JR Response: addressed.

no comment from planning

This needs to be a Final Drainage Report unless it is subsequent to another FDR provide references and excerpts if so.

DRAINAGE LETTER FOR

STERLING RANCH RECYCLINGFACILITY

Prepared For:

SR Land, LLC 20 Boulder Crescent, Suite 200 Colorado Springs, CO 80903 (719) 491-3024

> June 2022 Project No. 25188.00 PCD Filing No:

Please update with "PPR-22-041"

JR Response: addressed.

Prepared By: JR Engineering, LLC 5475 Tech Center Drive, Suite 235 Colorado Springs, CO 80919 719-593-2593



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 letter has been prepared according to the criteria established by El Paso County for drainage reports and said report is in conformity with the 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.

Mike Bramlett, Colorado P.E. 32314 For and On Behalf of JR Engineering, LLC

DEVELOPER'S STATEMENT:

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

Business Name:

SR Land, LLC

By:

Title: Address:

20 Boulder Crescent, Suite 200 Colorado Springs, CO 80903

El Paso County:

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

Jennifer Irvine, P.E.	Date	
County Engineer/ ECM Administrator	Please remove "Jennifer Irvine, P.E."	
Conditions:	- For future submittals the following will be acceptable	JR Response: addressed.
J R ENGINEERING	standalone: "County Engineer/ECM Administrator Conditions: "	

Table of Contents

Purpose	
General Site Description	
General LocationI	
Description of PropertyI	
Floodplain Statement I	
Existing Drainage Conditions)
Major Basin Descriptions	/
Existing Sub-basin Drainage2	/
Proposed Drainage Conditions	;
Proposed Sub-basin Drainage3	i
Drainage Design Criteria	i
Development Criteria Reference	ļ
Hydrologic Criteria4	ŀ
Hydraulic Criteria4	ŀ
Drainage Facility Design4	ŀ
General Concept4	ŀ
Water Quality4	ŀ
Drainage and Bridge Fees5)
Summary	,
References	,

APPENDIX

- Appendix A Vicinity Map, Soil Descriptions, FEMA Floodplain Map
- Appendix B Hydrologic Calculations
- Appendix C Reference Material
- Appendix D Drainage Maps



pre-development JR Response: addressed.

PURPOSE

This document is the Drainage Letter for Sterling Ranch Recycling Facility. The purpose of this report is to identify on-site and off-site drainage patterns, areas tributary to the site, compare existing and proposed drainage conditions, and to provide information for the eligibility for exclusion to permanent stormwater quality management requirements based on the Post Construction Stormwater Management Applicability Evaluation Form.

GENERAL SITE DESCRIPTION

GENERAL LOCATION

If the site previously drained offsite - (as shown on 2011 topo) then the exclusion won't apply

JR Response: noted.

Sterling Ranch Recycling Facility (hereby referred to as the "site") is a proposed development within the Sterling Ranch master planned community with a total area of approximately 32 acres that is presently used as a concrete and asphalt recycling facility.

The site is located in north half of Section 5, Township 13 South, Range 65 West of the Sixth Principal Meridian in El Paso County, State of Colorado. The site is bounded by Marksheffle Road to the northeast, Pioneer Sand CO to the west, and un platted land borders the site to the south and north. Refer to the vicinity map in Appendix A for additional information.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

In the existing and proposed condition, the property is used as an asphalt and concrete recycling facility with gravel drives, a staging area and some existing grasslands. The site generally slope(s) to the south at 1 to 6% towards an existing 8' berm on the southern edge of the property.

Soils for this project are classified as Blakeland Loamy Sand (8) and Columbine Gravelly Sandy Loam (19). These soils are characterized as hydrologic soil types Type A. Group A soils exhibit high infiltration rates when thoroughly wet, and consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. Refer to the soil survey map in Appendix A for additional information.

There are no known irrigation facilities located on the project site.

FLOODPLAIN STATEMENT

Based on the FEMA FIRM Maps number 08041C0533G, dated December 7, 2018, the entire site lies within Zone X. Zone X is defined as area outside the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) and higher than the elevation of the 0.2-percent-annual-chance (or 500-year) flood. FIRM Maps have been presented in Appendix A.



EXISTING DRAINAGE CONDITIONS

MAJOR BASIN DESCRIPTIONS

The site lies within the upper Sand Creek Drainage Basin based on the "Sand Creek Drainage Basin Planning Study" (DBPS) completed by Kiowa Engineering Corporation in January 1993, revised March 1996. The Sand Creek Drainage Basin covers approximately 54 square miles and is divided into 7 major sub-basins. The site is within the respective upper basin Sand Creek sub-basin as shown in Appendix C.

The site generally drains from north to southwest. Currently, the site is used as pasture land for cattle. Sand Creek is located west of the site running north to south. This reach of drainage conveyance is not currently improved. Currently, Kiowa is performing studies and plans to address Sand Creek stabilization adjacent to the site.

EXISTING SUB-BASIN DRAINAGE

The existing condition of the site was broken into five major basins. The basin and sub-basin delineation is shown in the existing drainage map in Appendix D and is described as follows:

Sub-basin EX1 (Q_5 = 1.5cfs, Q_{100} =6.6cfs) is 7.45 acres and 11 percent impervious and is located offsite southeast of Vollmer Road and southwest of Marksheffel Road. Runoff from this basin sheet flows from the northwest to southeast to the ditch along Marksheffel Road at design point 1.

Sub-basin EX2 (Q_5 = 14.4cfs, Q_{100} =33.2cfs) is 9.53 acres and 47 percent impervious and consists of Markshaffel Road. Runoff from this basin sheet flows southeast along the flow lines and is collected in on grade inlets in Markshaffel Road, and piped to the existing detention pond east of Marksheffel Road at design point 2.

Sub-basin EX3 (Q_5 = 1.9cfs, Q_{100} =11.4cfs) is 5.06 acres and 4 percent impervious and is located offsite just east of the recycling facility and west of Markshaffel Road. Runoff from this basin sheet flows southeast to design point 3 and is piped east to the existing detention pond east of Marksheffel Road.

Sub-basin EX4 (Q_5 = 7.7cfs, Q_{100} =40.6cfs) is 26.07 acres and is 6 percent impervious and is located in the central portion of the site. Runoff from this basin sheet flows south towards the existing 8' berm at design point 4.

Sub-basin EX5 (Q_5 = 2.0cfs, Q_{100} =11.4cfs) is 36.46 acres and is 5 percent impervious and is located on the western portion of the site. Runoff from this basin sheet flows southwest to design point 5 located just north of the existing 8' berr



J-R ENGINEERING

Hydrological calculations and drainage map show the area of EX5 being 6.19 acres. Please revise if necessary.

Page | 2

PROPOSED DRAINAGE CONDITIONS

PROPOSED SUB-BASIN DRAINAGE

The proposed site was broken into five basins including two onsite basins and three offsite basins. The proposed basin delineation is shown on the drainage basin map within Appendix D and is described as follows.

Basin OS1 (Q_5 = 1.5cfs, Q_{100} =6.6cfs) is 7.45 acres and 11 percent impervious and is located offsite southeast of Vollmer Road and southwest of Marksheffel Road. Runoff from this basin sheet flows from the northwest to southeast to the ditch along Marksheffel Road at design point 1.

Basin OS2 (Q_5 = 14.4cfs, Q_{100} =33.2cfs) is 9.53 acres and 47 percent impervious and consists of Markshaffel Road. Runoff from this basin sheet flows southeast along the flow lines and is collected in on grade inlets in Markshaffel Road, and piped to the existing detention pond east of Marksheffel Road at design point 2.

Basin OS3 (Q_5 = 1.9cfs, Q_{100} =11.4cfs) is 5.06 acres and 4 percent impervious and is located offsite just east of the recycling facility and west of Markshaffel Road. Runoff from this basin sheet flows southeast to design point 3 and is piped east to the existing detention pond east of Marksheffel Road.

Basin A (Q_5 = 7.7cfs, Q_{100} =40.6cfs) is 26.07 acres and is 6 percent impervious and is located in the central portion of the site. Runoff from this basin sheet flows south towards the existing 8' berm at design point 4.

Basin B (Q_5 = 2.0cfs, Q_{100} =11.4cfs) is 36.46 acres and is 5 percent impervious and is located on the western portion of the site. Runoff from this basin sheet flows southwest to design point 5 located just north of the existing 8' berm.

DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA

DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA REFERENCE

Storm drainage analysis and design criteria for this project were taken from the "*City of Colorado Springs/El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manual*" Volumes 1 and 2 (EPCDCM), dated October 12, 1994, the "*Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual*" Volumes 1 to 3 (USDCM) and Chapter 6 and Section 3.2.1 of Chapter 13 of the "*Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual*" (CSDCM), dated May 2014, as adopted by El Paso County.



HYDROLOGIC CRITERIA

All hydrologic data was obtained from the "*El Paso Drainage Criteria Manual*" Volumes 1 and 2, and the "*Urban Drainage and Flood Control District Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual*" Volumes 1, 2, and 3. Onsite drainage improvements were designed based on the 5 year (minor) storm event and the 100-year (major) storm event. Runoff was calculated using the Rational Method, and rainfall intensities for the 5-year and the 100-year storm return frequencies were obtained from Table 6-2 of the CSDCM. One hour point rainfall data for the storm events is identified in the chart below. Runoff coefficients were determined based on proposed land use and from data in Table 6-6 from the CSDCM. Time of concentrations were developed using equations from CSDCM. All runoff calculations and applicable charts and graphs are included in the Appendices.

Storm	Rainfall (in.)
5-year	1.50
100-year	2.52

Table 2 - 1-hr Point Rainfall Data

HYDRAULIC CRITERIA

The Rational Method and USDCM's SF-2 and SF-3 forms were used to determine the runoff from the minor and major storms on the site.

DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN

GENERAL CONCEPT

The proposed drainage patterns for the site will remain as is in the existing conditions. There are no proposed changes to the drainage patterns of the existing site and there are no proposed drainage facilities onsite. A proposed drainage map is presented in Appelndix D.

WATER QUALITY

Since the site meets the eligibility requirements for exclusion to permanent stormwater quality management requirements based on the Post Construction Stormwater Management Applicability Evaluation Form, no water quality features have been proposed. The site will remain as is today with a majority of the site consisting of pervious area. The drainage conditions and patterns will remain as existing conditions and do not result in concentrated stromwater fow or surface water discharge that leaves the site during an 80th percentile stormwater runoff event. The Post Construction Stormwater Management Applicability Evaluation Form is provided in Appendix C.



DRAINAGE AND BRIDGE FEES

The site lies within the Sand Creek Drainage Basin. Anticipated drainage and bridge fees are presented below and will be due at time of platting (depending on date of plat submittal):.

2022 D	RAINAGE AND BRID	OGE FEES – STERLIN	IG RANCH RECYCL	ING FACILITY
Impervious Acres (ac)	Drainage Fee (Per Imp. Acre)	Bridge Fee (Per Imp. Acre)	Sterling Ranch Drainage Fee	Sterling Ranch Bridge Fee
1.9	\$21,814	\$8,923	\$41,519	\$16,983

SUMMARY

The proposed Sterling Ranch Recycling Facility drainage improvements were designed to meet or exceed the El Paso County Drainage Criteria. The proposed development will not adversely affect the offsite drainage ways or surrounding development. This report is in conformance and meets the latest El Paso County Storm Drainage Criteria requirements for this site.



REFERENCES

- 1. "El Paso County and City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual, Vol I & II".
- 2. <u>Sand Creek Drainage Basin Planning Study</u>, prepared Kiowa Engineering Corporation, January 1993, revised March 1996.
- 3. <u>Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual</u> (Volumes 1, 2, and 3), Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, June 2001.



Appendix A Vicinity Map, Soil Descriptions, FEMA Floodplain Map





N.T.S.

STERLING RECYCLING FACILITY VICINITY MAP JOB NO. 25188.00 6/3/22 SHEET 1 OF 1



Centennial 303-740-9393 • Colorado Springs 719-593-2593 Fort Collins 970-491-9888 • www.jrengineering.com



Conservation Service

Web Soil Survey National Cooperative Soil Survey Hydrologic Soil Group-El Paso County Area, Colorado



Conservation Service

Natural Resources

NSDA

Hydrologic Soil Group

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
8	Blakeland loamy sand, 1 to 9 percent slopes	A	46.2	51.5%
19	Columbine gravelly sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	A	43.6	48.5%
Totals for Area of Intere	st		89.8	100.0%

Description

Hydrologic soil groups are based on estimates of runoff potential. Soils are assigned to one of four groups according to the rate of water infiltration when the soils are not protected by vegetation, are thoroughly wet, and receive precipitation from long-duration storms.

The soils in the United States are assigned to four groups (A, B, C, and D) and three dual classes (A/D, B/D, and C/D). The groups are defined as follows:

Group A. Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission.

Group D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink-swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission.

If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic group (A/D, B/D, or C/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group D are assigned to dual classes.

Rating Options

Aggregation Method: Dominant Condition Component Percent Cutoff: None Specified Tie-break Rule: Higher





Appendix B Hydrologic Calculations



COMPOSITE % IMPERVIOUS & COMPOSITE EXISTING RUNOFF COEFFICIENT CALCULATIONS

Subdivision: Location:

Sterling Ranch Recycling Facility El Paso County

Project Name: Sterling Ranch Project No.: 25188.00 Calculated By: JSC Checked By: RAR

Calculated By: JSC Checked By: RAB Date: 6/3/22

	Total	Str	eets (10	0% Impe	rvious)		Historica	ıl Analysi	is (2%)		ìravel (p	acked) (8	30%)	Basins Weigh	: Total ited C	Basins Total Weighted %
Basin ID	Area (ac)	C5	C ₁₀₀	Area (ac)	Weighted % Imp.	c	C ₁₀₀	Area (ac)	Weighted % Imp.	C5	C ₁₀₀	Area (ac)	Weighted % Imp.	C5	ues C ₁₀₀	Imp.
EX1	7.45	0.90	0.96	0.67	9.0%	0.09	0.36	6.78	1.8%	0.59	0.70	0.03	0.3%	0.17	0.42	11.1%
EX2	9.53	0.90	0.96	4.39	46.1%	0.09	0.36	5.14	1.1%	0.59	0.70	0.02	0.2%	0.46	0.64	47.3%
EX3	5.06	06.0	0.96	0.08	1.6%	0.09	0.36	4.98	2.0%	0.59	0.70	0.00	0.0%	0.10	0.37	3.5%
EX4	26.07	0.90	0.96	0.76	2.9%	0.09	0.36	24.88	1.9%	0.59	0.70	0.43	1.3%	0.12	0.38	6.1%
EX5	6.19	06.0	0.96	0.18	2.9%	0.09	0.36	6.01	1.9%	0.59	0.70	0.00	0.0%	0.11	0.38	4.8%
TOTAL (EX4-EX5)	32.26															5.9%
TOTAL	54.30															13.7%

	ssed																										
	e: addre		s Tc			FINAL	t_c	(min)	67.7	18.0	14.0	31.2	22.7									ctor, K					
	Respons		arlene - I h?			NS)	Jrbanized t_c	(min)	67.7	34.3	27.4	34.7	30.8								nce factors, K	Conveyance Fac	2.5	5	-	10	50
	ЯĻ		Ch: hig		tc CHECK	RANIZED BASI	TOTAL	LENGTH (ft)	1676.0	2413.0	311.0	1489.0	836.0								2. NRCS Conveva	uface	w	-	lawns	pun	paved swales
						IU)	COMP. t_c	(min)	71.1	18.0	14.0	31.2	22.7								Table 6-	Type of Land Su	Heavy meado	Tillage/field	Short pasture and	Crossed unitary	arcas and shallow
			c				t_t	(min)	46.1	12.8	1.9	9.6	5.4				n 6-3										Paved a
			terling Ranch 5188.00	SC AB \$/3/22	Щ		VEL.	(ft/s)	0.5	3.0	1.5	1.8	1.8				Equatio						Equation 6-5			form Equation 6.1	IOIII Equation v.
		z	Name: S ect No.: 2	ted By: Jr ked By: R Date: 6	RAVEL TIN	(1,)	х		10.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	10.0							1able 0-4) (ft).						f to the share + f	II ICSS MIAIL IC
(5	RM SF-2	ITRATIC	Project Proj	Calcula Chec			S _t	(%)	0.3%	2.3%	2.3%	3.2%	3.3%						utes)	equency (from ad flow path (ft						of an animal main	sign pour way
XISTING	NRD FOF	CONCEN					L _t	(ft)	1463	2325	171	1023	591			Ŀ	ML		flow time (mir	nt for 5-year Ir ad flow (ft) ong the overlar						tion for fart d	path (fi)
ш	STAND ²	ME OF (AND		t,	(min)	25.1	5.2	12.2	21.6	17.2				S ₀ ⁰³⁾		verland (mitial)	unoff coefficie ingth of overlau verage slope al			L	+9)√5,		and an an and an an	melized flow
	0,	Ē			AL/OVERL/	(Ľ)	s 。	(%)	1.0%	9.0%	5.5%	5.6%	4.3%				$t_i = -\frac{1}{2}$	Where:	1/= 0/	$C_S = 1$ $L_t = \frac{1}{S_s} = 3$	or areas		T_{i} + L	60(14 <i>i</i> +			length of cha
					INITI/		7	(ft)	213	88	140	466	245			on 6-2					10 minutes fo a lesser time		$_{t_{e}}^{4} = (26 - 1)^{4}$		Where:		Lr =
							C ₁₀₀		0.42	0.64	0.37	0.38	0.38			Equation					n te value of ions result in		Equation 6-				
			⁻ acility				ۍ		0.17	0.46	0.10	0.12	0.11								nd a minimur vhen calculat						
			ty ty		ASIN	ΓA	Impervious	(%)	11%	47%	4%	8%	5%					(minutes)	utes)		urbanized areas a. um values even v					(uim)	
			Sterling Ranc El Paso Coun		SUB-B.	DAT	Hydrologic	Soils Group	A	A	A	A	A					a of concentration	al) flow time (min)	ow time (minutes).	of 5 minutes for 1 ban. Use minim		$=\frac{T_r}{60T}$	1 ADD		ow time (travel time	gth (ft) se (ft/ft)
			division: ocation:				D.A.	(ac)	7.45	9.53	5.06	26.07	6.19			$= t_{i} + t_{i}$		computed time	overland (miti	channelized fl.	num t _e value - considered ui		= 20 1 10	oc A vno		channelized fl.	waterway leu
			Sub L				BASIN	٩	EX1	EX2	EX3	EX4	EX5		NOTES:	t	Where:	$t_c =$	u = u	$t_t =$	Use a minin that are not concentratio		1.		Where:	= 4	So

٦

X:\2510000.all\2518811\Excel\Drainage\2518811_Existing Conditions.xlsm

 $t_c =$ minimum time of concentration for first design point when less than t from Equation 6-1. $L_c =$ length of channelized flow path (m) $L_c =$ intervisionates (expressed as a decimal) $S_c =$ slope of the channelized flow path (ft/ft).

 $t_i = channelized flow time (travel time, min)$ $L_i = waterway length (ff)$ $L_i = waterway loop (thf)$ $T_i = taravel time velocity (ff) exc) = K V_{S_i}$ $T_i = taravel time velocity (ff) exc) = K V_{S_i}$

Page 2 of 5 6/3/2022

STANDARD FORM SF-3 - EXISTING STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM DESIGN (RATIONAL METHOD PROCEDURE)

Sterling Ranch Recycling Facility	: El Paso County	: 5-Year

Project Name: Sterling Ranch Project No.: 25188.00 Calculated By: JSC Checked By: RAB Date: 6/3/22

	REMARKS							
١E	(nim) ₃ 4							
/EL TIN	Velocity (fps)							
TRAV	(է) կէցոցվ							
1	Pipe Size (inches)							
IPE	(%) ədolS							
Ā	(ac) A*O							
	Q _{pipe} (cfs)							
VALE	(%) ədolS							
EET/SV	(sc) A*J							
STRE	Q _{street/swale} (cfs)							
Ŀ	Q (cfs)							
UNOF	('nd/ni) /							
DTAL R	(ac) A*O							
Ĕ	tc (mim) t							
	Q (cfs)	1.5	14.4	1.9	7.7	2.0		
	('nd/ni) /	1.26	3.25	3.62	2.42	2.90		
OFF	(ɔA) A*ጋ	1.23	4.43	0.52	3.18	0.70		
T RUN	t _c (nim) _o t	67.7	18.0	14.0	31.2	22.7		
DIREC	Runoff Coeff.	0.17	0.46	0.10	0.12	0.11		
	(эА) бэтА	7.45	9.53	5.06	26.07	6.19	<u> </u>	
1	Ol nise8	EX1	EX2	EX3	EX4	EX5		
	Jnio9 ngis9D	1	2	ю	4	5		
	STREET							

Notes: Street and Pipe C*A values are determined by Q/i using the catchment's intensity value. All pipes are private and RCP unless otherwise noted. Pipe size shown in table column.

STANDARD FORM SF-3 - EXISTING STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM DESIGN (RATIONAL METHOD PROCEDURE)

					REMARKS							
				ш	tt (nim) t							
ch				LTIN	Velocity (fps)							
g Ran .00				TRAVE	(ֈֈ) կֈՑսəๅ						_	
Sterlin 25188	ISC	RAB	6/3/22	È	Pipe Size (inches)							
No.:	I By:	Ä	ate:		(%) ədolS							
oject Na Project	alculated	Checked		PIPE	(ac) A*2							
đ	Ü				Q _{pipe} (cfs)							
				Ε	(%) ədolS							
				ET/SWA	(36) A*O							
				STRE	Q _{street/swale} (cfs)							
					Q (cfs)							
				UNOF	(ıu/ui) /							
				TOTALF	(ac) A*2							
				Ĺ	tc (mim) <i>st</i>							
					Q (cfs)	6.6	33.2	11.4	40.6	11.4		
					/ (in/hr)	2.11	5.45	6.08	4.06	4.87		
				UNOFF	(วɛ) A*ጋ	3.11	6.05	1.87	9.95	2.34		
acility				ECT RI	t _c (mim)	67.7	18.0	14.0	31.2	22.7		
ling Fa				DIR	Runoff Coeff.	0.42	0.64	0.37	0.38	0.38		
ch Recyc	ty				(ac) (ac)	7.45	9.53	5.06	26.07	6.19		
ng Ran	o Coui	ear			DI nise8	EX1	EX2	EX3	EX4	EX5		
Sterlir	El Pas	100-Y.			Jnio9 ngiz9D	1	2	Э	4	5		
Subdivision:	Location:	Design Storm:			Description							

Notes: Street and Pipe C*A values are determined by Q/i using the catchment's intensity value. All pipes are private and RCP unless otherwise noted. Pipe size shown in table column.

COMPOSITE % IMPERVIOUS & COMPOSITE PROPOSED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT CALCULATIONS

Subdivision: Location:

Sterling Ranch Recycling Facility El Paso County

Project Name: Sterling Ranch Project No.: 25188.00 Calculated By: JSC Checked By: RAR

Calculated By: JSC Checked By: RAB Date: 6/3/22

	Total	Str	eets (10	0% Impei	rvious)		Historica	ıl Analysi	s (2%)		ìravel (p	acked) (8	(%0)	Basins Weigh	: Total ited C	Basins Total Weighted %
Basin ID	Area (ac)	C5	C ₁₀₀	Area (ac)	Weighted % Imp.	C.	C ₁₀₀	Area (ac)	Weighted % Imp.	c	C ₁₀₀	Area (ac)	Weighted % Imp.	C5	ues C ₁₀₀	Imp.
0S1	7.45	0.90	0.96	0.67	9.0%	0.09	0.36	6.78	1.8%	0.59	0.70	0.03	0.3%	0.17	0.42	11.1%
052	9.53	0.90	0.96	4.39	46.1%	0.09	0.36	5.14	1.1%	0.59	0.70	0.02	0.2%	0.46	0.64	47.3%
OS3	5.06	0.90	0.96	0.08	1.6%	0.09	0.36	4.98	2.0%	0.59	0.70	0.00	0.0%	0.10	0.37	3.5%
А	26.07	0.90	0.96	0.76	2.9%	0.09	0.36	24.88	1.9%	0.59	0.70	0.43	1.3%	0.12	0.38	6.1%
В	6.19	0.90	0.96	0.18	2.9%	0.09	0.36	6.01	1.9%	0.59	0.70	0.00	0.0%	0.11	0.38	4.8%
TOTAL (EX4-EX5)	32.26															5.9%
TOTAL	54.30															13.7%

TIME OF CONCENTRATION **STANDARD FORM SF-2** PROPOSED

> Subdivision: Sterling Ranch Recycling Facility Location: El Paso County

Project Name: Sterling Ranch Project No.: 25188.00 Calculated By: JSC

Date: 6/3/22 Checked By: RAB

	FINAL	t_c	(min)	67.	18.	14.	31.	22.	
	SINS)	Urbanized t_c	(min)	67.7	34.3	27.4	34.7	30.8	
tc CHECK	RBANIZED BA	TOTAL	LENGTH (ft)	1676.0	2413.0	311.0	1489.0	836.0	
	n)	COMP. t c	(min)	71.1	18.0	14.0	31.2	22.7	
		t_t	(min)	46.1	12.8	1.9	9.6	5.4	
ИЕ		VEL.	(ft/s)	0.5	3.0	1.5	1.8	1.8	
TRAVEL TIN	(T _t)	К		10.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	
		St	(%)	0.3%	2.3%	2.3%	3.2%	3.3%	
		L t	(ft)	1463	2325	171	1023	591	
LAND		\mathbf{t}_i	(min)	25.1	5.2	12.2	21.6	17.2	
AL/OVERI	(T _i)	S 。	(%)	1.0%	9.0%	5.5%	5.6%	4.3%	
INITI		7	(ft)	213	88	140	466	245	
		C100		0.42	0.64	0.37	0.38	0.38	
		ĉ		0.17	0.46	0.10	0.12	0.11	
3ASIN	ТА	Impervious	(%)	11%	47%	4%	6%	5%	
SUB-E	DA	Hydrologic	Soils Group	A	A	A	A	A	
		D.A.	(ac)	7.45	9.53	5.06	26.07	6.19	
		BASIN	٩	0S1	052	023	A	В	

7 0

NOTES:

 $t_o = t_i + t_t$

Where:

 $t_c = \text{computed time of concentration (minutes)}$ h = overland (initial) flow time (minutes)

 t_i = channelized flow time (minutes).

 t_1 = overland (initial) flow time (minutes) C₃ = munoff coefficien for 3-year frequency (from Table 0-4) L₂ = numbit of overland flow (ft) L₂ = average slope along the overland flow path (ft/ft). Where:

Equation 6-3

 $t_i = \frac{0.395(1.1 - C_5)\sqrt{L_i}}{S_o^{0.33}}$

Equation 6-2

Use a minimum *t*_e value of 5 minutes for urbanized areas and a minimum *t*_e value of 10 minutes for areas that are not considered urban. Use minimum values even when calculations result in a lesser time of concentration.

 $I_t = \frac{L_t}{60K\sqrt{S_o}} = \frac{L_t}{60V_t}$

 t_{i} = channelized flow time (travel time, min) L_{i} = waterway length (ff) E_{i} = waterway length (ff) T_{i} = waterway length (ff) T_{i} = travel time volocity (ff) (ec) = K \lo_{0} K = NRCS conveyance factor (see Table 6-2). Where:

Equation 6-4 $t_{i} = (26 - 17i) + \frac{t_{i}}{60(14i + 9)\sqrt{S_{i}}}$ Where:

 t_c minimum time of concentration for first design point when less than t_c from Equation 6-1. L_i = length of channelistic flow path (th) L_i = merrorismest (expressed as a decimal) S_i = slope of the channelized flow path (th)t)

Equation 6-5

Table 6-2. NRCS Conveyance factors, K

1 ype of Land Surface	Conveyance Factor, K
Heavy meadow	2.5
Tillage/field	5
Short pasture and lawns	2
Nearly bare ground	10
Grassed waterway	15
ed areas and shallow paved swales	20

STANDARD FORM SF-3 - PROPOSED STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM DESIGN

(RATIONAL METHOD PROCEDURE)

REMARKS (uim) TRAVEL TIME Project Name: Sterling Ranch Project No.: 25188.00 Calculated By: <u>JSC</u> Checked By: <u>RAB</u> Date: <u>6/3/22</u> /elocity (fps) (11) հեջոց (sədəni) əzi2 əqiq (%) ədolg PIPE (ว6) A*3 (cfs) _{9qiq}C (%) ədolg STREET/SWALE (วธ) A*3 (cfs) _{street/swale} (cfs) (cfs) C TOTAL RUNOFF (ın/hr) (ว6) A*3 (uim) ว; 1.5 14.4 1.9 7.7 2.0 (cfs) C 1.26 2.42 2.90 3.25 3.62 (ın/hr) 3.18 1.23 4.43 0.52 0.70 ()A) A*(DIRECT RUNOFF 31.2 18.0 14.0 22.7 67.7 Subdivision: Sterling Ranch Recycling Facility Location: El Paso County Design Storm: 5-Year (uim) 0.17 0.46 0.10 0.12 0.11 Runoff Coeff. 5.06 26.07 6.19 7.45 9.53 (cA) 691A OS2 **0**51 OS3 в OI nises ∢ ഹ 4 Joign Point ÷ m ç STREET

Notes:

Street and Pipe C*A values are determined by $Q\dot{h}$ using the catchment's intensity value. All pipes are private and RCP unless otherwise noted. Pipe size shown in table column.

STANDARD FORM SF-3 - PROPOSED STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM DESIGN

(RATIONAL METHOD PROCEDURE)

		REMARKS							
	RAVEL TIME	ť, (nim) t							
ج ا		Velocity (fps)							
g Rano		(tt) (tgn9/						_	
terlin 5188. SC /3/22		(sədəni) əzi2 əqiq							
BY: 20 BY: 20 ate: 6		(%) ədol2							-
oject Na Project alculated Checked	PIPE	(36) A*O							
20		(cfs) _{eqipe}							
	ET/SWALE	(%) ədolS							
		(วธ) A*ጋ							
	STRE	(cfs) _{sisws/test/swale}							
	÷	Q (cfs)							
	RUNOF	('in/hr) (
	TOTAL F	(วɛ) A*J							
		tc (mim) t							
	JNOFF	Q (cfs)	6.6	33.2	11.4	40.6	11.4		
		(in/hr) (2.11	5.45	6.08	4.06	4.87		
		(วɛ) A*J	3.11	6.08	1.87	9.99	2.34		
cility	ECT RI	t _c (mim) t	67.7	18.0	14.0	31.2	22.7		
cling Fa	DIRE	.iieo2 iionuЯ	0.42	0.64	0.37	0.38	0.38		
ch Recyc		(วธ) ธ9าA	7.45	9.53	5.06	26.07	6.19		
ng Ranc o Coun ear		QI nise8	0S1	0S2	053	A	В		
Sterlin El Pas 100-Y		Jnio9 ngis9D	1	2	ю	4	5		
Subdivision: Location: Design Storm:		Description							

Notes: Street and Pipe C*A values are determined by Q/i using the catchment's intensity value. All pipes are private and RCP unless otherwise noted. Pipe size shown in table column.

Appendix C Reference Materials



SAND CREEK DRAINAGE BASIN PLANNING STUDY

PRELIMINARY DESIGN REPORT

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO



PREPARED FOR:

City of Colorado Springs Department of Comprehensive Planning, Development and Finance Engineering Division 30 S. Nevada Colorado Springs, Colorado 80503

PREPARED BY:

Kowa Engineering Corporation 1011 North Weber Colorado Springs, CO 80903

to 75 ⁰ in the summer. The relative humidity ranges from about 25 percent in the summer to 45 percent in the winter.	Soils and Geology Soils within the Sand Creek basin vary between soil types A through D, as identified by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. The predominant soil groupings are in the Truckton and Bresser soil associations. The soils consist of deep, well drained soils that formed in alluvium and residium, derived from sedimentary rock. The soils have high to moderate infiltration rates, and are extremely susceptible to wind and water erosion where poor vegetation cover exists. In undeveloped areas, the predominance of Type A and B soils give this	 Pasin a lower runoff per unit area as compared to basins with soils dominated by Types C and D. Presented on Figure II.2 is the Hydrologic Soil distribution map for the Sand Creek basin. Property Ownership and Impervious Land Densities Property ownership along the major drainageway within the Sand Creek basin vary from public to private. Along the development of the adjacent residential and commercial land. Where development has not occurred, the drainage right-of-way or easements. There are several public parks which abut the mainstem of Sand Creek. Roadway and utility easements abutting or crossing the major drainageways occur most frequently in the developed portions of the basin. Land use information for the existing and future conditions were reviewed as part of the planning effort. This information is used in the hydrologic analysis to predict runoff rates and volumes for the purposes of facility evaluation. The identification of land uses abutting the drainageways is also useful in the identification. The identification of the creek. Presented on Figure II-3 is the proposed land use map used in the evaluation of impervious land dusc map used in the evaluation of impervious land dusc map used in the evaluation of impervious land densities discussed in the hydrologic section of this report. Figure II-3 is not intended to reflect the future zoning or land use policies of the City or the 	County. The land use information within the Banning-Lewis Ranch property was obtained from Aries Properties during the time the draft East Fork Sand Creek Drainage Basin Planning Study was being prepared. The land use information was again reviewed with the City of Colorado Springs Department of Planning and was found to be appropriate for use in the estimation of hydrology for the East Fork Basin. The location of future arterial streets and roadways within
II. STUDY AREA DESCRIPTION	The Sand Creek drainage basin is a left-bank tributary to the Fountain Creek lying in the west-central portions of El Paso County. Sand Creek's drainage area at Fountain Creek is approximately 54 square miles of which approximately 18.8 square miles are inside the City of Colorado Springs corporate limits. The basin is divided into five major sub-basins, the Sand Creek mainstem, the East Fork Sand Creek, the Central Tributary to East Fork, the West Fork, and the East Fork Subtributary. Figure II-1 shows the location of the Sand Creek basin.	Basin Description The Sand Creek basin covers a total of 54 square miles in unincorporated El Paso County and Colorado Springs, Colorado. Of this total, approximately 28 square miles is encompassed by the Sand Creek basin, and 26 square miles for the East Fork Sand Creek basin. The basin trends in generally a south to southwesterly direction, entering the Fountain Creek approximately two miles upstream of the Academy Boulevard bridge over Fountain Creek and East Fork Sand Creek. Development presence in most evident along the mainstream. At this time, approximately 25 percent of the basin is developed. This alternative evaluation focuses upon the Sand Creek basin only. The maximum basin elevation is approximately 7,620 feet above mean sea level, and falls to approximately 5,790 feet at the confluence with Fountain Creek. The headwaters of the basin originate in the conflet covered areas of The Black Forest. The middle eastern portions of the basin originate in the conflite covered areas of The Black Forest. The middle eastern portions of the basin originate in the conflite covered areas of The Black Forest. The middle eastern portions of the basin originate in the conflite covered areas of The Black Forest. The middle eastern portions of the basin originate in the conflite covered areas of The Black Forest. The middle eastern portions of the basin originate in the conflite covered areas of The Black Forest. The middle is a total with semi-arid climates.	precipitation amounts typical of a semi-arid region. Winters are generally cold and dry. Precipitation ranges from 14 to 16 inches per year, with the majority of this precipitation occurring in spring and summer in the form of rainfall. Thunderstorms are common during the summer months, and are typified by quick-moving low pressure cells which draw moisture from the Gulf of Mexico into the region. Average temperatures range from about 30°F in the winter

4

Þ



Post Construction Stormwater Management Applicability Evaluation Form

This form is to be used by the Engineer of Record to evaluate applicable construction activities to determine if the activities are eligible for an exclusion to permanent stormwater quality management requirements. Additionally Part III of the form is used to identify and document which allowable control measure design standard is used for the structure.

Part I. Project Information					
1. Project Name: STERLING RECYCLING FACILITY					
El Paso County Project #:	3. ESQCP #: TBD				
4. Project Location: EAST OF VOLLMER, SOUTH	Project Location in MS4 Permit Area (Y or N): Y				
OF MARKSHEFFEL EXTENSION, AND SOUTH OF	• • • • •				
STERLING RANCH DEVELOPMENT					
5 Decident Decementing CONODETE AND ACDUALT					
5. Project Description: CONCRETE AND ASPHALT RECYCLING FACILITY					
If project is located within the EI Paso County MS4 Permit Area, please provide copy of this completed form					

to the Stormwater Quality Coordinator for reporting purposes; and save completed form with project file.

Part II. Exclusion Evaluation: Determine if Post-Construction Stormwater Management exclusion criteria						
are met. Note: Questions A thru K directly correlate to the MS4 permit Part I.E.4.a.i (A) thru (K). If Yes, to any of the following questions, then mark Not Applicable in Part III, Question 2.						
Questions	Yes	No	Not	Notes:		
			Applicable			
A. Is this project a "Pavement		Х		This exclusion applies to "roadways"		
Management Sile" as defined in Permit				only. Areas used primarily for		
				included.		
B. Is the project "Excluded Roadway						
Development"? NO						
 Does the site add less than 1 acre of paved area per mile? 		Х				
• Does the site add 8.25 feet or less of		Х				
paved width at any location to the						
existing roadway?						
C. Does the project increase the width of the existing roadway by less than 2 times		Х		For redevelopment of existing		
the existing vidth?				existing roadway is excluded from		
				post-construction requirements		
				when the site does not increase the		
				width by two times or more. Inis		
				original roadway area it does NOT		
				apply to entire project.		
D. Is the project considered an		Х		Activity can NOT permanently alter		
aboveground and Underground Utilities				the terrain, ground cover or		
activity?				drainage patterns from those		
F is the project considered a "Large Lot		X		Must be a single-residential lot or		
Single-Family Site"?		^		agricultural zoned land, > 2.5 acres		
				per dwelling and total lot		
				impervious area < 10 percent.		

Questions (cont'd)	Yes	No	Not Applicable	Notes
F. Do Non-Residential or Non-Commercial Infiltration Conditions exist? Post-development surface conditions do not result in concentrated stormwater flow or surface water discharge during an 80 th percentile stormwater runoff event.	X			Exclusion does not apply to residential or commercial sites for buildings. A site specific study is required and must show: rainfall and soil conditions; allowable slopes; surface conditions; and ratios of imperviousness area to pervious area.
G. Is the project land disturbance to Undeveloped Land where undeveloped land remains undeveloped following the activity?	X			Project must be on land with no human made structures such as buildings or pavement.
H. Is the project a Stream Stabilization Site?		Х		Standalone stream stabilization projects are excluded.
I. Is the project a bike or pedestrian trail?		X		Bike lanes for roadways are not included in this exclusion, but may qualify if part of larger roadway activity is excluded in A, B or C above.
J. Is the project Oil and Gas Exploration?		X		Activities and facilities associated with oil and gas exploration are excluded.
K. Is the project in a County Growth Area? YES				Note, El Paso County does not apply this exclusion. All Applicable Construction Activity in El Paso County must comply the Post-Construction Stormwater Management criteria.

Part III. Post Construction (Permanent) Stormwater Control Determination		
Questions	Yes	No
1. Is project an Applicable Construction Activity?	Х	
2. Do any of the Exclusions (A-K in Part II) apply?	Х	

If the project is an Applicable Construction Activity and no Exclusions apply then Post-Construction (Permanent) Stormwater Management is required.

Complete the applicable sections of Part IV below and then coordinate signatures for form and place in project file.

If the project is not an Applicable Construction Activity, or Exclusion(s) apply then Post-Construction (Permanent) Stormwater Management is NOT required. Coordinate signatures for form and place in project file.

Ра	rt IV: Onsite PWQ Requirements, Documentation and Considerations	Yes	No
1.	Check which Design Standard(s) the project will utilize. Standards align with Control		Х
	Measure Requirements identified in permit Part I.E.4.a.iv.		
Α.	Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV) Standard		Х
Β.	Pollutant Removal/80% Total Suspended Solids Removal (TSS)		Х
C.	Runoff Reduction Standard		Х
D.	Applicable Development Site Draining to a Regional WQCV Control Measure		Х
Ε.	Applicable Development Site Draining to a Regional WQCV Facility		Х
F.	Constrained Redevelopment Sites Standard		Х
G.	Previous Permit Term Standard		Х
2.	Will any of the project permanent stormwater control measure(s) be maintained by		
	another MS4?		Х
	If Yes, you must obtain a structure specific maintenance agreement with the other		
	MS4 prior to advertisement.		
3.	Will any of the project permanent stormwater control measures be maintained by a		<u>X</u>
	private entity or quasi-governmental agency (e.g. HOA or Special District,		
	respectively)?		
	If Yes, a Private Detention Basin/Stormwater Quality Best Management Practice		
	Maintenance Agreement and Easement must be recorded with the EI Paso County		
	Clerk and Recorder.		

Part V Notes (attach an additional sheet if you need more space)

Project design is complete to include the project design, construction plans, drainage report, specifications, and maintenance and access agreements as required. The engineering, drainage considerations and information used to complete these documents is complete, true, and accurate to the best of my belief and knowledge.

Signature and Stamp of Engineer of Record

Post-Construction Stormwater Management Applicability Form has been reviewed and the project design, construction plans, drainage report, specifications, and maintenance and access agreements as required, have been reviewed for compliance with the Post Construction Stormwater Management process and MS4 Permit requirements.

Signature of El Paso County Project Engineer

Date

Date

Appendix D Drainage Maps





