage easement from the plat boundary
[Response: Revised](#)
5. Plat Sheet 2 – this portion of the easement is outside the plat boundary – it should be dedicated by separate document
[Response: Revised](#)
6. Plat Sheet 2 – 4
[Response: Revised](#)
7. Plat Sheet 3 – see comment on sheet 4
[Response: Revised](#)
8. Plat Sheet 3 – add missing dimension tags
[Response: Revised](#)
9. Plat Sheet 3 – check for missing dimension tag
[Response: Revised](#)
10. Plat Sheet 3 – it is not clear what this dimension tag is to – show a “crows foot” leader or similar to be more clear-see also comment on sheet 4
[Response: Revised](#)



11. Plat Sheet 3 – it is not clear what these dimension tags c60 and c63 are to (the distance does not seem to scale correctly to match the graphic) – show a “crows foot” leader or similar to be more clear – see also comment on sheet 4
[Response: Revised](#)
12. Plat Sheet 3 – it is not clear what this dimension tag is to – show a “crows foot” leader or similar to be more clear – see also comment on sheet 4
[Response: Revised](#)
13. Plat Sheet 3 – see comment on sheet 4 (check radius of tag c4)
[Response:](#)
14. Plat Sheet 3 – it is not clear what this dimension tag c61 is to (the distance does not seem to scale correctly to match the graphic) – show a “crows foot” leader or similar to be more clear – see also comment on sheet 4
[Response: Revised](#)
15. Plat Sheet 3 – 4
[Response: Revised](#)
16. Plat Sheet 4 – revise bearing to match L56 + L57
[Response: Revised](#)
17. Plat Sheet 4 – Check distance due to comment on L58
[Response: Revised](#)
18. Plat Sheet 4 – See comment on sheet 3
[Response: Revised](#)
19. Plat Sheet 4 – See comment on sheet 3
[Response: Revised](#)
20. Plat Sheet 4 – these radius dimensions should be 715.00’ see comment on sheet 3
[Response: Revised](#)
21. Plat Sheet 4 – Sheet 4 of 4
[Response: Revised](#)

We hope we have adequately addressed your comments. If you have any questions, or need further clarification concerning the resubmitted plans, please don't hesitate to give me a call at 303-353-3695.

Respectfully submitted,
MERRICK & COMPANY



Kristofer K. Wiest, PE
Project Manager

