

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 15, 2021

TO: Kari Parsons, PCD-Project Manager

FROM: Jeff Rice, PCD-Engineering  
719-520-7877

SUBJECT: PUDSP-20-005 –Bent Grass MDDP  
Seventh Submittal

---

**Engineering Division**

Planning and Community Development (PCD)-Engineering reviews plans and reports to ensure general conformance with El Paso County standards and criteria. The project engineer is responsible for compliance with all applicable criteria, including other governmental regulations. Notwithstanding anything depicted in the plans in words or graphic representation, all design and construction related to roads, storm drainage and erosion control shall conform to the standards and requirements of the most recent version of the relevant adopted El Paso County standards, including the Land Development Code (LDC), the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), the Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM), and the Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 2 (DCM2). Any deviations from regulations and standards must be requested, and approved by the ECM Administrator, in writing. Any modifications necessary to meet overlooked criteria after-the-fact will be entirely the developer's responsibility to rectify.

The comments include unresolved previous comments and new comments resulting from the re-submittal in **bold highlighted purple**. All previous comments that have been resolved have been noted or deleted. A written response to all comments and redlines is required for review of the re-submittal. Please arrange a meeting between the developer's team and County staff to review and discuss these comments and prepared revisions/responses prior to the next submittal.

MDDP

1. County maintenance and drainage fee reimbursement for constructed improvements will be dependent on Drainage Board approval of a DBPS addendum. It is recommended that an information package be assembled for initial Drainage Board consideration. The information package/addendum will be needed to reconcile DBPS costs/reimbursements and fee adjustments. Some information was provided in the MDDP; the process in the DCM needs to be followed for documentation (reference DCM Sections 1.7 and 3.3). Please discuss with PCD-Engineering staff.
2. See MDDP redlines. See *updated/remaining redlines*. **Partially resolved; see remaining redlines. Provide the latest version of the model results and Rational calculations on pages 182-225 and delete page 274 if it's duplicate of a previous page.**  
*Response: See attached MDDP redline responses. Future HMS model results have replaced with June Model and page 274 was a duplicate and sheet was removed.*
3. *Resolved.*
4. *Resolved.*
5. *Resolved.*

6. Provide conceptual channel cross-sections and drop/check structure design (from the diversion channel confluence north of Bent Grass Meadows Drive to the existing improvements upstream of Woodmen Road) on the developed drainage plans. Provide a channel plan and profile. *It is unclear what the proposed channel improvements are; if there are increased flows in the channel from the DBPS (~1,200 cfs vs ~900 cfs?) it seems that additional improvements may be needed. (If not, are the DBPS improvements proposed unchanged?) This issue needs to be addressed in more detail in the MDDP, along with proposed timing of these channel improvements.* Resolved (but replace the DBPS plan sheets); a channel design report will be required for the channel design with the final plat(s). *Resolved for the MDDP.*
7. Regarding construction phasing and responsibilities for the main West Tributary channel (RWT204 and RWT210) (which is reimbursable under the DBPS and can offset drainage fees):
  - a. *Resolved.*
  - b. Concurrence or agreement between the owners on construction phasing and district maintenance until completion will be required. *Unresolved; a formal agreement will be required; provide documentation from the subject owners and the district that all have no objections to an agreement.* As discussed, an agreement will be required with the first final plat.
  - c. *Resolved.*
  - d. *Provide the cost estimate showing a total of ~\$1,950,000 as in the cost-sharing table. Update if necessary. Cost estimate will be needed with the agreement.*  
***Response: Noted. A cost estimate of the channel improvements will be included with agreement.***
8. If the twin 16'x6' box culverts are going to be requested for reimbursement, the costs need to be included in the "Fee Development" section. DCM1 reimbursement procedures need to be followed. (A reimbursement project has been set up in EDARP.)  
***Resolved.***
9. Bids and actual costs for the Pond WU improvements will be required as well when reimbursement is requested or credits are carried forward. Note that excess unverified credits may not apply to future plats if actual costs have not been vetted.  
***Response: Noted. Costs will be included when reimbursement is requested or credits carried forward.***

#### Attachments/Electronic Redlines

1. MDDP redlines