

FDR:

In general the FDR is confusing with the nomenclature used where you call the site "Claremont Business Park filing no 2, lot 2-1A. The site is platted as "Lot 2, Claremont Business Park filing No. 1A" or "Claremont Business Park filing No. 1A, Lot 2". Please correct this reference at all locations.

*The title of the project has been revised throughout the GEC plans and FDR report to "Claremont Business Park Fil 1A, Lot 2".*

First full paragraph on the top of page 6 calls out that a sand filter basin is proposed for Claremont Commercial Subdivision filing no 2. Please reference the current plat name of this area as well, because it is not platted as Claremont Commercial sub fil no 2 at this time, and we have no assurance that it will be, we should call out both names please.

*The Existing Conditions statement has been revised to provide clarity as to the (2) separate reports for Claremont Business Park Fil No. 2 by Matrix and the (future planned) property to the north as identified in "A Resubdivision of Tract C of Claremont Business Park Fil. No. 2, Preliminary Drainage Report by M&S Civil Consultants.*

The Claremont Business Park filing no 2 FDR (which your report refers to as 'MDDP' (which it is not an MDDP)) and the FDR for filing 1 calls out a 24" stub out of the inlet adjacent to your site. Please explain why you are not connecting into that anticipated stub. Please confirm that the 42" pipe that you are connecting into has the capacity due to the fact that the referenced FDR anticipated that your flow will enter the inlet, and not connect into the 42" pipe. Please call out the ownership of the 42" pipe.

*The Paragraph has been revised to remove references to "MDDP", and clearly state Claremont Business Park Fil No 2 Final Drainage Report, by Matrix.*

*The referenced 24" RCP that was planned to be constructed has been addressed in the Existing Conditions paragraph.*

*The existing 42" RCP has been verified to be able to convey all flows from both Tract C of Claremont Business Park Fil No. 2 and the flows from the Lot 2 of Claremont Business Park Fil 1A.*

*The ownership of the private storm system has been added to the text of the report, referencing Central Marksheffel Metro District.*

The Claremont business park filing 1A and filing 2 FDR's did not anticipate this much impervious surface for this lot. the bottom of page 6, top of page 7 (of your report) calls out the cumulative runoff, but doesn't address your specific lot and the anticipated C value. Please call out what the original C value was calculated as (in the filing 1A and filing 2 FDR) and what your new C value is and call out the additional flow and state if the downstream and the 42" pipe can handle the added Q for the area of this lot.

*The C Value in question has been decided to be left as originally determined in the report.*

Please explain how you got a weighted C value for basins A and B when the basins are 100% impervious. Please update all calculations (for each basin) for the weighed C and provide a single weighted C for the entire site, and (as stated above) compare to the previous reports assumptions.

*The C Value in question has been decided to be left as originally determined in the report.*