

Traffic & Safety

Region 1

2829 W Howard Place, 2nd Floor
Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation
Region 1

Project Name: Canyons Far South

Print Date: 4/8/2025

Highway: 86

Mile Marker: 102.117

A comment response letter is REQUIRED along with the next submittal.

Review POC: Eyl, Aaron

Environmental Comments:

No Planning concerns

If cdot row is treated by post construction water quality treatment, we will need to discuss areas requiring cdot design standards and supplemental documentation.

For ANY ground disturbance/work within CDOT ROW---

Required:

Arch/History/Paleo:

Since this is a permit, a file search for Arch, Paleo and History is required. If the file search identifies anything, a more extensive report will be required. If nothing is identified, then the file search should be sufficient. For the file search contact:

Cultural/History File Search: <https://www.historycolorado.org/file-access> Email: hc_filesearch@state.co.us

Paleo File Search: Colorado University Museum of Natural History - Email: jacob.vanveldhuizen@colorado.edu
and <https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>

The ECIS will be used to support HazMat requirements.

Non-historic 4f does not apply.

If any non-historic Gf properties will be impacted or disturbed applicant shall coordinate with Veronica McCall
veronica.mccall@state.co.us

Info for Applicant/Contractor:

The Permittee shall complete a stormwater management plan (SWMP) which must be prepared with good engineering, hydrologic, and pollution control practices and include at a minimum the following components: qualified stormwater manager; spill prevention and response plan; materials handling; potential sources of pollution; implementation of control measures; site description; and site map.

In addition, the Permittee shall comply with all local/state/federal regulations and obtain all necessary permits. Permittee shall comply with CDOT's MS4 Permit. When working within a local MS4 jurisdictional boundary, the permittee shall obtain concurrence from the local MS4 that the local MS4 will provide construction stormwater oversight. The local MS4 concurrence documentation shall be retained with the SWMP.

Clear Zone: It is the responsibility of the engineer/architect who stamps the plans to ensure that: any new landscaping/trees are outside of the clear zones for any State Highway/COOT ROW and that the new landscaping/trees do not interfere with site lines from any State Highway/COOT ROW.

Landscape: Any new or changes to existing landscaping within CDOT ROW must be reviewed and approved by CDOT. Landscaping plans should be submitted and should include details of all proposed plant species and seed mixes/ratios

2/8/2023: Environemtnal review will continue once file reasearch results are received.

QUESTION: Will CDOT be treated by post construction water quality treatment? Is so, we need to set-up a meeting sooner than later to discuss.

1/8/2024: From CDOT WQ Specialist: We would like the applicant to provide a statement as the drainage report indicates that OSI and OS2 (including Founders Pkwy) will be treated by full spectrum WQ ponds. However, when we look at the plans, we do not really see delineations indicating what (if any) pavement of Founders Pkwy will be going to a WQ pond.

2/18/2025: Environemtnal review will continue once file search results are received.

Hydraulics Comments:

Please provide drainage memo/report when available for review
also available for a site visit if needed Samer 1-23-2023

Please provide drainage memo/report when available for review
also available for a site visit if needed Samer 2-22-2023

I took a look at the report, the drainage looks fine and I have no further comments
Samer 1-11-2024

the drainage is good with this location
Samer 2-26-2025

Permits Comments:

1-9-24

- No objection to the residential and commercial development.
- Access for this development appears to be off Founders Pkwy (SH 86) and what is currently being called Commercial Ave. Commercial Ave also connects to the Canyons South development. This access has an issued access permit #123057, however NTP has not been issued. This access permit is associated with the Canyons South development.
- Any signing for this development must be on premise and cannot be either partly or wholly in COOT Right-of-Way. Signing must be compliant with CDOT rules governing outdoor advertising per 2 CCR 601-3.
- Working from or within CDOT ROW will require a utility/special use permit. This includes, but is not limited to survey, landscaping, or utility work. Application is made on line at the following link:
<https://cdotpermits.force.com/portal/s/login/?ec=302&startURL=%2Fportal%2Fs%2F> -- Aaron Eyl 1-9-24

2.21.25

- Provide a comment response letter addressing all of CDOTs comments individually with the next submittal.
- Label CDOT ROW on all plans. Example - If the ROW is currently labeled "Existing ROW" and the ROW is CDOTs, it should be labeled "CDOT ROW" or "Existing CDOT ROW"
- Please keep in mind that working from or within CDOT ROW will require a utility/special use permit. This includes, but is not limited to survey, landscaping, signal or utility work. Application is made online at the following link: <https://cdotpermits.force.com/portal/s/login/?ec=302&startURL=%2Fportal%2Fs%2F> -- Aaron Eyl 2.21.25

2/24/25 - TRM - Please include 3rd party inspections. Permitted working hours for a single lane closure will be 9am to 3pm, or 6pm to 6am.

3.31.25

- Page 5 of the Updated Construction Plans show a driveway that is labeled "Remove Asphalt Driveway." This appears to be an existing access that will be closed. Please keep in mind that all closures require an Access Permit form our office.
- The State Highway Access Permit will cover any access work, sidewalk work, street lighting, and stormwater work. Any work outside of that including, but not limited to, landscaping, signal, survey, or utility work will require a Special Use/Utility Permit. Application is made online at the following link:
<https://cdotpermits.force.com/portal/s/login/?ec=302&startURL=%2Fportal%2Fs%2F>
- Provide a comment response letter addressing all of CDOTs comments individually with the next submittal.
- Label CDOT ROW on all plans. -- Aaron Eyl 3.31.25

Residential Engineer Comments:

4/7/2025 JB - Here are my comments:

- What is the design speed that you are using? I will need this in order to review these updated plans to make sure design standards are being met.

- Need to see typical sections for SH-86 for lane widths, lengths, tapers, etc.

- I don't see a note talking about color and pattern for the proposed median cover. Need to be sure you match both. I have uploaded a plan sheet showing the median cover detail and what we used on our CDOT project. Beware, we have since gone to placing expansion material every 50' coinciding with control joints instead of 200' to help with median cover cracking and heaving.

- It looks like you are using Type I-M curb and gutter in the median. We used Type II-M on previous project to help with drainage spread width. Be sure to use Type II-M everywhere to be consistent with curb and gutter on both ends of your project.

- Hard to tell, but the WB accel taper looks to be a little short. Getting the typical sections will help with this.

- The WB left turn decel length/storage looks to be a little short while the taper looks to be a little long. There is room within the median to adjust.

- Curb ramps should be directional. Also, you need curb ramps on southern access across from Embark Ave. since you have curb ramps directing them that way on the north side.

- Is it possible to have Storm Lateral 1 be more perpendicular instead of at a skew as it is designed today?

- Has CORE Electric been consulted on how to get into their access now that the median has been closed at their driveway? They have some big vehicles/trailers and they needed that EB left turn into their access to fit that bigger vehicle. It looks like the access has gone to a right in-right out.

2/13/2025 JB - Doesn't look like anything has changed, roadway design related, regarding Founders Parkway. I will say previous comments from 1/5/2024 still apply, especially the coordination needed with local agencies like Douglas County and Castle Pines regarding the Happy Canyon interchange project. Will wait for more detailed plans to confirm if new improvements along Founders Parkway meet standards.

1/5/2024 JB - It sounds like construction drawings are coming in the future, but wanted to make everyone aware of what my previous comments were regarding the previous permit:

- Would be good to see a typical section on Founders Parkway that shows what the work will be, as well as existing/proposed ROW lines, to make sure everything matches up with plan views.

- Need to be sure to keep the raised median intact on Founders Parkway when it is revised to include auxiliary lanes. There was discussion early on from the developer to stripe it instead of keeping the raised median. COOT wants the raised median to stay.

- Be sure to make sure auxiliary lanes are standard in width, length, etc. Also be aware of the clear zone as this is on the outside of a curve for westbound traffic and may need to be protected if proposed obstructions are installed within clear zone.

- There is a 1601 process for the 1-25 & Happy Canyon interchange currently underway. The interchange will be upgraded in the future to include the new growth in this area as there will be new connections from Crowfoot Valley to the 1-25 & Happy Canyon interchange. Any changes to this development should be conveyed to the Town of Castle Pines as that may impact their traffic study and design for the new interchange.

1/20/2023 JB - There will be a future COOT resurfacing project from Woodlands to IREA substation on SH-86. It is still being looked into, but a sidewalk may be added to the COOT project and may need to be coordinated with this future project. Will wait to see future plans for this project to see how new intersection ties into SH-86.

Right Of Way Comments:

1/17 /23 - The CDOT ROW plans for this area of SH-86 have been uploaded. Will there be a forthcoming subdivision plat to review? Are there plans for dedicating ROW along SH-86? If so, those dedications should be made to the local agency and then will subsequently be deeded to CDOT in the future.

2/8/23 - No additional comments from ROW related to Rev 2.

12/19/23 - SDH - The comment response letter that was included with Rev 2 made reference to additional ROW conveyances that would be made to the Town along Founders Pkwy., but I don't see those shown on the Site Development Plan sheets that show SH-86 (Sheets 7, 9, 19 & 23). Should we expect to see a subdivision plat that will show those ROW conveyance areas?

2/7/25 - SDH - Rev 4 docs reviewed. The tracts along Founders Pkwy (SH-86) have already been dedicated to the Town of Castle Rock and there are no A-line issues here, so no comments / concerns from ROW.

3/17/2025 - John Olson - Plats were submitted with Rev 5 - No Dedications to CDOT all to Utilities and Town of Castle Rock. Filing 1 Tracts K M L to Town adjacent to CDOT facilities no concern. Filing No 2 Tracts A and B to town - seperated from CDOT Facilties by Town of CR parcels - No concerns from ROW

Traffic Comments:

GRilling 04/03/2025

1. Provide comment response letter addressing previous comments
2. Revision 5 submittal PDP narrative (01/30/2025) states that units have gone from 474 to 515, including duplex development. This changes the trip generation, though I'm unclear if this is reflected in the TIS dated 12/18/2024. Please either update TIS or respond in the comment response letter that this is properly addressed by the 12/18/2024 TIS.
3. Construction plans- sheet 2 or 27- M&S standards plan list is out of date (there's a December 2024 version). Update this immediately before going to construction to make sure you have the latest version. Check the box for CDOT traffic control (S-630-1 and S-630-2) for use on state highways.
4. Construction plans- sheet 3 of 27- ToCR signage and striping notes, notes 2, 6, 7- be aware that CDOT may have different thicknesses and application rates, different materials requirements, etc. Verify you are following CDOT's specs for state highway applications.
5. Construction plans- PDF page 23 (signal plans page 2)- M&S plans list is out of date.
6. Reach out to Grant Rilling (grant.rilling@state.co.us) to get relevant project special provisions on signal equipment (if this will be a CDOT signal) and traffic signal notes (if this will be a CDOT signal)
7. All signals must meet warrants with existing volumes prior to installation. Projected volumes will not be accepted.
8. It's noted that the signal poles will be green. If this is a Castle Rock maintained signal (and they're responsible for repainting), this may be allowable. If this is to be CDOT maintained, I don't want to have to repaint. Please clarify who will be maintaining the proposed signal.
9. Signing and striping notes (from Castle Rock) might have the same issues as outlined in comment 4.
10. Will signal poles be constructed to the CDOT standards? S-614-40 and S-614-40A? Please label the pole standard, the caisson diameter, and the caisson depth for each corner.
11. How certain is the timing of the south leg? It looks like you're placing a NE caisson based on current CDOT standard, and I'd hate for that standard to be revised prior to the S leg being constructed.
12. Why aren't curb ramps being built as directional?
13. Electrical engineer stamped one line diagram required for signals on the state highway.
14. What type of communication will be utilized? I don't see fiber items, radio items, or cell modem items.
15. For the purposes of matching CDOT spec (assuming that's what you want to do), the item names for drilled caissons have changed to "drilled shaft". It's worth tabulating them as such if you want to make lookup in the CDOT spec book simpler.
16. Discuss whether a N/S crossing should be provided despite the S leg not yet being developed. It looks like a curb ramp for it is being built, and we don't want curb ramps to nowhere. Generally speaking, CDOT has been requiring crosswalks across mainline when new signals are built, regardless of if the other side is developed yet.

GRilling 02/24/2025

1. Trip generation has gone down from Revision 3. This is permissible.
2. Previous comments regarding intersection and signal plans still apply.
3. Page 12- striping appears off, though it might just be due to early stages.

- Hatching on SH86 between the WB to SB left turn lane and the through lane should be chevron.
 - Extension/guide lines through intersection aren't scaled right, etc. When a striping plan is developed, please label all stripes with material, width, inlay depth, color, pattern, etc per S-627-1.
 - Label lane widths on striping sheet (note that widths are not inclusive of gutter pan).
 - Through-right arrow on local street seems improper. Instead, I'd handle it with a sign stating "right lane must turn right" "at conceptual entrance 2", allowing for the right lane at entrance 1 to be gone through to get to entrance 2. Use weave striping for the accel out of 1, and you'll be alright. I worry with a through-right arrow that folks will think the through lane goes further, and will get them into the neighborhood.
4. Any signals have to meet warrants with existing volumes. No projected signal warrants will be allowed. Plan on "opening day" being without a signal, even if you expect to meet warrants in the near future.

GRilling 01/08/2024

1. Comments previously provided on "Canyons South" permit, and addressed by that developer.
2. Either this development, or the Canyons South development, will need to provide detailed plans of the intersection with SH86. Be aware that signal plans require an electrical one line diagram stamped by an electrical engineer, a SUE investigation (or equivalent in coordination with CDOT Utilities), and signal phasing diagrams.
3. Plan sheet 65 shows a 3-leg intersection. Sheet 97 shows a 4-leg. Please clarify, and make sure the final configuration (and any interim configurations) is properly analyzed in the TIS and/or traffic letter. If there is to be a fourth leg and signalization, it seems odd that there is no SB through lane at the intersection.
4. Looking at the Auto Turn templates, it appears that the curb ramps at SH86 are not directional. Why? Additionally, will there be a N/S crossing of SH86 at this signal? If there is to be one in the future, does this impact the median location or truck turning templates?

Kiene 1/18/23 - Proposed full movement intersection on SH 86 should conform to Access Control Plan / serve as the single allowed signalized intersection in this segment. Unclear on connection of "Connector Collector" roadway from Intersection #5 to the northwest, is there direct connection to Crowfoot Valley Road through the adjacent network?

Other Comments:

Generally for this zoning:

All access location along SH 86 should match the Access Control Plan (ACP).

Potential traffic signal locations are shown on the ACP. These intersections are preferred to be 4-way intersections. The safest locations for multi-modal crossings of SH 86 would be at a signalized intersections.

COOT supports completing the roadway network in this part of Castle Rock by ensuring intersections align with roadways planned on the west side of SH 86 providing more direct access and connectivity from Castle Oaks Dr to Front Street without reliance on SH 86.

Provide a cross section on the plan sheets for SH 86. That cross section and plan sheets so affected, need to illustrate for COOT how much RoW exists and how much is proposed so we might see that it is compliant with the SH 86 Corridor Optimization Plan (preferable a 156-ft roadway).

RS 01-12-23