



December 22, 2025

Attention: Tez Hawkins
Town of Eagle
200 Broadway
Eagle, CO 81631

**RE: HAYMEADOW RMF – 4/5 MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND SUBDIVISION
DR25-08 & FP25-01**
HKS Project No. 2504026

Dear Tez Hawkins,

Enclosed is the comment response letter for the first review of the Haymeadow, RMF - 4/5 Major Development Permit and Subdivision. The first review comments that were provided on December 1, 2025, have been addressed and are included with this letter.

Please contact me if you have any questions or require additional information at rpatton@hkseng.com or 303-623-6300.

Sincerely,
HARRIS KOCHER SMITH

Rachel Patton, PE
Project Manager



Civil Construction Plans

- 1) Overall Utility Plan Sheet C4
 - a) Was this stub installed in Filing 2 Construction. if so the Line should be abandoned in the Manhole.
HKS Response: Stub was installed with Filing 2, the sanitary layout for RMF4/5 has been revised to utilize stub.
- 2) Overall Grading Plan Sheet C11
 - a) What are the overall earthwork numbers cut and fill? for the full lot and per proposed phase.
HKS Response: earthwork numbers have been added to the cover sheet.
 - b) Seems like these lots will likely have sidewalk connections from the units to the public sidewalk. how will the swale be maintained in that circumstance or does drainage piping need to be extended?
HKS Response: final drainage will be determined at building permit if walks are added to disrupt the swale. Curb chases or landscape drains could be utilized in that condition.
 - c) Does any over lot grading need to be considered on these lots to prep those sites
HKS Response: grading provided coordinated and confirmed with ownership, any further lot prep will be done under building permit.
 - d) Will the 3 ft fill slope work with the proposed unit type here?
HKS Response: Ultimate unit type is unknown at this point, 3' fill slope was at the direction of ownership. Final grading and unit type to be determined at building permit.
- 3) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C13
 - a) Is drainage solution needed in here where back of sidewalk drains toward building
HKS Response: grading revised; small areas are intended to drain over walk.
- 4) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C14
 - a) Is this a trapped low point?
HKS Response: landscape drains added for this submittal
 - b) What is this wall type and top of wall grades? if greater than 4' provide detailed
HKS Response: grading revised, wall removed.
- 5) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C16
 - a) where is the inlet? show the drainage infrastructure on the grading plans
HKS Response: landscape drains added for this submittal.
- 6) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C17
 - a) why two flow lines through existing infrastructure
HKS Response: grading revised, and flow lines corrected.



- b) are all Manhole adjustments existing infrastructure shown in the utility plans?

HKS Response: Manhole adjustments noted in grading plans

- 7) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C18

- a) grade missing

HKS Response: spot revised

- b) is there intention to grade in a swale here? where does it drain to?

HKS Response: swale shown and more detail added for clarity.

- 8) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C19

- a) seems like this lack of drainage inlets in this area will cause icing on sidewalks. consider adding an inlet

HKS Response: grading revised, landscape drains now shown.

- b) LP with no inlet.

HKS Response: grading revised, landscape drains now added.

- c) label all driveway slopes

HKS Response: driveway slopes added for reference – final driveway grades will be determined at building permit.

- d) note wall type and detail

HKS Response: grading revised, this wall removed.

- e) LP no inlet

HKS Response: grading revised, landscape drains now added.

- 9) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C20

- a) label wall type and detail

HKS Response: grading revised, this wall removed.

- b) is this denoting a swale? doesn't appear to be graded as such

HKS Response: grading revised, swale and buildings revised.

- 10) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C26

- a) seems like FL needs to be lowered to accommodate

HKS Response: grading revised.

- 11) Detailed Grading Plan Sheet C27

- a) keymap is incorrect

HKS Response: Keymap updated



Sanitary Sewer Plans

- 1) Sanitary Plan & Profile – Line A Sheet SS2
 - a) does this ex manhole have an existing stub if not swap out the base
HKS Response: Note added to swap out base
 - b) Secondary containment?
HKS Response: secondary containment added.
 - c) show service crossings in profile
HKS Response: service crossings added.
- 2) Sanitary Plan & Profile – Line A Sheet SS3
 - a) crossings in profile
HKS Response: crossings labeled in plan and profile
- 3) Sanitary Plan & Profile – Line A Sheet SS4
 - a) minimize the number of manholes. they are an additional cost and become a larger maintenance burden. evaluate along this entire curvature. adjust easements accordingly
HKS Response: water and sewer has been reconfigured to limit the number of manholes around this curve. No adjustments to the easement were made.
 - b) What is forcing this to be a drop manhole or adjust and only have one drop manhole in this section?
HKS Response: drop manholes have been adjusted across the site. Drop manholes utilized in areas with laterals in order to achieve minimum cover.
 - c) What is forcing this to be a drop manhole?
HKS Response: drop manholes have been adjusted across the site. Drop manholes utilized in areas with laterals in order to achieve minimum cover.
 - d) provide detail if required
HKS Response: detail listed on cover sheet
 - e) what is forcing this to be an outside drop manhole? could this line be steepened closer to 4.5% and eliminate the drop?
HKS Response: pipe steepened to 4.5% and drop eliminated.
- 4) Sanitary Plan & Profile – Lines B & C Sheet SS6
 - a) extend private main so 90 degree bends can be avoided in the service lines
HKS Response: service lines and mains have been revised to limit 90 degree bends wherever possible.
- 5) Sanitary Plan & Profile – Line D Sheet SS7
 - a) Update field



HKS Response: field corrected.

6) Sanitary Plan & Profile – Lines E & K Sheet SS8

- a) avoid 90 degree bends in the service lines where possible

HKS Response: services and mains adjusted where possible to avoid 90degree bends in service lines

- b) provide the detail

HKS Response: Detail added

- c) Another drop manhole?

HKS Response: Drop manholes utilized in locations with laterals that need to be lower.

7) Sanitary Plan & Profile – Line H & J (Private) Sheet SS10

- a) widen the view port so adjacent building edges can be seen

HKS Response: viewport widened so adjacent building edges can be seen.

- b) avoid 90 degree bends in service lines

HKS Response: services and mains adjusted where possible to avoid 90degree bends in service lines

8) Sanitary Sewer Service Plan Sheet SS11

- a) General comment for all service lines: minimize the number of 90 degree bends where possible

HKS Response: services and mains adjusted where possible to avoid 90degree bends in service lines

9) Sanitary Sewer Service Plan Sheet SS12

- a) provide detail for clean out and traffic rated cover located in paved areas. (typ.)

HKS Response: Detail not provided in town standards, is there a detail that the town can provide?

Water Plans

1) Overall Water Plan Sheet WT1

- a) Need to Coordinate with Tom G and water court cases if these potable water irrigation connections are allowable in this area.

HKS Response: Per Section 8.2 Provision of Treated Water and Irrigation Water Service

8.2.1: "In addition to municipal service will provide water for the landscape irrigation of various single family/duplex lots and a limited number of public parks and recreation lands, all as will be set forth in application Subdivision Final Plats approved by the town from time to time, but not to exceed a total of fifty-five acres, total within, the PUD."

With the challenges to get non-potable water to these areas, the development team has deemed these lots to be best served off of the allowable 55 acre total. At each building permit application, there will be a table illustrating how much each lot is



using. These will not be controlled by individual homeowners, but by the HOA managing this development.

- 2) Water Plan & Profile – Line A Sheet WT2
 - a) add valves
HKS Response: valves added
 - b) Flowfill?
HKS Response: concrete encasement added to sanitary when crossing over water (method 1 per TOE public works manual)
 - c) add valve
HKS Response: valve added
 - d) General note all sanitary crossings are at 18in which is the minimum to avoid secondary containment but in my experience the offset shrinks in the field would recommend giving more space or plan on using a lot of flowfill
HKS Response: concrete encasement added to sanitary when crossing over water (method 1 per TOE public works manual)
- 3) Water Plan & Profile – Line A Sheet WT3
 - a) add valves
HKS Response: valves added
 - b) add all crossings
HKS Response: all crossings added
- 4) Water Plan & Profile – Line A Sheet WT4
 - a) add valve
HKS Response: valve added
 - b) update
HKS Response: profile has been revised.
- 5) Water Plan & Profile – Line B Sheet WT5
 - a) Add valve
HKS Response: valve added
- 6) Water Plan & Profile – Line B Sheet WT6
 - a) move valve to other side of Tee
HKS Response: valve moved
- 7) Water Plan & Profile – Line B Sheet WT7
 - a) swap for 2 45s
HKS Response: 90degree bend changed to two 45-degree bends



8) Water Plan & Profile – Line B Sheet WT8

- a) add valve

HKS Response: valve added.

- b) what is driving the increased depth here try to brink closer to 6 or 7 where possible

HKS Response: main depth adjusted to run at 6' depth wherever possible

9) Water Plan & Profile – Lines C & D Sheet WT9

- a) look at minimizing the numb of 11.25 bends in series along here

HKS Response: number of bends reduced where possible

- b) avoid long parallel crossing such as this Typical. please reviews all services for this condition. also proximity of the service line to the storm sewer should be evaluated for insulation if necessary

HKS Response: storm and water services have been updated to avoid this configuration, and non-perpendicular long crossings.

- c) This doesn't look possible and needs revision

HKS Response: area has been revised.

10) Water Service Plan Sheet WT10

- a) Indicate all curb stop locations place as near to easement line at practical and generally outside of the traveled way and vehicle parking.

HKS Response: curb stops added.

11) Water Service Plan Sheet WT11

- a) service line from main to curb stop should be a straight run

HKS Response: service lines adjusted to be straight through the curb stop.

12) Water Service Plan Sheet WT14

- a) indicate extension from newly installed curb stop locations

HKS Response: Extensions of existing service stubs called out.

13) Non-Potable Water Service Plan Sheet NP1

- a) indicate path remove and replace area

HKS Response: service stubs were included/constructed with phase 2 to avoid removing/replacing asphalt. Connections to existing stubs called out.

Storm Sewer Plans

1) Storm Plan & Profile – Lines A & B Sheet STM2

- a) indicate the demarcation point between private on site drainage pipes and inlets and connection to the public system in the road ROW. Place on overall sheet as well.

HKS Response: private vs public is shown on storm p&p sheets as well as overall sheet.



- b) has over lot grading been sufficiently designed to know that rim elevation needs to be at
HKS Response: yes, to the extent of what can be anticipated. if significant earthwork is required with the building of the home, rim will have to be adjusted at that time.
- 2) Storm Plan & Profiles – Lines C & D Sheet STM3
 - a) indicate the demarcation point between private on site drainage pipes and inlets and connection to the public system in the road. Place on overall sheet as well.
HKS Response: private vs public is shown on storm p&p sheets as well as overall sheet.
- 3) Storm Plan & Profile – Lines E & G Sheet STM4
 - a) is this manhole necessary?
HKS Response: Line E has been reconfigured with the removal of the sanitary main in this drive and to avoid using inlet E2 as a junction structure.
 - b) consider avoiding wall / utility crossings or conflicts
HKS Response: grading has been revised to eliminate the need for walls and storm crossings.
 - c) with tiered walls over the storm is any protection of flowfill nessesaray to minmize settlement of wall
HKS Response: grading has been revised to eliminate the need for walls and storm crossings.

Roadway Plans

- 1) Paving Plan Sheet RD1
 - a) indicate which of the materials it is or where it transitions
HKS Response: material is gravel, callout has been corrected.
 - b) provide the specific details within the plan set
HKS Response: details have been added to the plan set.
- 2) Paving Plan – Cross Sections Sheet RD2
 - a) what material is this asphalt or gravel
HKS Response: material is gravel, callout has been corrected.
 - b) the curb pan is not included in the drive lane width note the actual asphalt width
HKS Response: asphalt width noted
 - c) include the detail on the plans
HKS Response: details have been added to the plan set.
 - d) what is the recommended pavement section for all asphalt in this development
HKS Response: pavement section per Geotech report has been included on RD1



- e) is this driveway typical section?

HKS Response: driveway typical section has been removed. Driveways will be constructed with the building permit; length of driveways will vary but a minimum of 19' is provided.

- 3) Signage & Striping Plan Sheet RD3

- a) doe3s this 4 way intersection internal to the site warrant two way stop control

HKS Response: internal stop control has been added.

- b) will sight distances allow for uncontrolled intersections such as this?

HKS Response: internal stop control has been added.