

# tres birds

Date: 01.23.2026

Project: Red Mountain Ranch (RMR) – Parcel 1

Submittal: Major Development Permit (MDP) & Preliminary Plan Review (PPR) – R3 Submittal

Attention: Ryan Johnson, PE

## R2 Comment Responses: Public Works Department

Ryan Johnson,

Thank you for providing comments on the R2 MDP/PPR submittals for the Red Mountain Ranch (RMR) – Parcel 1. The following document contains the design team's responses to the comments dated **01.07.2026**. Those comments have been attached below for reference.

Your comments and our responses are written below in the following format:

Original comment; Rewritten in grey font.

**Response:** *written in black italics. Updated drawings will be noted here as applicable.*

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any questions or concerns regarding our comment responses.

Thank You,



David Hoffman  
Architect  
561.386.5528  
[dh@tresbirds.com](mailto:dh@tresbirds.com)

# tres birds

## Responses to Comments from Public Works Department:

### Items to be incorporated into a Development Agreement

#### 1. External Permit Requirements.

- a. At a minimum the following permits.
  - i. CDOT Utility (Special Use Permits') at the two utility main crossings located at the west end and east end of the site.
  - ii. CDOT Access Permit
  - iii. CDPHE Lift Station permitting
  - iv. UPRR Railroad Utility Crossing Permit for the water main crossing

**Response:** Acknowledged. The project team does not object to these items being included in a Development Agreement. External permits noted here can be incorporated as we work with the Town of Eagle to develop this agreement.

#### 2. Easement Requirements.

- a. The plan as submitted will need at a minimum the following offsite easements.
  - i. Dedication from the Town of Eagle for Sanitary sewer force main easement across parcel # 1939-333-14-003
  - ii. Dedication from the property owners Water Main utility easements across Parcels: 1939-331-18-003, and 1939-284-00-022

**Response:** Acknowledged. The project team does not object to these items being included in a Development Agreement. Easements noted here can be incorporated as we work with the Town of Eagle to develop this agreement..

#### 3. Maintenance responsibility of the pedestrian connection through the culvert under highway 6 should be dedicated to the developer/HOA

**Response:** Acknowledged. The project team does not object to these items being included in a Development Agreement. Maintenance responsibilities noted here can be incorporated as we work with the Town of Eagle to develop this agreement.

### General Comments

#### 1. At the link below comments are provided directly on the plan sheets

**Response:** Acknowledged. The project team has reviewed the sheet comments and has no objections. These sheets can be revised as directed following additional feedback from public hearings.

#### 2. Additional analysis of the downstream gravity sewer system along Nogal Road requires further investigation. This segment of system is known to have some flatter grades and previous study attempts appear to inadequately quantify the tributary population to these main segments.

**Response:** Acknowledged. As discussed during a coordination meeting with Planning and Public Works on 1/12/2026, the design team is committed to working with the Public Works in completing this additional analysis.

- a. Depending on the outcome of this analysis, the storage volume and max flow rate from the lift station may need to be adjusted.

**Response:** Depending on the outcome of that analysis, the design team will work with the Town of Eagle to identify and make reasonable adjustments to the lift

# tres birds

*station. These might include revisions to the storage volume, flow rate or flow timing if such adjustments can accommodate the results of the analysis.*

3. Strongly encourage exploration of a sewer alignment behind buildings 1, 2, and 3 this has the potential to eliminate one of the lift stations.

**Response:** *We are currently evaluating the feasibility of this option. The response for item 2 above remains the same regardless of what changes result from that analysis.*

4. There are concerns about the practicality of using the CDOT culvert as a pedestrian underpass as listed below and on the plans. The connection of bikes and peds to the broader regional trail system is an important element of transportation connectivity of this neighborhood.

**Response:** *At the 1/12/2026 meeting we identified two potential issues with the proposed bike and pedestrian access: permission from CDOT to use their culvert for this purpose and challenges associated with the grading around the culvert. Since that meeting, we have addressed both. Using the CDOT culvert is a feasible and practical solution for connecting bikes and pedestrians to the larger trail network.*

- a. Regular Maintenance of this path.

**Response:** *Maintenance responsibilities will require additional coordination between the project team, Town of Eagle, and CDOT. However, the project team is committed to finding a solution here and we do not anticipate this affecting the viability of this proposal.*

- b. Vertical and horizontal constraints.

**Response:** *Following the 1/12/2026 meeting. We had a surveyor analyze the area around the culvert. Using that data, we've sketched a potential path from our proposed road on Parcel 1, through the culvert, and connecting to the existing bike path north of the culvert. That potential path is described in the "R3 – 20260123 CulvertAccess.pdf" document included with this submittal.*

- c. Stakeholder involvement from CDOT

**Response:** *We held a meeting on 1/22/2026 to discuss the viability of using CDOT's culvert for this purpose. That meeting was held on site and included representation from: Jared Schneider and Alan Krambeer (CDOT Region 3 Utility, Fiber and Special Use Permit Coordinator). At that meeting, it was established that CDOT would not be opposed to this proposal and would allow us to use the culvert for our proposed purpose if we could provide a flow report for the culvert and provide guarantees for the maintenance of the culvert. Both conditions are not an issue for the project team.*

- d. Does this proposal meet AASHTO/ CDOT standards for the size of the structure?

**Response:** *Yes. The culvert meets or exceeds standards for clear width, height, length, visibility and slope.*

- e. Has there been any evaluation of other on grade crossing points for bikes and peds?

**Response:** *Other options have been evaluated, but none are appropriate or preferable to the culvert. Looking west, any potential crossing point would need to happen before HWY 6 crosses the river. Unfortunately, the bridge's design is solid right up to the edge of the river and would not allow bikes or pedestrians to move under HWY 6. The only other on-grade crossing point would be at the intersection*

# tres birds

*with Nogal Road. Given that there is no traffic light, a relatively high speed limit, approaching bend westbound and insufficient night lighting, we believe an on grade crossing here would be inappropriate, if not outright dangerous. Looking east faces similar problems as the Nogal Road intersection, but without the benefit of an existing intersection of convenient connection point to the trail system.*

*While use of the culvert does present challenges, it is the safest and most direct connection point for bikes and pedestrians.*

This concludes the comment responses.