



**MVE, INC.**  
ENGINEERS SURVEYORS

1903 kellaray street, suite 200  
colorado springs, co 80909  
719.635.5736

# Final Drainage Report

## **Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1**

A Replat of Lot 13, Wildwood Ranch  
Estates Filing 7

**Project No. 61211**

**December 28, 2023**

PCD File No.

# **Final Drainage Report**

for

**Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1**

**Project No. 61211**

**December 28, 2023**

prepared for

**Alan Greaves**

2935 Underwood Point #10  
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

prepared by

**MVE, Inc.**

1903 Lelaray Street, Suite 200  
Colorado Springs, CO 80909  
719.635.5736

Copyright © MVE, Inc., 2023

61211-Greaves Sub-FDR.odt

# Statements and Acknowledgments

## Engineer's Statement

The attached drainage plan and report were prepared under my direction and supervision and are correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Said drainage report has been prepared according to the criteria established by El Paso County for drainage reports and said report is in conformity with the applicable master plan of the drainage basin. I accept responsibility for any liability caused by any negligent acts, errors or omissions on my part in preparing this report.

David R. Gorman, P.E.  
Colorado No. 31672  
For and on Behalf of MVE, Inc.

## Developer's Statement

I, the owner/developer have read and will comply with all of the requirements specified in this drainage report and plan.

---

Alan Greaves  
Owner  
2935 Underwood Point #10  
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

---

Date

## El Paso County

Filed in accordance with the requirements of the Drainage Criteria Manual, Volumes 1 and 2, El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual and Land Development Code as amended.

---

Joshua Palmer  
County Engineer / ECM Administrator

---

Date

Conditions:

# Contents

Statements and Acknowledgments.....	iii
Contents.....	v
Final Drainage Report.....	1
<b>1 General Location and Description.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Location.....	1
1.2 Description of Property.....	1
<b>2 Drainage Basins and Sub-Basins.....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Major Basin Descriptions.....	2
2.2 Sub-Basin Description.....	2
<b>3 Drainage Design Criteria.....</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1 Development Criteria Reference.....	2
3.2 Previous Drainage Studies.....	3
3.3 Hydrologic Criteria.....	3
<b>4 Drainage Facility Design.....</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1 General Concept.....	3
4.2 Existing / Developed Hydrologic Conditions.....	3
4.3 Erosion Control.....	4
4.4 Four Step Process.....	4
<b>5 Drainage and Bridge Fees.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6 Conclusion.....</b>	<b>5</b>

References.....	7
Appendices.....	9
<b>1 General Maps and Supporting Data.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2 Hydrologic Calculations.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3 Report Maps.....</b>	<b>41</b>

# Final Drainage Report

The purpose of this Final Drainage Report is to identify drainage patterns and quantities within and affecting the proposed Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 site. The development project is a residential subdivision with 5.0± acre lots. The report will identify specific solutions to drainage concerns on-site and off-site resulting from the proposed project. The report and included maps present results of hydrologic and drainage facilities analyses. The report will discuss the recommended drainage improvements to the site and identify drainage requirements relative to the proposed project. This report has been prepared and submitted in accordance with the requirements of the El Paso County development approval process. An Appendix is included with this report with pertinent calculations and graphs used in the drainage analyses and design.

## 1 General Location and Description

### 1.1 Location

The proposed Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 site is a replat of Lot 13, Wildwood Ranch Estates Filing 7 located within the northwest one-quarter of Section 5, Township 12 South, Range 65 West of the 6th principal meridian in El Paso County, Colorado. The 10.364± acre site is situated on the north side of Snow Mass Drive, east of Black Forest Road, a public gravel road with 60 ft right-of-way, is adjacent to the southern edge of the site. The existing Lot 13, Wildwood Ranch Estates Filing 7 (Zone RR-5) previously contained a single family residence and out buildings that were destroyed in the Black Forest fire. The El Paso County Assessor's Schedule Number for the site is 5205209004. A **Vicinity Map** is included in the **Appendix**. The north half of the site is located in El Paso County's East Cheery Creek Drainage Basin and the south half is located in the Kettle Creek Drainage Basin.

### 1.2 Description of Property

The Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 site 10.364± acres and is zoned RR-5 (Residential Rural (5 Acres)). The property is the former location of a single-family residence with an existing gravel driveway. The proposed Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 includes 2 rural residential lots, and about 1,000 feet of gravel driveways.

The ground cover, which is in fair condition, consists of native grasses. The tree coverage is sporadic throughout the site with the majority of them damaged or killed in the fire.

The existing site topography slopes to the south with grades that range from 2% to 15% and northeast with grades that range from 2% to 8%.

There are no major drainage ways in the Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 site. For the south half of the site, all storm runoff flows drain south and for the north half of the site the flows drain northeast. There is no storm drain system in the surrounding area. The north half of the site is located in El Paso County's East Cheery Creek Drainage Basin and the south half is located in the Kettle Creek Drainage Basin. The flows from the site flow south and eventually enter Kettle Creek or north and enter East Cherry Creek.

According to the National Resource Conservation Service, there are two (2) soil types in the Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 site. Kettle gravelly loamy sand (map unit 41) makes up about 46% of the soil on the site. The soil is deep and somewhat excessively drained. Permeability is rapid, surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate. Kettle gravelly loamy sand is classified as being part of Hydrologic Soil Group B.

The other soil type located on the site is Peyton-Pring Complex (map unit 68) which makes up the remaining 54% of the soil on the site. The soil is deep and well drained. Permeability is moderate, surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate. Peyton-Pring Complex is classified as being part of Hydrologic Soil Group B.

A portion of the Soil Map and data tables from the National Cooperative Soil Survey and relevant Official Soil Series Descriptions (OSD) are included in the **Appendix**.<sup>1 2</sup>

## **2 Drainage Basins and Sub-Basins**

### **2.1 Major Basin Descriptions**

The Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 site is located in the Kettle Creek Drainage Basin (FOMO3000) and the East Cheery Creek Drainage Basin (CYCY0200). The north half of the site is located in El Paso County's East Cheery Creek Drainage Basin and the south half is located in the Kettle Creek Drainage Basin. No Drainage Basin Planning Studies are on file for either drainage basin.

The current Flood Insurance Study of the region includes Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), effective on December 7, 2018.<sup>3</sup> The proposed subdivision is included in the Community Panel Numbered 08041C0315 G of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps for the El Paso County. No part of the site is shown to be included in a 100-year flood hazard area as determined by FEMA. A portion of the current FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps with the site delineated is included in the **Appendix**.

### **2.2 Sub-Basin Description**

The existing and developed drainage patterns of the Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 project are described by two (2) on-site drainage basins and two (2) offsite basins. All of these basins are previously undisturbed or developed to a degree as described below. All existing basin delineations and data are depicted on the attached **Drainage Map**.

#### **2.2.1 Existing / Developed Drainage Patterns (Off-Site)**

Existing off-site sub-basin OS-A is located northwest of the site, containing pasture/meadow areas, drains east onto the site. This flow enters the onsite sub-basin A and continues through the site.

Existing off-site sub-basin C represents the off-site that combine with sub-basin B to travel along the roadside ditch to an existing 18" CMP at the southeast corner of the site.

#### **2.2.2 Existing / Developed Drainage Patterns (On-Site)**

Sub-basin A is the northern portion of the site, containing pasture/meadow, drains northeast. The combined flows of sub-basin OS-A and A drains to the northeast and exits the site into the adjacent property.

Sub-basin B is the southern portion of the site. The sub-basin contains the site of the former residence and pasture/meadow areas that drain to the south towards Snow Mass Drive.

---

1 WSS  
2 OSD  
3 FIRM

## 3 Drainage Design Criteria

### 3.1 Development Criteria Reference

This Final Drainage Report for Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 has been prepared according to the report guidelines presented in the latest edition of *El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM)*<sup>4</sup>. The County has also adopted portions of the City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual Volumes 1 and 2, especially concerning the calculation of rainfall runoff flow rates.<sup>5 6</sup> The hydrologic analysis is based on a collection of data from the DCM, the NRCS Web Soil Survey<sup>7</sup>, and existing topographic data by Polaris.

### 3.2 Previous Drainage Studies

No drainage reports were found for any of the surrounding developments.

### 3.3 Hydrologic Criteria

For this Final Drainage Report, the Rational Method as described in the *Drainage Criteria Manual* has been used for all Storm Runoff calculations, as the development and all sub-basins are less than 130 acres in area. "Colorado Springs Rainfall Intensity Duration Frequency" curves, Figure 6-5 in the DCM, was used to obtain the design rainfall values; a copy is included in the **Appendix**. The "Overland (Initial) Flow Equation" (Eq. 6-8) in the DCM, and Manning's equation with estimated depths were used in time of concentration calculations. "Runoff Coefficients for Rational Method", Table 6-6 in the DCM, was utilized as a guide in estimating runoff coefficient and Percent Impervious values; a copy is included in the **Appendix**. Peak runoff discharges were calculated for each drainage sub-basin for both the 5-year storm event and the 100-year storm event with the Rational Method formula, (Eq. 6-5) in the DCM.<sup>8</sup>

## 4 Drainage Facility Design

### 4.1 General Concept

The intent of the drainage concept presented in this Final Drainage Report is to allow for the development of the two five (5) acres lots while maintaining the existing drainage patterns on the site. The site will be in compliance with the County's Stormwater Management regulations without the need for permanent water quality treatment facilities. Major and minor storm flows will continue to be safely conveyed through the site and downstream.

The existing and proposed drainage hydrologic conditions are described in more detail below. Input data and results for all calculations are included in the **Appendix**. A Drainage map for the hydrology are also included in the **Appendix**.

### 4.2 Existing / Developed Hydrologic Conditions

The Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 site includes four (4) sub-basins, two (2) on site and two (2) off site. The site generally drains north and south away from a ridge line crossing approximately the middle of the lot. The sub-basins are described in more detail below.

Existing offsite sub-basin OS-A, located on the northwest side of the site, is 0.75± acres in area. Sub-basin OS-A contains a meadow/pasture area. Peak storm runoff rates are  $Q_5 = 0.2$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 1.5$  cfs (existing / developed flows) which drain on-site to the northwest. These flows continue northeast through sub-basin A.

---

4 DCM Section 4.3 and Section 4.4

5 CS DCM Vol 1

6 CS DCM Vol 2

7 WSS

8 DCM



Sub-basin A, located in approximately the north half of the site, is 5.67± acres in area and accepts the flows from off-site sub-basin OS-A. Sub-basin A contains currently meadow/pasture and is proposed to have a single family residence and a gravel driveway. Proposed single family residence is assumed to be 2,500 sf. of roof, 2,500 sf. of paved area for porches and patios and 5,000 sf. of gravel driveway. Peak storm runoff rates are  $Q_5 = 1.3$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 9.4$  cfs (existing flows) and runoff rates of  $Q_5 = 1.7$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 10.0$  cfs (developed flows) which drain northeast to DP-A. These flows continue to drain northeast to the adjacent properties. The combined peak storm runoff rates flowing to DP-A are  $Q_5 = 1.3$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 9.6$  cfs (existing flows) and  $Q_5 = 1.7$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 10.0$  cfs (developed flows) which flow south through adjacent properties to Smith Creek. This is a negligible increase of  $Q_5 = 0.4$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 0.4$  cfs which enters adjacent property over the length of the lot and is not concentrated.

Sub-basin B, located in approximately the south half of the site, is 4.69± acres in area. Sub-basin B previously contained a single family residence but is now meadow/pasture and the existing gravel driveway, it is proposed to have a single family residence reconstructed. The proposed single family residence is assumed to be 2,500 sf. of roof, 2,500 sf. of paved area for porches and patios and 5,000 sf. of gravel driveway. Peak storm runoff rates are  $Q_5 = 1.5$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 8.5$  cfs (existing flows) and runoff rates of  $Q_5 = 1.7$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 8.9$  cfs (developed flows) which drain south to Snow Mass Drive and then southeast in a shallow roadside ditch. This is a negligible increase of  $Q_5 = 0.2$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 0.4$  cfs from the current conditions.

Existing offsite sub-basin OS-C, represents the remainder of the area draining to an existing 18" CMP that flows under Snow Mass Drive. Located on the southern side of the site, it is 1.87± acres in area. Sub-basin OS-A contains off-site meadow/pasture area along with the northern half of the gravel Snow Mass Drive. Peak storm runoff rates are  $Q_5 = 1.0$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 4.7$  cfs (existing / developed flows) which drain southeast in the roadside ditch to an existing 18" CMP under Snow Mass Drive. Since sub-basin B previously contained a residence the reconstruction of the improvements in sub-basin B do not have an impact on the downstream properties over and above those of when the lot was developed. The existing 18" CMP is designated as Design Point C (DP-C) and has peak storm runoff rates are  $Q_5 = 2.5$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 12.5$  cfs. The existing culvert has sufficient capacity for the 5 year flows and minimal overtopping of 1.3 cfs in the 100 year and is in stable condition with no signs of erosion at the downstream end. There are no increase in flows from the original developed condition. Analysis of this culvert is included in the **Appendix**.

### 4.3 Erosion Control

There is no public infrastructure construction or overlot grading associated with this subdivision. Any required control measures (CM's) for the individual lot home construction will be handled on the BESQCP for each lot at time of building permit.

### 4.4 Four Step Process

The El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (Appendix I, Section 1.7.2 ) requires the consideration of a "Four Step Process for receiving water protection that focuses on reducing runoff volumes, treating the water quality capture volume (WQCV), stabilizing drainageways, and implementing long term source controls". The Four Step Process is incorporated in this project and the elements are discussed below.

The entire site consists of 5-acre single family residential lots which are excluded from Post Construction Stormwater Management requirements by ECM 1.7.1.B.5 due to the low development density as 5-acre lots. There is no public roadway being dedicated or constructed as part of this project. The site is not subject to Post Construction Stormwater Treatment requirements.

1) Runoff Reduction Practices are employed in this project. Impervious surfaces have been reduced as much as practically possible. There is only minimal concrete or other hard surfaces proposed. Minimized Directly Connected Impervious Areas (MDCIA) is employed on the project because runoff passes through an open space meadow area before leaving the site.

- 2) There are no drainage paths on the site that are required to be stabilized as they are well vegetated with no visual erosion.
- 3) The project contains no potentially hazardous uses. The site is exempted from the use of WQCV CMs by ECM 1.7.1.B.5 by virtue of the large lot rural residential nature of the site having percent imperviousness of less than 10%.
- 4) The rural residential lot is not anticipated to contain storage of potentially harmful substances or use of potentially harmful substances. No site specific or other source control CMs are required.

## 5 Drainage and Bridge Fees

The southern portion of the site is located within the Kettle Creek Drainage Basin, El Paso Basin Number FOMO3000, which which has no DBPS. Fees associated with this basin are Drainage Fees of \$12,463 per impervious acre and Bridge Fees of \$0 per impervious acre. The percent Imperiousness of the portion lying within the Kettle Creek Drainage Basin is 5-acre Rural Residential site at 7% in accordance with El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual Appendix L Table 3-1. Also, reductions in the per acre Drainage Fee are allowed pursuant to El Paso County Resolution 99-383. A fee reduction in the of 25% for lots 2.5 acres or large is utilized for this project. The Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 site within the Kettle Creek Drainage Basin contains 4.69 acres. Drainage and Bridge Fees for the site are calculated below:

### FEE CALCULATION (Kettle Creek 2023 Drainage and Bridge Fees)

Drainage Fee =	4.69 x \$12,463/Imp. Ac x 0.07 Imp.	=	\$ 4,091.60
	25% Fee Reduction	=	<u>(\$1,022.90)</u>
Bridge Fee =	4.69 x \$0/Imp. Ac x 0.07 Imp.	=	<u>\$ 0.00</u>
	<b>Grand Total Fees</b>	=	<b><u>\$ 3,068.70</u></b>

## 6 Conclusion

This Final Drainage Report presents existing and proposed drainage conditions for the proposed Greaves Subdivision Filing No. 1 project. The development will have negligible and inconsequential effects on the existing site drainage and drainage conditions downstream. The site is exempted from the use of WQCV CMs by ECM 1.7.1.B.5 by virtue of the large lot rural residential nature of the site having percent imperviousness of less than 10%. The entire site is consists of 5-acre single family residential lots which are excluded from Post Construction Stormwater Management requirements due to the low development density as 5-acre lots. The site is not subject to Post Construction Stormwater Treatment requirements. With such a negligible increase in stormwater flows from the site, detention will not be necessary for the proposed development and will not be provided. The proposed project will not, with respect to stormwater runoff, negatively impact the adjacent properties and downstream properties.

## References

*NRCS Web Soil Survey.* United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service ("<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>", accessed March, 2018).

*NRCS Official Soil Series Descriptions.* United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service ("<http://soils.usda.gov/technical/classification/osd/index.html>", accessed March, 2018).

*Flood Insurance Rate Map.* Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Flood Insurance Program (Washington D.C.: FEMA, December 7, 2018).

*NCSS Web Soil Survey.* United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service ("<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>", accessed May, 2017).

*Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 2, Stormwater Quality Policies, Procedures and Best Management Practices (BMPs).* City of Colorado Spring Engineering Division (Colorado Springs: , May 2014).

*City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual, Volume 1.* City of Colorado Springs Engineering Division Staff, Matrix Design Group/Wright Water Engineers (Colorado Springs: , May 2014).


*City of Colorado Springs/El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manual.* City of Colorado Springs, Department of Public Works, Engineering Division; HDR Infrastructure, Inc.; El Paso County, Department of Public Works, Engineering Division (Colorado Springs: City of Colorado Springs, Revised November 1991).

*City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 1.* City of Colorado Springs Engineering Division with Matrix Design Group and Wright Water Engineers (Colorado Springs, Colorado: , May 2014).

# | Appendices

## **1 General Maps and Supporting Data**

- Vicinity Map
- Portions of Flood Insurance Rate Map
- NRCS Soil Map and Tables
- SCS Soil Type Descriptions
- Hydrologic Soil Group Map and Tables



# VICINITY MAP

NOT TO SCALE

# National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMMette



104°42'2"W 39°2'35"N



## Legend

SEE FIS REPORT FOR DETAILED LEGEND AND INDEX MAP FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT


SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS		Without Base Flood Elevation (BFE) Zone A, V, A99
		With BFE or Depth Zone AE, AO, AH, VE, AR
		Regulatory Floodway
OTHER AREAS OF FLOOD HAZARD		0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard, Areas of 1% annual chance flood with average depth less than one foot or with drainage areas of less than one square mile Zone X
		Future Conditions 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard Zone X
		Area with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee. See Notes. Zone X
		Area with Flood Risk due to Levee Zone D
OTHER AREAS		NO SCREEN Area of Minimal Flood Hazard Zone X
		Effective LOMRs
GENERAL STRUCTURES		Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard Zone D
		Channel, Culvert, or Storm Sewer
		Levee, Dike, or Floodwall
OTHER FEATURES		20.2 Cross Sections with 1% Annual Chance Water Surface Elevation
		17.5 Coastal Transect
		Base Flood Elevation Line (BFE)
		Limit of Study
		Jurisdiction Boundary
		Coastal Transect Baseline
MAP PANELS		Digital Data Available
		No Digital Data Available
		Unmapped
		The pin displayed on the map is an approximate point selected by the user and does not represent an authoritative property location.



This map complies with FEMA's standards for the use of digital flood maps if it is not void as described below. The basemap shown complies with FEMA's basemap accuracy standards

The flood hazard information is derived directly from the authoritative NFHL web services provided by FEMA. This map was exported on **12/28/2023 at 10:51 AM** and does not reflect changes or amendments subsequent to this date and time. The NFHL and effective information may change or become superseded by new data over time.

This map image is void if the one or more of the following map elements do not appear: basemap imagery, flood zone labels, legend, scale bar, map creation date, community identifiers, FIRM panel number, and FIRM effective date. Map images for unmapped and unmodernized areas cannot be used for regulatory purposes.



1:6,000

104°41'25"W 39°2'7"N

Basemap Imagery Source: USGS National Map 2023

# Custom Soil Resource Report for El Paso County Area, Colorado



# Preface

---

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/>) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (<https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs>) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist ([http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2\\_053951](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2_053951)).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require



alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

# Contents

---

<b>Preface</b> .....	2
<b>How Soil Surveys Are Made</b> .....	5
<b>Soil Map</b> .....	8
Soil Map.....	9
Legend.....	10
Map Unit Legend.....	11
Map Unit Descriptions.....	11
El Paso County Area, Colorado.....	13
41—Kettle gravelly loamy sand, 8 to 40 percent slopes.....	13
68—Peyton-Pring complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes.....	14
<b>References</b> .....	16

# How Soil Surveys Are Made

---

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil

## Custom Soil Resource Report

scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and

## Custom Soil Resource Report

identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.

# Soil Map


---

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.

# Custom Soil Resource Report Soil Map




Map Scale: 1:2,030 if printed on A portrait (8.5" x 11") sheet.



Map projection: Web Mercator Corner coordinates: WGS84 Edge tics: UTM Zone 13N WGS84

### MAP LEGEND

**Area of Interest (AOI)**

 Area of Interest (AOI)




















**Soils**







 Soil Map Unit Polygons

 Soil Map Unit Lines


 Soil Map Unit Points

**Special Point Features**






-  Blowout
-  Borrow Pit
-  Clay Spot
-  Closed Depression
-  Gravel Pit
-  Gravelly Spot
-  Landfill
-  Lava Flow
-  Marsh or swamp
-  Mine or Quarry
-  Miscellaneous Water
-  Perennial Water
-  Rock Outcrop
-  Saline Spot
-  Sandy Spot
-  Severely Eroded Spot
-  Sinkhole
-  Slide or Slip
-  Sodic Spot

-  Spoil Area
-  Stony Spot
-  Very Stony Spot
-  Wet Spot
-  Other
-  Special Line Features


**Water Features**

 Streams and Canals

**Transportation**

-  Rails
-  Interstate Highways
-  US Routes
-  Major Roads
-  Local Roads

**Background**

 Aerial Photography

### MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service  
 Web Soil Survey URL:  
 Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: El Paso County Area, Colorado  
 Survey Area Data: Version 21, Aug 24, 2023

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Jun 9, 2021—Jun 12, 2021

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.



## Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
41	Kettle gravelly loamy sand, 8 to 40 percent slopes	4.4	46.1%
68	Peyton-Pring complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes	5.1	53.9%
<b>Totals for Area of Interest</b>		<b>9.5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however,

## Custom Soil Resource Report

onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An *association* is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

## El Paso County Area, Colorado

### 41—Kettle gravelly loamy sand, 8 to 40 percent slopes

#### Map Unit Setting

*National map unit symbol:* 368h  
*Elevation:* 7,000 to 7,700 feet  
*Farmland classification:* Not prime farmland

#### Map Unit Composition

*Kettle and similar soils:* 85 percent  
*Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.*

#### Description of Kettle

##### Setting

*Landform:* Hills  
*Landform position (three-dimensional):* Side slope  
*Down-slope shape:* Linear  
*Across-slope shape:* Linear  
*Parent material:* Sandy alluvium derived from arkose

##### Typical profile

*E - 0 to 16 inches:* gravelly loamy sand  
*Bt - 16 to 40 inches:* gravelly sandy loam  
*C - 40 to 60 inches:* extremely gravelly loamy sand

##### Properties and qualities

*Slope:* 8 to 40 percent  
*Depth to restrictive feature:* More than 80 inches  
*Drainage class:* Somewhat excessively drained  
*Runoff class:* Medium  
*Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat):* High (2.00 to 6.00 in/hr)  
*Depth to water table:* More than 80 inches  
*Frequency of flooding:* None  
*Frequency of ponding:* None  
*Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches:* Low (about 3.4 inches)

##### Interpretive groups

*Land capability classification (irrigated):* None specified  
*Land capability classification (nonirrigated):* 7e  
*Hydrologic Soil Group:* B  
*Ecological site:* F048AY908CO - Mixed Conifer  
*Hydric soil rating:* No

#### Minor Components

##### Other soils

*Percent of map unit:*  
*Hydric soil rating:* No

##### Pleasant

*Percent of map unit:*  
*Landform:* Depressions  
*Hydric soil rating:* Yes

## 68—Peyton-Pring complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes

### Map Unit Setting

*National map unit symbol:* 369f

*Elevation:* 6,800 to 7,600 feet

*Farmland classification:* Not prime farmland

### Map Unit Composition

*Peyton and similar soils:* 40 percent

*Pring and similar soils:* 30 percent

*Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.*

### Description of Peyton

#### Setting

*Landform:* Hills

*Landform position (three-dimensional):* Side slope

*Down-slope shape:* Linear

*Across-slope shape:* Linear

*Parent material:* Arkosic alluvium derived from sedimentary rock and/or arkosic residuum weathered from sedimentary rock

#### Typical profile

*A - 0 to 12 inches:* sandy loam

*Bt - 12 to 25 inches:* sandy clay loam

*BC - 25 to 35 inches:* sandy loam

*C - 35 to 60 inches:* sandy loam

#### Properties and qualities

*Slope:* 3 to 5 percent

*Depth to restrictive feature:* More than 80 inches

*Drainage class:* Well drained

*Runoff class:* Low

*Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat):* Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr)

*Depth to water table:* More than 80 inches

*Frequency of flooding:* None

*Frequency of ponding:* None

*Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches:* Moderate (about 7.3 inches)

#### Interpretive groups

*Land capability classification (irrigated):* None specified

*Land capability classification (nonirrigated):* 4c

*Hydrologic Soil Group:* B

*Ecological site:* R049XY216CO - Sandy Divide

*Hydric soil rating:* No

**Description of Pring**

**Setting**

*Landform:* Hills  
*Landform position (three-dimensional):* Side slope  
*Down-slope shape:* Linear  
*Across-slope shape:* Linear  
*Parent material:* Arkosic alluvium derived from sedimentary rock

**Typical profile**

*A - 0 to 14 inches:* coarse sandy loam  
*C - 14 to 60 inches:* gravelly sandy loam

**Properties and qualities**

*Slope:* 3 to 8 percent  
*Depth to restrictive feature:* More than 80 inches  
*Drainage class:* Well drained  
*Runoff class:* Low  
*Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat):* High (2.00 to 6.00 in/hr)  
*Depth to water table:* More than 80 inches  
*Frequency of flooding:* None  
*Frequency of ponding:* None  
*Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches:* Low (about 6.0 inches)

**Interpretive groups**

*Land capability classification (irrigated):* None specified  
*Land capability classification (nonirrigated):* 3e  
*Hydrologic Soil Group:* B  
*Ecological site:* R048AY222CO - Loamy Park  
*Hydric soil rating:* No

**Minor Components**

**Other soils**

*Percent of map unit:*  
*Hydric soil rating:* No

**Pleasant**

*Percent of map unit:*  
*Landform:* Depressions  
*Hydric soil rating:* Yes

# References

---

- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.
- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.
- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.
- Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.
- Federal Register. September 18, 2002. Hydric soils of the United States.
- Hurt, G.W., and L.M. Vasilas, editors. Version 6.0, 2006. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.
- National Research Council. 1995. Wetlands: Characteristics and boundaries.
- Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18. [http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2\\_054262](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_054262)
- Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436. [http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2\\_053577](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053577)
- Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. [http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2\\_053580](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053580)
- Tiner, R.W., Jr. 1985. Wetlands of Delaware. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Wetlands Section.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Waterways Experiment Station Technical Report Y-87-1.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National forestry manual. [http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/home/?cid=nrcs142p2\\_053374](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/home/?cid=nrcs142p2_053374)
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National range and pasture handbook. <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/landuse/rangepasture/?cid=stelprdb1043084>

## Custom Soil Resource Report

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. [http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2\\_054242](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2_054242)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. [http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2\\_053624](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053624)

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. 1961. Land capability classification. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 210. [http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2\\_052290.pdf](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_052290.pdf)

pricklypear occur. Ample amounts of litter and forage should be left on the soil because of the high hazard of soil blowing.

Windbreaks and environmental plantings are generally well suited to this soil. Summer fallow a year prior to planting and continued cultivation for weed control are needed to insure establishment and survival of plantings. Trees that are best suited and have good survival are Rocky Mountain juniper, eastern redcedar, ponderosa pine, Siberian elm, Russian-olive, and hackberry. Shrubs that are best suited are skunkbush sumac, lilac, Siberian peashrub, and American plum.

Depending on land use, this soil can produce habitat that is suitable for either rangeland wildlife, such as antelope, or for openland wildlife, such as pheasant, cottontail, and mourning dove. Availability of irrigation water largely determines the land use. Where no irrigation water is available, this soil is mainly used as rangeland, a use that favors rangeland wildlife. If this soil is used as rangeland, fences, livestock water developments, and proper livestock grazing use are practices that enhance habitat for rangeland wildlife. Production of crops such as wheat, corn, and alfalfa provides suitable habitat for openland wildlife, especially pheasant. Among the practices that increase openland wildlife populations are planting trees and shrubs and providing undisturbed nesting cover.

The main limitation of this soil for urban use is shrink-swell potential. Buildings and roads need to be designed to overcome this limitation. Roads need to be designed to minimize frost-heave damage. Capability subclasses IVE, nonirrigated, and IIe, irrigated.

**40—Kettle gravelly loamy sand, 3 to 8 percent slopes.** This deep, well drained soil formed in sandy arkosic deposits on uplands. Elevation ranges from 7,000 to 7,700 feet. The average annual precipitation is about 18 inches, the average annual air temperature is about 43 degrees F, and the average frost-free period is about 120 days.

Typically, the surface layer is gray gravelly loamy sand about 3 inches thick. The subsurface layer is light gray gravelly loamy sand about 13 inches thick. The subsoil is very pale brown gravelly sandy loam about 24 inches thick. It consists of a matrix of loamy coarse sand that has thin bands of coarse sandy loam or sandy clay loam. The substratum to a depth of 60 inches or more is light yellowish brown extremely gravelly loamy sand.

Included with this soil in mapping are small areas of Alamosa loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes; Elbeth sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes; Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes; Tomah-Crowfoot loamy sands, 3 to 8 percent slopes; and a few rock outcrops.

Permeability of this Kettle soil is rapid. Effective rooting depth is 60 inches or more. Available water capacity is low to moderate. Surface runoff is slow, and the hazard of erosion is slight to moderate. A few gullies have formed in drainageways.

This soil is used for woodland, livestock grazing, wildlife habitat, recreation, and homesites.

This soil is suited to the production of ponderosa pine. It is capable of producing about 2,240 cubic feet or 4,900 board feet (International rule), of merchantable timber per acre from a fully stocked, even-aged stand of 80-year-old trees. The main limitation for the production or harvesting of timber is the low available water capacity. The low available water capacity also influences seedling survival, especially in areas where understory plants are plentiful. Erosion must be kept to a minimum when harvesting timber.

This soil has good potential for mule deer, tree squirrels, cottontail rabbit, and wild turkey. These animals obtain their food and shelter from pine trees, shrubs, and ground cover, which provide browse, forbs, fruit, and seeds. The presence of ponderosa pine and Gambel oak should encourage wild turkey populations; however, where water is not naturally present, wildlife watering facilities must be provided to attract and maintain wild turkey and other wildlife species. Livestock grazing management is vital on this soil if wildlife populations are to be maintained.

This soil has good potential for use as homesites. Plans for homesite development on this soil should provide for the preservation of as many trees as possible in order to maintain the esthetic value of the sites. During seasons of low precipitation, fire may become a hazard to homesites. This hazard can be minimized by installing firebreaks and reducing the amount of litter on the forest floor. Capability subclass VIe.

**41—Kettle gravelly loamy sand, 8 to 40 percent slopes.** This deep, well drained soil formed in sandy arkosic deposits on uplands. Elevation ranges from 7,000 to 7,700 feet. The average annual precipitation is about 18 inches, the average annual air temperature is about 43 degrees F, and the average frost-free period is about 120 days.

Typically, the surface layer is gray gravelly loamy sand about 3 inches thick. The subsurface layer is light gray gravelly loamy sand about 13 inches thick. The subsoil is very pale brown gravelly sandy loam about 24 inches thick. It consists of a matrix of loamy coarse sand that has thin bands of coarse sandy loam or sandy clay loam. The substratum to a depth of 60 inches or more is light yellowish brown extremely gravelly loamy sand.

Included with this soil in mapping are small areas of Elbeth sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes; Pring coarse sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes; Tomah-Crowfoot loamy sands, 8 to 15 percent slopes; and a few rock outcrops.

Permeability of this Kettle soil is rapid. Effective rooting depth is 60 inches or more. Available water capacity is low to moderate. Surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate. Some gullies have formed in drainageways.

The soil is used for woodland, livestock grazing, wildlife habitat, recreation, and homesites.

This soil is suited to the production of ponderosa pine. It is capable of producing 2,240 cubic feet, or 4,900 board



feet (International rule), of merchantable timber per acre from a fully stocked, even-aged stand of 80-year-old trees. The main limitation for this use is the moderate hazard of erosion. Measures must be taken to reduce erosion when harvesting timber, especially on the steeper slopes. The low to moderate available water capacity also influences seedling survival, especially in areas where understory plants are plentiful.

This soil has good potential for mule deer, tree squirrel, cottontail, and wild turkey. These animals obtain their food and shelter from pine trees, shrubs, and ground cover, which provide browse, forbs, fruit, and seeds. The presence of ponderosa pine and Gambel oak should encourage wild turkey populations; however, where water is not naturally present, wildlife watering facilities must be provided to attract and maintain wild turkey and other wildlife species. Livestock grazing management is vital on this soil if wildlife populations are to be maintained.

The moderately sloping to steep slopes limit the suitability of this soil for homesites. Special practices must be provided to minimize surface runoff and thus keep erosion to a minimum. This soil requires special site or building designs because of the slope. Deep cuts, to provide essentially level building sites, may expose bedrock. Access roads must be designed to provide adequate cut-slope grade, and drains must be used to control surface runoff and keep soil losses to a minimum. During seasons of low precipitation, fire may become a hazard to homesites. This hazard can be minimized by installing firebreaks and reducing the amount of litter on the forest floor. Capability subclass VIe.

**42—Kettle-Rock outcrop complex.** This gently rolling to very steep complex, is mostly on the side slopes of uplands. Slopes range from 8 to 60 percent. Elevation ranges from 6,800 to 7,700 feet. The average annual precipitation is about 18 inches, and average annual air temperature is about 43 degrees F.

The Kettle soil makes up about 60 percent of the complex, Rock outcrop about 20 percent, and other soils about 20 percent.

Included with this complex in mapping are areas of Peyton-Pring complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes; Elbeth sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes; and Elbeth-Pring complex, 5 to 50 percent slopes.

The Kettle soil is deep and well drained. It formed in sandy arkosic deposits, mostly on the lower slopes of the complex. Slope is commonly less than 20 percent. Typically, the surface layer is gray, medium acid or slightly acid gravelly loamy sand about 3 inches thick. The sub-surface layer is light gray, medium acid gravelly loamy sand about 13 inches thick. The subsoil is very pale brown, medium acid or slightly acid gravelly sandy loam about 24 inches thick. It consists of loamy coarse sand that has thin bands of coarse sandy loam or sandy clay loam. The substratum to a depth of 60 inches or more is light yellowish brown extremely gravelly loamy sand.

Permeability of the Kettle soil is rapid. Effective rooting depth is more than 60 inches. Available water capaci-

ty is low to moderate. Surface runoff is medium to rapid, and the hazard of erosion is slight to high. Soil slippage and deep gullies are common.

Rock outcrop is mostly in the form of vertical cliffs. Large stones are common on the lower slopes of this complex.

This complex is suited to the production of ponderosa pine. It is capable of producing 2,240 cubic feet, or 4,900 board feet (International rule), of merchantable timber per acre from a fully stocked, even-aged stand of 80-year-old trees. The main limitation of this complex for this use is the presence of Rock outcrop and the moderate hazard of erosion on the Kettle soil. Measures must be taken to minimize erosion when harvesting timber, especially on the steeper slopes. The low to moderate available water capacity also influences seedling survival, especially where understory plants are plentiful.

This complex has good potential for producing habitat for mule deer, tree squirrels, cottontail, and wild turkey. These animals obtain their food and shelter from pine trees, shrubs, and ground cover, which provide browse, forbs, fruit, and seeds. The presence of ponderosa pine and Gambel oak should encourage wild turkey populations; however, where water is not naturally present, wildlife watering facilities must be provided to attract and maintain wild turkey and other wildlife species. Livestock grazing management is vital on this soil if wildlife populations are to be maintained.

The moderate to very steep slopes limit the potential of this complex for homesites. Special practices must be provided to minimize surface runoff and thus keep erosion to a minimum. Special site or building designs are required because of the slope. Deep cuts, to provide essentially level building sites, can expose bedrock. The limitation of large stones on the soil surface can be overcome through the use of heavy equipment when preparing building sites. Access roads must be designed to provide adequate cut-slope grade, and drains must be used to control surface runoff and thus keep soil losses to a minimum. Deep cuts along the uphill side of the roads can expose the bedrock. Capability subclass VIIe.

**43—Kim loam, 1 to 8 percent slopes.** This deep, well drained soil formed in calcareous loamy sediment on fans and uplands. Elevation ranges from 5,300 to 5,600. The average annual precipitation is about 13 inches, the average annual temperature is about 49 degrees F, and the average frost-free period is about 145 days.

Typically, the surface layer is brown loam about 4 inches thick. The substratum is very pale brown loam to a depth of 60 inches or more.

Included with this soil in mapping are small areas of Fort Collins loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes; Midway clay loam, 3 to 25 percent slopes, and Wiley silt loam, 3 to 9 percent slopes.

Permeability of this Kim soil is moderate. Effective rooting depth is 60 inches or more. Available water capacity is high. Surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate.

Almost all areas of this soil are used as rangeland.

support a load and potential frost action on roads and streets. Roads and buildings can be designed to overcome these limitations. Capability subclass IVe.

**67—Peyton sandy loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes.** This deep, noncalcareous, well drained soil formed in alluvium and residuum derived from weathered arkosic sedimentary rock on uplands. Elevation ranges from 6,800 to 7,600 feet.

Typically, the surface layer is grayish brown sandy loam about 12 inches thick. The subsoil, about 23 inches thick, is pale brown sandy clay loam in the upper 13 inches and pale brown sandy loam in the lower 10 inches. The substratum is pale brown sandy loam to a depth of 60 inches.

Included with this soil in mapping are small areas of Holderness loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes; Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes; and Tomah-Crowfoot loamy sands, 3 to 8 percent slopes.

Permeability of this soil is moderate. Effective rooting depth is 60 inches or more. Available water capacity is high. Surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate. Gullies and rills are common.

Most of the acreage of this Peyton soil is used as rangeland. Some areas are used for wheat and oats. Stubble mulching or other crop residue management practices are needed to control water erosion. Wildlife habitat is also an important use.

This soil is well suited to the production of native vegetation suitable for grazing. The native vegetation is mainly mountain muhly, bluestem, mountain brome, needleandthread, and blue grama. This soil is subject to invasion by Kentucky bluegrass and Gambel oak. Minor amounts of forbs such as hairy goldenrod, geranium, milkvetch, low larkspur, fringed sage, and buckwheat are in the stand.

Proper location of livestock watering facilities helps to control grazing. Timely deferment of grazing is needed to protect the plant cover.

Windbreaks and environmental plantings generally are suited to this soil. Soil blowing is the main limitation to the establishment of trees and shrubs. This limitation can be overcome by cultivating only in the tree rows and leaving a strip of vegetation between the rows. Supplemental irrigation may be necessary when planting and during dry periods. Trees that are best suited and have good survival are Rocky Mountain juniper, eastern redcedar, ponderosa pine, Siberian elm, Russian-olive, and hackberry. Shrubs that are best suited are skunkbush sumac, lilac, and Siberian peashrub.

This soil is suited to habitat for openland and rangeland wildlife. Rangeland wildlife, such as pronghorn antelope, can be encouraged by developing livestock watering facilities, properly managing livestock grazing, and reseeding range where needed.

This soil has good potential for homesites. The main limitation is the limited ability to support a load and potential frost action. Buildings and roads can be designed to overcome these limitations. Capability subclass IVe.

**68—Peyton-Pring complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes.** These gently sloping to moderately sloping soils are on valley side slopes and on uplands. Elevation ranges from 6,800 to 7,600 feet. The average annual precipitation is about 17 inches, the average annual air temperature is about 43 degrees F, and the average frost-free period is about 120 days.

The Peyton soil makes up about 40 percent of the complex, the Pring soil about 30 percent, and other soils about 30 percent.

Included with these soils in mapping are areas of Holderness loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes; Holderness loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes; and Tomah-Crowfoot loamy sands, 3 to 8 percent slopes. In some places arkosic beds of sandstone and shale are at a depth of 0 to 40 inches.

The Peyton soil is commonly on the less sloping part of the landscape. It is deep, noncalcareous, and well drained. It formed in alluvium and residuum derived from weathered arkosic sedimentary rock. Typically, the surface layer is grayish brown sandy loam about 12 inches thick. The subsoil, about 23 inches thick, is pale brown sandy clay loam in the upper 13 inches and pale brown sandy loam in the lower 10 inches. The substratum is pale brown sandy loam to a depth of 60 inches or more.

Permeability of the Peyton soil is moderate. Effective rooting depth is 60 inches or more. Available water capacity is high. Surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate.

The Pring soil is deep, noncalcareous, and well drained. It formed in sandy sediment derived from weathered arkosic sedimentary rock. Typically, the surface layer is dark grayish brown coarse sandy loam about 4 inches thick. The substratum is dark grayish brown coarse sandy loam about 10 inches thick over pale brown gravelly sandy loam that extends to a depth of 60 inches or more.

Permeability of the Pring soil is rapid. Effective rooting depth is 60 inches or more. Available water capacity is moderate. Surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate.

These soils are used as rangeland, for wildlife habitat, and for homesites.

These soils are well suited to the production of native vegetation suitable for grazing. The dominant native species are mountain muhly, bluestem, needleandthread, and blue grama. These soils are subject to invasion of Kentucky bluegrass and Gambel oak. Common forbs are hairy goldenrod, geranium, milkvetch, low larkspur, fringed sage, and buckwheat.

Properly locating livestock watering facilities helps to control grazing. Timely deferment of grazing is needed to protect the plant cover.

Windbreaks and environmental plantings generally are suited to these soils. Soil blowing is the main limitation to the establishment of trees and shrubs. This limitation can be overcome by cultivating only in the tree rows and leaving a strip of vegetation between the rows. Supplemental irrigation may be needed when planting and during dry periods. Trees that are best suited and have good

survival are Rocky Mountain juniper, eastern redcedar, ponderosa pine, Siberian elm, Russian-olive, and hackberry. Shrubs that are best suited are skunkbush sumac, lilac, and Siberian peashrub.

These soils are suited to habitat for openland and rangeland wildlife. Rangeland wildlife, such as pronghorn antelope, can be encouraged by developing livestock watering facilities, properly managing livestock grazing, and reseeding range where needed.

These soils have a good potential for homesites. The main limitations, especially on the Peyton soil, are low bearing strength and frost-action potential. Buildings and roads can be designed to overcome these limitations. Access roads should have adequate cut-slope grade and be provided with drains to control surface runoff and keep soil losses to a minimum. Capability subclass VIe.

**69—Peyton-Pring complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes.** These gently to moderately sloping soils are on valley side slopes and on uplands. Elevation ranges from 6,800 to 7,600 feet. The average annual precipitation is about 17 inches, the average annual air temperature is about 43 degrees F, and the average frost-free period is about 120 days.

The Peyton soil makes up about 40 percent of the complex, the Pring soil about 30 percent, and other soils about 30 percent.

Included with these soils in mapping are areas of Holderness loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes; Tomah-Crowfoot loamy sands, 8 to 15 percent slopes; Kettle gravelly loamy sand, 8 to 40 percent slopes; and a few areas of Rock outcrop.

The Peyton soil is commonly on the less sloping part of the landscape. It is deep, noncalcareous, and well drained. It formed in alluvium and residuum derived from weathered, arkosic, sedimentary rock. Typically, the surface layer is grayish brown sandy loam about 12 inches thick. The subsoil, about 23 inches thick, is pale brown sandy clay loam in the upper 13 inches and pale brown sandy loam in the lower 10 inches. The substratum is pale brown sandy loam to a depth of 60 inches or more.

Permeability of the Peyton soil is moderate. Effective rooting depth is 60 inches or more. Available water capacity is high. Surface runoff is medium to rapid, and the hazard of erosion is moderate to high. Some gullies have developed along drainageways and livestock trails.

The Pring soil is deep, noncalcareous, and well drained. It formed in sandy sediment derived from weathered, arkosic, sedimentary rock. Typically, the surface layer is dark grayish brown coarse sandy loam about 4 inches thick. The substratum is dark grayish brown coarse sandy loam about 10 inches thick over pale brown gravelly sandy loam that extends to a depth of 60 inches or more.

Permeability of the Pring soil is rapid. Effective rooting depth is 60 inches or more. Available water capacity is moderate. Surface runoff is medium to rapid, and the hazard of erosion is moderate to high. Some gullies have developed along drainageways and livestock trails.

The soils in this complex are used as rangeland, for wildlife habitat, and for homesites.

These soils are well suited to the production of native vegetation suitable for grazing. The dominant native species are mountain muhly, bluestem grasses, needle-andthread, and blue grama. These soils are subject to invasion of Kentucky bluegrass and Gambel oak. Common forbs are hairy goldenrod, geranium, milkvetch, low larkspur, fringed sage, and buckwheat.

Properly locating livestock watering facilities helps to control grazing. Timely deferment of grazing is needed to protect the plant cover.

Windbreaks and environmental plantings generally are suited to these soils. Soil blowing is the main limitation to the establishment of trees and shrubs. This limitation can be overcome by cultivating only in the tree rows and leaving a strip of vegetation between the rows. Supplemental irrigation may be needed when planting and during dry periods. Trees that are best suited and have good survival are Rocky Mountain juniper, eastern redcedar, ponderosa pine, Siberian elm, Russian-olive, and hackberry. Shrubs that are best suited are skunkbush sumac, lilac, and Siberian peashrub.

These soils are well suited to wildlife habitat. They are best suited to habitat for openland and rangeland wildlife. Rangeland wildlife, such as pronghorn antelope, can be encouraged by developing livestock watering facilities, properly managing livestock grazing, and reseeding range where needed.

These soils have good potential for use as homesites. The main limitations are steepness of slope, limited ability to support a load, and frost-action potential. Buildings and roads can be designed to overcome these limitations. These soils also require special site or building designs because of the slope. Access roads should have adequate cut-slope grade, and drains should be provided to control surface runoff and keep soil losses to a minimum. Capability subclass VIe.

**70—Pits, gravel.** Gravel pits are in nearly level to rolling areas. They are open excavations several feet deep and commonly 5 acres or less in size.

Gravel pits are very low in natural fertility and are highly susceptible to soil blowing. A cover of weeds or straw helps to control erosion.

Windbreaks and environmental plantings generally are not suited to these areas. Onsite investigation is needed to determine if plantings are feasible. Capability subclass VIIIs.

**71—Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes.** This deep, noncalcareous, well drained soil formed in sandy sediment derived from arkosic sedimentary rock on valley side slopes and on uplands. Elevation ranges from 6,800 to 7,600 feet. The average annual precipitation is about 17 inches, the average annual air temperature is about 43 degrees F, and the average frost-free period is about 120 days.

Typically, the surface layer is dark grayish brown coarse sandy loam about 4 inches thick. The substratum is dark grayish brown coarse sandy loam about 10 inches thick over pale brown gravelly sandy loam that extends to a depth of 60 inches or more.

## **2 Hydrologic Calculations**

Runoff Coefficients and Percent Imperviousness Table 6-6

Colorado Springs Rainfall Intensity Duration Frequency Table 6-5

Hydrologic Calculations Summary Form SF-1 for Existing & Developed Conditions


Hydrologic Calculations Summary 5-yr Form SF-2 for Existing & Developed Conditions

Hydrologic Calculations Summary 100-yr Form SF-2 for Existing & Developed Conditions

**Table 6-6. Runoff Coefficients for Rational Method**  
(Source: UDFCD 2001)

Land Use or Surface Characteristics	Percent Impervious	Runoff Coefficients											
		2-year		5-year		10-year		25-year		50-year		100-year	
		HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D
<b>Business</b>													
Commercial Areas	95	0.79	0.80	0.81	0.82	0.83	0.84	0.85	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.89
Neighborhood Areas	70	0.45	0.49	0.49	0.53	0.53	0.57	0.58	0.62	0.60	0.65	0.62	0.68
<b>Residential</b>													
1/8 Acre or less	65	0.41	0.45	0.45	0.49	0.49	0.54	0.54	0.59	0.57	0.62	0.59	0.65
1/4 Acre	40	0.23	0.28	0.30	0.35	0.36	0.42	0.42	0.50	0.46	0.54	0.50	0.58
1/3 Acre	30	0.18	0.22	0.25	0.30	0.32	0.38	0.39	0.47	0.43	0.52	0.47	0.57
1/2 Acre	25	0.15	0.20	0.22	0.28	0.30	0.36	0.37	0.46	0.41	0.51	0.46	0.56
1 Acre	20	0.12	0.17	0.20	0.26	0.27	0.34	0.35	0.44	0.40	0.50	0.44	0.55
<b>Industrial</b>													
Light Areas	80	0.57	0.60	0.59	0.63	0.63	0.66	0.66	0.70	0.68	0.72	0.70	0.74
Heavy Areas	90	0.71	0.73	0.73	0.75	0.75	0.77	0.78	0.80	0.80	0.82	0.81	0.83
<b>Parks and Cemeteries</b>													
Parks and Cemeteries	7	0.05	0.09	0.12	0.19	0.20	0.29	0.30	0.40	0.34	0.46	0.39	0.52
Playgrounds	13	0.07	0.13	0.16	0.23	0.24	0.31	0.32	0.42	0.37	0.48	0.41	0.54
Railroad Yard Areas	40	0.23	0.28	0.30	0.35	0.36	0.42	0.42	0.50	0.46	0.54	0.50	0.58
<b>Undeveloped Areas</b>													
Historic Flow Analysis-- Greenbelts, Agriculture	2	0.03	0.05	0.09	0.16	0.17	0.26	0.26	0.38	0.31	0.45	0.36	0.51
Pasture/Meadow	0	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.30	0.44	0.35	0.50
Forest	0	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.30	0.44	0.35	0.50
Exposed Rock	100	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96
Offsite Flow Analysis (when landuse is undefined)	45	0.26	0.31	0.32	0.37	0.38	0.44	0.44	0.51	0.48	0.55	0.51	0.59
<b>Streets</b>													
Paved	100	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96
Gravel	80	0.57	0.60	0.59	0.63	0.63	0.66	0.66	0.70	0.68	0.72	0.70	0.74
<b>Drive and Walks</b>													
Drive and Walks	100	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96
<b>Roofs</b>													
Roofs	90	0.71	0.73	0.73	0.75	0.75	0.77	0.78	0.80	0.80	0.82	0.81	0.83
<b>Lawns</b>													
Lawns	0	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.30	0.44	0.35	0.50

Figure 6-5. Colorado Springs Rainfall Intensity Duration Frequency



#### IDF Equations

$$I_{100} = -2.52 \ln(D) + 12.735$$

$$I_{50} = -2.25 \ln(D) + 11.375$$

$$I_{25} = -2.00 \ln(D) + 10.111$$

$$I_{10} = -1.75 \ln(D) + 8.847$$

$$I_5 = -1.50 \ln(D) + 7.583$$

$$I_2 = -1.19 \ln(D) + 6.035$$

Note: Values calculated by equations may not precisely duplicate values read from figure.

Job No.: 61211  
 Project: Snow Mass Replat

Date: 2/19/2024 15:44  
 Calcs By: TJW  
 Checked By: \_\_\_\_\_

**Time of Concentration** (Modified from Standard Form SF-1)

Sub-Basin	Sub-Basin Data				Overland			Shallow Channel				Channelized				t <sub>c</sub> Check		t <sub>c</sub> (min)
	Area (Acres)	C <sub>5</sub>	C <sub>100</sub> /CN	% Imp.	L <sub>0</sub> (ft)	S <sub>0</sub> (%)	t <sub>i</sub> (min)	L <sub>0t</sub> (ft)	S <sub>0t</sub> (ft/ft)	v <sub>0sc</sub> (ft/s)	t <sub>t</sub> (min)	L <sub>0c</sub> (ft)	S <sub>0c</sub> (ft/ft)	v <sub>0c</sub> (ft/s)	t <sub>c</sub> (min)	L (min)	t <sub>c,alt</sub> (min)	
OS-A	0.75	0.08	0.35	0%	274	6%	17.0	0	0.000	0.0	0.0	0	0.000	0.0	0.0	274	N/A	17.0
OS-C	1.87	0.13	0.39	9%	115	19%	7.1	0	0.000	0.0	0.0	485	0.045	1.7	4.8	600	N/A	11.9
EX-A	5.67	0.08	0.35	0%	300	4%	20.8	330	0.073	1.9	2.9	0	0.000	0.0	0.0	630	N/A	23.7
EX-B	4.69	0.11	0.37	4%	300	5%	18.7	470	0.115	2.4	3.3	0	0.000	0.0	0.0	770	N/A	22.0
PP-A	5.67	0.11	0.37	4%	300	4%	20.3	330	0.073	1.9	2.9	0	0.000	0.0	0.0	630	N/A	23.2
PP-B	4.69	0.12	0.38	6%	300	5%	18.4	470	0.115	2.4	3.3	0	0.000	0.0	0.0	770	N/A	21.7

Job No.: **61211**  
 Project: **Snow Mass Replat**  
 Design Storm: **5-Year Storm (20% Probability)**  
 Jurisdiction: **DCM**

Date: **2/19/2024 15:44**  
 Calcs By: **TJW**  
 Checked By: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sub-Basin and Combined Flows** (Modified from Standard Form SF-2)

DP	Sub-Basin	Area (Acres)	C5	Direct Runoff				Combined Runoff				Streetflow			Pipe Flow					Travel Time		
				t <sub>c</sub>	CA	I5	Q5	t <sub>c</sub>	CA	I5	Q5	Slope	Length	Q	Q	Slope	Mnngs	Length	D <sub>Pipe</sub>	Length	V <sub>disc</sub>	t <sub>t</sub>
				(min)	(Acres)	(in/hr)	(cfs)	(min)	(Acres)	(in/hr)	(cfs)	(%)	(ft)	(cfs)	(cfs)	(%)	n	(ft)	(in)	(ft)	(ft/s)	(min)
DP-EXA	OS-A	0.75	0.08	17.0	0.06	3.33	0.20															
	EX-A	5.67	0.08	23.7	0.45	2.84	1.29															
		6.42	0.08					28.8	0.51	2.54	1.3											
DP-EXC	EX-B	4.69	0.11	22.0	0.50	2.95	1.47															
	OS-C	1.87	0.13	11.9	0.25	3.87	0.97															
		6.57	0.11					21.7	0.75	2.97	2.2											
DP-PPA	OS-A	0.75	0.08	17.0	0.06	3.33	0.20															
	PP-B	4.69	0.12	21.7	0.58	2.97	1.73															
		6.42	0.10					28.8	0.66	2.54	1.7											
DP-PPC	B																					
	OS-C	1.87	0.13	11.9	0.25	3.87	0.97															
		6.57	0.13					21.7	0.84	2.97	2.5											

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$   
 C1: 1.5  
 C1: 7.583



Job No.: **61211**  
 Project: **Snow Mass Replat**  
 Design Storm: **100-Year Storm (1% Probability)**  
 Jurisdiction: **DCM**

Date: **2/19/2024 15:44**  
 Calcs By: **TJW**  
 Checked By: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sub-Basin and Combined Flows** (Modified from Standard Form SF-2)

DP	Sub-Basin	Area (Acres)	C100	Direct Runoff				Combined Runoff				Streetflow			Pipe Flow					Travel Time			
				t <sub>c</sub> (min)	CA (Acres)	I100 (in/hr)	Q100 (cfs)	t <sub>c</sub> (min)	CA (Acres)	I100 (in/hr)	Q100 (cfs)	Slope (%)	Length (ft)	Q (cfs)	Q (cfs)	Slope (%)	Mnngs n	Length (ft)	D <sub>Pipe</sub> (in)	Length (ft)	V <sub>0.5c</sub> (ft/s)	t <sub>t</sub> (min)	
DP-EXA	OS-A	0.75	0.35	17.0	0.26	5.59	1.47																
	EX-A	5.67	0.35	23.7	1.98	4.76	9.44																
		6.42	0.35					28.8	2.25	4.27	9.6												
DP-EXC	EX-B	4.69	0.37	22.0	1.73	4.95	8.55																
	OS-C	1.87	0.39	11.9	0.73	6.50	4.71																
		6.57	0.37					21.7	2.45	4.99	12.2												
DP-PPA	OS-A	0.75	0.35	17.0	0.26	5.59	1.47																
	PP-B	4.69	0.38	21.7	1.79	4.99	8.92																
		6.42	0.37					28.8	2.35	4.27	10.0												
DP-PPC	B																						
	OS-C	1.87	0.39	11.9	0.73	6.50	4.71																
		6.57	0.38					21.7	2.51	4.99	12.5												

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$   
 C1: 2.52  
 C1: 12.735

## Sub-Basin OS-A Runoff Calculations

Job No.: 61211  
 Project: Snow Mass Replat  
 Jurisdiction: DCM  
 Runoff Coefficient: Surface Type

Date: 2/19/2024 15:44  
 Calcs by: TJW  
 Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Soil Type: B  
 Urbanization: Non-Urban

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient						% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100	
Pasture/Meadow	32,767	0.75	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%
<b>Combined</b>	<b>32,767</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

32767

### Basin Travel Time

	Shallow Channel	Ground Cover	Short Pasture/Lawns				
$L_{max,Overland}$	300	ft	$C_v$	7			
$L$ (ft)	274	$\Delta Z_0$ (ft)	$S_0$ (ft/ft)	$v$ (ft/s)	$t$ (min)	$t_{Alt}$ (min)	
Total	274	16	-	-	-	-	
Initial Time	274	16	0.058	-	17.0	N/A	DCM Eq. 6-8
Shallow Channel			0.000	0.0	0.0	-	DCM Eq. 6-9
Channelized			0.000	0.0	0.0	-	V-Ditch
				$t_c$	<b>17.0 min.</b>		

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
Intensity (in/hr)	2.66	3.33	3.89	4.44	5.00	5.59
Runoff (cfs)	0.0	<b>0.2</b>	0.4	0.8	1.1	<b>1.5</b>
Release Rates (cfs/ac)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Allowed Release (cfs)	0.0	<b>0.2</b>	0.4	0.8	1.1	<b>1.5</b>

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1	1.19	1.5	1.75	2	2.25	2.52
C2	6.035	7.583	8.847	10.111	11.375	12.735

### Notes

## Sub-Basin OS-C Runoff Calculations

Job No.: 61211  
 Project: Snow Mass Replat  
 Jurisdiction: DCM  
 Runoff Coefficient: Surface Type

Date: 2/19/2024 15:44  
 Calcs by: TJW  
 Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Soil Type: B  
 Urbanization: Non-Urban

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient						% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100	
Pasture/Meadow	72,921	1.67	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%
Gravel	8,676	0.20	0.57	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.7	80%
<b>Combined</b>	<b>81,597</b>	<b>1.87</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>8.5%</b>

81597

### Basin Travel Time

	Shallow Channel	Ground Cover	Short Pasture/Lawns			
	$L_{max,Overland}$	300 ft			$C_v$	7
	L (ft)	$\Delta Z_0$ (ft)	$S_0$ (ft/ft)	v (ft/s)	t (min)	$t_{Alt}$ (min)
Total	600	44	-	-	-	-
Initial Time	115	22	0.191	-	7.1	N/A DCM Eq. 6-8
Shallow Channel			0.000	0.0	0.0	- DCM Eq. 6-9
Channelized	485	22	0.045	1.7	4.8	- V-Ditch
				$t_c$	<b>11.9 min.</b>	

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
Intensity (in/hr)	3.09	3.87	4.52	5.16	5.81	6.50
Runoff (cfs)	0.5	1.0	1.7	2.8	3.7	4.7
Release Rates (cfs/ac)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Allowed Release (cfs)	0.5	1.0	1.7	2.8	3.7	4.7

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1      1.19      1.5      1.75      2      2.25      2.52  
 C2      6.035      7.583      8.847      10.111      11.375      12.735

### Notes

## Sub-Basin EX-A Runoff Calculations

Job No.: 61211  
 Project: Snow Mass Replat  
 Jurisdiction: DCM  
 Runoff Coefficient: Surface Type

Date: 2/19/2024 15:44  
 Calcs by: TJW  
 Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Soil Type: B  
 Urbanization: Non-Urban

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient						% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100	
Pasture/Meadow	246,958	5.67	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%
<b>Combined</b>	<b>246,958</b>	<b>5.67</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

246958

### Basin Travel Time

	Shallow Channel	Ground Cover	Short Pasture/Lawns				
$L_{max,Overland}$	300	ft	$C_v$	7			
$L$ (ft)	$\Delta Z_0$ (ft)	$S_0$ (ft/ft)	$v$ (ft/s)	$t$ (min)	$t_{Alt}$ (min)		
Total	630	35	-	-	-		
Initial Time	300	11	0.037	-	20.8	N/A DCM Eq. 6-8	
Shallow Channel	330	24	0.073	1.9	2.9	- DCM Eq. 6-9	
Channelized			0.000	0.0	0.0	- V-Ditch	
				$t_c$	<b>23.7 min.</b>		

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
<b>Intensity (in/hr)</b>	2.27	2.84	3.31	3.78	4.25	4.76
<b>Runoff (cfs)</b>	0.3	1.3	2.8	5.4	7.2	9.4
<b>Release Rates (cfs/ac)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Allowed Release (cfs)</b>	0.3	1.3	2.8	5.4	7.2	9.4

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1      1.19      1.5      1.75      2      2.25      2.52  
 C2      6.035      7.583      8.847      10.111      11.375      12.735

### Notes

## Sub-Basin EX-B Runoff Calculations

Job No.: 61211  
 Project: Snow Mass Replat  
 Jurisdiction: DCM  
 Runoff Coefficient: Surface Type

Date: 2/19/2024 15:44  
 Calcs by: TJW  
 Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Soil Type: B  
 Urbanization: Non-Urban

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient						% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100	
Pasture/Meadow	193,896	4.45	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%
Gravel	10,586	0.24	0.57	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.7	80%
<b>Combined</b>	<b>204,482</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>4.1%</b>

204482

### Basin Travel Time

	Shallow Channel	Ground Cover	Short Pasture/Lawns				
$L_{max,Overland}$	300	ft	$C_v$	7			
$L$ (ft)	$\Delta Z_0$ (ft)	$S_0$ (ft/ft)	$v$ (ft/s)	$t$ (min)	$t_{Alt}$ (min)		
Total	770	68	-	-	-		
Initial Time	300	14	0.047	-	18.7	N/A DCM Eq. 6-8	
Shallow Channel	470	54	0.115	2.4	3.3	- DCM Eq. 6-9	
Channelized			0.000	0.0	0.0	- V-Ditch	
				$t_c$	<b>22.0 min.</b>		

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
<b>Intensity (in/hr)</b>	2.36	2.95	3.44	3.93	4.42	4.95
<b>Runoff (cfs)</b>	0.5	1.5	2.8	5.0	6.6	8.5
<b>Release Rates (cfs/ac)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Allowed Release (cfs)</b>	0.5	1.5	2.8	5.0	6.6	8.5

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1	1.19	1.5	1.75	2	2.25	2.52
C2	6.035	7.583	8.847	10.111	11.375	12.735

### Notes

## Sub-Basin PP-A Runoff Calculations

Job No.: 61211  
 Project: Snow Mass Replat  
 Jurisdiction: DCM  
 Runoff Coefficient: Surface Type

Date: 2/19/2024 15:44  
 Calcs by: TJW  
 Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Soil Type: B  
 Urbanization: Non-Urban

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient						% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100	
Pasture/Meadow	236,958	5.44	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%
Roofs	2,500	0.06	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.8	0.81	90%
Paved	2,500	0.06	0.89	0.9	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	100%
Gravel	5,000	0.11	0.57	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.7	80%
<b>Combined</b>	<b>246,958</b>	<b>5.67</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>3.5%</b>

246958

### Basin Travel Time

	Shallow Channel Ground Cover		Short Pasture/Lawns			
	$L_{max,Overland}$	300 ft			$C_v$	7
	L (ft)	$\Delta Z_0$ (ft)	$S_0$ (ft/ft)	v (ft/s)	t (min)	$t_{Alt}$ (min)
Total	630	35	-	-	-	-
Initial Time	300	11	0.037	-	20.3	N/A DCM Eq. 6-8
Shallow Channel	330	24	0.073	1.9	2.9	- DCM Eq. 6-9
Channelized			0.000	0.0	0.0	- V-Ditch
				$t_c$	<b>23.2 min.</b>	

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
<b>Intensity (in/hr)</b>	2.29	2.87	3.35	3.82	4.30	4.81
<b>Runoff (cfs)</b>	0.6	1.7	3.3	5.9	7.8	10.0
<b>Release Rates (cfs/ac)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Allowed Release (cfs)</b>	0.6	1.7	3.3	5.9	7.8	10.0

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1	1.19	1.5	1.75	2	2.25	2.52
C2	6.035	7.583	8.847	10.111	11.375	12.735

### Notes

## Sub-Basin PP-B Runoff Calculations

Job No.: 61211  
 Project: Snow Mass Replat  
 Jurisdiction: DCM  
 Runoff Coefficient: Surface Type

Date: 2/19/2024 15:44  
 Calcs by: TJW  
 Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Soil Type: B  
 Urbanization: Non-Urban

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient						% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100	
Pasture/Meadow	188,896	4.34	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%
Roofs	2,500	0.06	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.8	0.81	90%
Paved	2,500	0.06	0.89	0.9	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	100%
Gravel	10,586	0.24	0.57	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.7	80%
<b>Combined</b>	<b>204,482</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>6.5%</b>

204482

### Basin Travel Time

	Shallow Channel Ground Cover		Short Pasture/Lawns			
	$L_{max,Overland}$	300 ft	$S_0$ (ft/ft)	$v$ (ft/s)	$t$ (min)	$t_{Alt}$ (min)
Total	770	68	-	-	-	-
Initial Time	300	14	0.047	-	18.4	N/A DCM Eq. 6-8
Shallow Channel	470	54	0.115	2.4	3.3	- DCM Eq. 6-9
Channelized			0.000	0.0	0.0	- V-Ditch
			<b><math>t_c</math> 21.7 min.</b>			

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
<b>Intensity (in/hr)</b>	2.38	2.97	3.47	3.96	4.46	4.99
<b>Runoff (cfs)</b>	0.8	1.7	3.1	5.3	7.0	8.9
<b>Release Rates (cfs/ac)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Allowed Release (cfs)</b>	0.8	1.7	3.1	5.3	7.0	8.9

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1      1.19      1.5      1.75      2      2.25      2.52  
 C2      6.035      7.583      8.847      10.111      11.375      12.735

### Notes

## Combined Sub-Basin Runoff Calculations

Includes Basins OS-A EX-A

Job No.:	<b>61211</b>	Date:	<b>2/19/2024 15:44</b>
Project:	<b>Snow Mass Replat</b>	Calcs by:	<b>TJW</b>
Jurisdiction	<b>DCM</b>	Checked by:	
Runoff Coefficient	<b>Surface Type</b>	Soil Type	<b>B</b>
		Urbanization	<b>Non-Urban</b>

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient						% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100	
Pasture/Meadow	279,725	6.42	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%
Roofs	-	0.00	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.8	0.81	90%
Paved	-	0.00	0.89	0.9	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	100%
Gravel	-	0.00	0.57	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.7	80%
<b>Combined</b>	<b>279,725</b>	<b>6.42</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

### Basin Travel Time

	Sub-basin or Channel Type	Material Type	L (ft)	Elev. ΔZ <sub>0</sub> (ft)	Q <sub>i</sub> (cfs)	Base or Dia (ft)	Sides z:1 (ft/ft)	v (ft/s)	t (min)
Furthest Reach	OS-A	-	274	16	-	-	-	-	17.0
Channelized-1	Trap Ditch	2	630	35	2	20	20	0.9	11.8
Channelized-2									
Channelized-3									
Total			904	51					

2 = Natural, Winding, minimal vegetation/shallow grass

**t<sub>c</sub> (min) 28.8**

### Contributing Offsite Flows (Added to Runoff and Allowed Release, below.)

Contributing Basins/Areas

Q<sub>Minor</sub> (cfs) - 5-year Storm

Q<sub>Major</sub> (cfs) - 100-year Storm

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
<b>Intensity (in/hr)</b>	2.04	2.54	2.97	3.39	3.82	4.27
<b>Site Runoff (cfs)</b>	0.26	<b>1.31</b>	2.86	5.44	7.35	<b>9.59</b>
<b>OffSite Runoff (cfs)</b>	-	<b>0.00</b>	-	-	-	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Release Rates (cfs/ac)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Allowed Release (cfs)</b>	-	<b>1.3</b>	-	-	-	<b>9.6</b>

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1	1.19	1.5	1.75	2	2.25	2.52
C2	6.035	7.583	8.847	10.111	11.375	12.735

### Notes

Runoff from Offsite basins have been assumed constant, despite additional times of concentration.



## Combined Sub-Basin Runoff Calculations

Includes Basins OS-A PP-A

Job No.:	<b>61211</b>	Date:	<b>2/19/2024 15:44</b>
Project:	<b>Snow Mass Replat</b>	Calcs by:	<b>TJW</b>
Jurisdiction	<b>DCM</b>	Checked by:	
Runoff Coefficient	<b>Surface Type</b>	Soil Type	<b>B</b>
		Urbanization	<b>Non-Urban</b>

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient						% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100	
Pasture/Meadow	269,725	6.19	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%
Roofs	2,500	0.06	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.8	0.81	90%
Paved	2,500	0.06	0.89	0.9	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	100%
Gravel	5,000	0.11	0.57	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.7	80%
<b>Combined</b>	<b>279,725</b>	<b>6.42</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>3.1%</b>

### Basin Travel Time

	Sub-basin or Channel Type	Material Type	L (ft)	Elev. ΔZ <sub>0</sub> (ft)	Q <sub>i</sub> (cfs)	Base or Dia (ft)	Sides z:1 (ft/ft)	v (ft/s)	t (min)
Furthest Reach	OS-A	-	274	16	-	-	-	-	17.0
Channelized-1	Trap Ditch	2	630	35	2	20	20	0.9	11.8
Channelized-2									
Channelized-3									
Total			904	51					

2 = Natural, Winding, minimal vegetation/shallow grass

**t<sub>c</sub> (min) 28.8**

### Contributing Offsite Flows (Added to Runoff and Allowed Release, below.)

Contributing Basins/Areas

Q<sub>Minor</sub> (cfs) - 5-year Storm

Q<sub>Major</sub> (cfs) - 100-year Storm

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
<b>Intensity (in/hr)</b>	2.04	2.54	2.97	3.39	3.82	4.27
<b>Site Runoff (cfs)</b>	0.57	<b>1.67</b>	3.26	5.84	7.77	<b>10.03</b>
<b>OffSite Runoff (cfs)</b>	-	<b>0.00</b>	-	-	-	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Release Rates (cfs/ac)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Allowed Release (cfs)</b>	-	<b>1.7</b>	-	-	-	<b>10.0</b>

DCM: I = C1 \* ln(tc) + C2

C1	1.19	1.5	1.75	2	2.25	2.52
C2	6.035	7.583	8.847	10.111	11.375	12.735

### Notes

Runoff from Offsite basins have been assumed constant, despite additional times of concentration.

## Combined Sub-Basin Runoff Calculations

Includes Basins OS-C EX-B

Job No.:	<b>61211</b>	Date:	<b>2/19/2024 15:44</b>
Project:	<b>Snow Mass Replat</b>	Calcs by:	<b>TJW</b>
Jurisdiction	<b>DCM</b>	Checked by:	
Runoff Coefficient	<b>Surface Type</b>	Soil Type	<b>B</b>
		Urbanization	<b>Non-Urban</b>

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient							% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100		
Pasture/Meadow	266,817	6.13	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%	
Roofs	-	0.00	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.8	0.81	90%	
Paved	-	0.00	0.89	0.9	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	100%	
Gravel	19,262	0.44	0.57	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.7	80%	
<b>Combined</b>	<b>286,079</b>	<b>6.57</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	

### Basin Travel Time

	Sub-basin or Channel Type	Material Type	L (ft)	Elev. ΔZ <sub>0</sub> (ft)	Q <sub>i</sub> (cfs)	Base or Dia (ft)	Sides z:1 (ft/ft)	v (ft/s)	t (min)
Furthest Reach	PP-B	-	770	68	-	-	-	-	21.7
Channelized-1									
Channelized-2									
Channelized-3									
Total			770	68					
								<b>t<sub>c</sub> (min)</b>	<b>21.7</b>

### Contributing Offsite Flows (Added to Runoff and Allowed Release, below.)

Contributing Basins/Areas: [Redacted]

Q<sub>Minor</sub>: [Redacted] (cfs) - 5-year Storm

Q<sub>Major</sub>: [Redacted] (cfs) - 100-year Storm

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
<b>Intensity (in/hr)</b>	2.38	2.97	3.47	3.96	4.46	4.99
<b>Site Runoff (cfs)</b>	0.89	<b>2.23</b>	4.15	7.22	9.53	<b>12.23</b>
<b>OffSite Runoff (cfs)</b>	-	<b>0.00</b>	-	-	-	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Release Rates (cfs/ac)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Allowed Release (cfs)</b>	-	<b>2.2</b>	-	-	-	<b>12.2</b>

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1	1.19	1.5	1.75	2	2.25	2.52
C2	6.035	7.583	8.847	10.111	11.375	12.735

### Notes

Runoff from Offsite basins have been assumed constant, despite additional times of concentration.

## Combined Sub-Basin Runoff Calculations

Includes Basins OS-C PP-B

Job No.:	<b>61211</b>	Date:	<b>2/19/2024 15:44</b>
Project:	<b>Snow Mass Replat</b>	Calcs by:	<b>TJW</b>
Jurisdiction	<b>DCM</b>	Checked by:	
Runoff Coefficient	<b>Surface Type</b>	Soil Type	<b>B</b>
		Urbanization	<b>Non-Urban</b>

### Basin Land Use Characteristics

Surface	Area		Runoff Coefficient							% Imperv.
	(SF)	(Acres)	C2	C5	C10	C25	C50	C100		
Pasture/Meadow	261,817	6.01	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.3	0.35	0%	
Roofs	2,500	0.06	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.8	0.81	90%	
Paved	2,500	0.06	0.89	0.9	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	100%	
Gravel	19,262	0.44	0.57	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.7	80%	
<b>Combined</b>	<b>286,079</b>	<b>6.57</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	

### Basin Travel Time

	Sub-basin or Channel Type	Material Type	L (ft)	Elev. ΔZ <sub>0</sub> (ft)	Q <sub>i</sub> (cfs)	Base or Dia (ft)	Sides z:1 (ft/ft)	v (ft/s)	t (min)
Furthest Reach	PP-B	-	770	68	-	-	-	-	21.7
Channelized-1									
Channelized-2									
Channelized-3									
Total			770	68					
								<b>t<sub>c</sub> (min)</b>	<b>21.7</b>

### Contributing Offsite Flows (Added to Runoff and Allowed Release, below.)

Contributing Basins/Areas: [Redacted]

Q<sub>Minor</sub>: [Redacted] (cfs) - 5-year Storm

Q<sub>Major</sub>: [Redacted] (cfs) - 100-year Storm

### Rainfall Intensity & Runoff

	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
<b>Intensity (in/hr)</b>	2.38	2.97	3.47	3.96	4.46	4.99
<b>Site Runoff (cfs)</b>	1.10	<b>2.48</b>	4.42	7.50	9.82	<b>12.54</b>
<b>OffSite Runoff (cfs)</b>	-	<b>0.00</b>	-	-	-	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Release Rates (cfs/ac)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Allowed Release (cfs)</b>	-	<b>2.5</b>	-	-	-	<b>12.5</b>

DCM:  $I = C1 * \ln(tc) + C2$

C1	1.19	1.5	1.75	2	2.25	2.52
C2	6.035	7.583	8.847	10.111	11.375	12.735

### Notes

Runoff from Offsite basins have been assumed constant, despite additional times of concentration.

# Culvert Report

## DP-C 18in CMP - 5 yr

Invert Elev Dn (ft)	= 7592.00
Pipe Length (ft)	= 34.00
Slope (%)	= 2.00
Invert Elev Up (ft)	= 7592.68
Rise (in)	= 18.0
Shape	= Circular
Span (in)	= 18.0
No. Barrels	= 1
n-Value	= 0.023
Culvert Type	= Circular Corrugate Metal Pipe
Culvert Entrance	= Projecting
Coeff. K,M,c,Y,k	= 0.034, 1.5, 0.0553, 0.54, 0.9

### Embankment


Top Elevation (ft)	= 7595.67
Top Width (ft)	= 23.00
Crest Width (ft)	= 100.00

### Calculations

Qmin (cfs)	= 2.50
Qmax (cfs)	= 2.50
Tailwater Elev (ft)	= (dc+D)/2

### Highlighted

Qtotal (cfs)	= 2.50
Qpipe (cfs)	= 2.50
Qovertop (cfs)	= 0.00
Veloc Dn (ft/s)	= 1.89
Veloc Up (ft/s)	= 3.80
HGL Dn (ft)	= 7593.05
HGL Up (ft)	= 7593.28
Hw Elev (ft)	= 7593.55
Hw/D (ft)	= 0.58
Flow Regime	= Inlet Control



# Culvert Report


## DP-C 18in CMP - 100 yr

Invert Elev Dn (ft)	= 7592.00
Pipe Length (ft)	= 34.00
Slope (%)	= 2.00
Invert Elev Up (ft)	= 7592.68
Rise (in)	= 18.0
Shape	= Circular
Span (in)	= 18.0
No. Barrels	= 1
n-Value	= 0.023
Culvert Type	= Circular Corrugate Metal Pipe
Culvert Entrance	= Projecting
Coeff. K,M,c,Y,k	= 0.034, 1.5, 0.0553, 0.54, 0.9

<b>Embankment</b>	
Top Elevation (ft)	= 7595.67
Top Width (ft)	= 23.00
Crest Width (ft)	= 100.00

<b>Calculations</b>	
Qmin (cfs)	= 12.50
Qmax (cfs)	= 12.50
Tailwater Elev (ft)	= (dc+D)/2

<b>Highlighted</b>	
Qtotal (cfs)	= 12.50
Qpipe (cfs)	= 11.20
Qovertop (cfs)	= 1.30
Veloc Dn (ft/s)	= 6.56
Veloc Up (ft/s)	= 6.34
HGL Dn (ft)	= 7593.39
HGL Up (ft)	= 7594.56
Hw Elev (ft)	= 7595.70
Hw/D (ft)	= 2.01
Flow Regime	= Inlet Control



### **3 Report Maps**

Existing Condition Hydraulic Analysis Map (Map Pocket)  
Proposed Condition Hydraulic Analysis Map (Map Pocket)



**LEGEND**

PROPERTY LINE  
EASEMENT LINE  
LOT LINE

**EXISTING**

INDEX CONTOUR  
INTERMEDIATE CONTOUR

**PROPOSED**


INDEX CONTOUR  
INTERMEDIATE CONTOUR  
BASIN BOUNDARY  
FLOW AMOUNTS  
SLOPE DIRECTION AND GRADE  
BASIN LABEL  
AREA IN ACRES  
PERCENT IMPERVIOUS  
DESIGN POINT  
TIME OF CONCENTRATION  
FLOW DIRECTION

**FLOODPLAIN STATEMENT**



ACCORDING TO FEMA FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP COMMUNITY PANEL NO. 08041C0285 G, DATED DECEMBER 7, 2018, THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN ZONE "X". (AREAS DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 500-YEAR FLOODPLAIN).

**EXISTING DRAINAGE SUMMARY TABLE**

DESIGN POINTS	INCLUDED BASINS	AREA (AC)	Tc (MIN.)	RUNOFF		METHOD	
				Q5 (CFS)	Q100 (CFS)		
	OS-A	0.75	17.0	0.2	1.5	RATIONAL	
	A	5.67	23.7	1.3	9.4	RATIONAL	
	DP-A	OS-A, A	6.42	28.8	1.3	9.6	RATIONAL
	B	4.69	22.0	1.5	8.5	RATIONAL	
	OS-C	1.87	11.9	1.0	4.7	RATIONAL	
	DP-C	B, OS-C	6.57	21.7	2.2	12.2	RATIONAL



BENCHMARK



**MVE, INC.**  
ENGINEERS / SURVEYORS

1903 Leamy Street, Suite 200 Colorado Springs, CO 80909 719.635.5726

REVISIONS

DESIGNED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
DRAWN BY \_\_\_\_\_  
CHECKED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
AS-BUILT BY \_\_\_\_\_  
CHECKED BY \_\_\_\_\_

**GREAVES SUBDIVISION**  
FILING NO. 1

**DRAINAGE REPORT**

**EXISTING DRAINAGE**

MVE PROJECT 61211  
MVE DRAWING DRAIN-EX

**JANUARY 29, 2024**  
**SHEET 1 OF 1**



**LEGEND**

PROPERTY LINE  
 EASEMENT LINE  
 LOT LINE

**EXISTING**

INDEX CONTOUR  
 INTERMEDIATE CONTOUR

**PROPOSED**

INDEX CONTOUR  
 INTERMEDIATE CONTOUR

BASIN BOUNDARY

FLOW AMOUNTS  
 $Q_2 = 19.0$  cfs  
 $Q_{100} = 80.0$  cfs

SLOPE DIRECTION AND GRADE

BASIN LABEL  
 AREA IN ACRES  
 PERCENT IMPERVIOUS

DESIGN POINT


TIME OF CONCENTRATION

FLOW DIRECTION



**FLOODPLAIN STATEMENT**

ACCORDING TO FEMA FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP COMMUNITY PANEL NO. 08041C0285 G, DATED DECEMBER 7, 2018, THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN ZONE 'X'. (AREAS DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 500-YEAR FLOODPLAIN).

DESIGN POINTS	INCLUDED BASINS	AREA (AC)	Tc (MIN.)	RUNOFF		METHOD
				Q5 (CFS)	Q100 (CFS)	
	OS-A	0.75	17.0	0.2	1.5	RATIONAL
	A	5.67	23.2	1.7	10.0	RATIONAL
DP-A	OS-A, A	6.42	28.8	1.7	10.0	RATIONAL
	B	4.69	21.7	1.7	8.9	RATIONAL
	OS-C	1.87	11.9	1.0	4.7	RATIONAL
DP-C	B, OS-C	6.57	21.7	2.5	12.5	RATIONAL



BENCHMARK



**MVE, INC.**  
 ENGINEERS / SURVEYORS

1903 Leary Street, Suite 200 Colorado Springs, CO 80909 719.635.5726

REVISIONS

DESIGNED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
 DRAWN BY \_\_\_\_\_  
 CHECKED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
 AS-BUILT BY \_\_\_\_\_  
 CHECKED BY \_\_\_\_\_

GREAVES SUBDIVISION  
 FILING NO. 1

DRAINAGE REPORT  
 DEVELOPED DRAINAGE

MVE PROJECT 61211  
 MVE DRAWING DRAIN-PP

JANUARY 29, 2024  
 SHEET 1 OF 1