



July 27, 2026

El Paso County
 Planning and Community Development Department
 2880 International Circle, Suite 110
 Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910

RE: Falcon Reserve Ponds (2nd Submittal)

To Whom it May Concern,

The following responses to comments are intended to streamline the review process and to appropriately track both internally and externally each review and associated comments.

Please refer to M&S's response to each comment in [Blue](#).

Final Drainage Report:

Comment 1: (EPC Stormwater – Zachary) ‘These values should be flipped’ (Pond 1)

User Input: Overflow Weir (Dropbox with Flat or Sloped Grate and Outlet Pipe OR Rectangular/Trapezoidal Weir and No Outlet Pipe)					
	Zone 3 Weir		Not Selected		
Overflow Weir Front Edge Height, Ho =	4.85 ✓		N/A	ft (relative to basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft)	Height of
Overflow Weir Front Edge Length =	5.00 ✗	←	N/A	feet	Overfl
Overflow Weir Grate Slope =	0.00 ✓		N/A	H:V	ea
Horiz. Length of Weir Sides =	9.00 ✗	←	N/A	feet	e (
Overflow Grate Type =	Type C Grate		N/A		te
Debris Clogging % =	50%		N/A	%	

These values
should be flipped

M&S Response: [Acknowledged](#). [Updated accordingly](#). Please reference updated MHFD spreadsheet.

Comment 2: (EPC Stormwater – Zachary) ‘Calcs do not match details in plans’ (Pond 2)

User Input: Orifice Plate with one or more orifices or Elliptical Slot Weir (typically used to drain WQCV and/or EURV in a sedimentation BMP)					
Centroid of Lowest Orifice =	0.00	✓	ft (relative to basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft)		WQ C
Depth at top of Zone using Orifice Plate =	4.68	✓	ft (relative to basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft)		
Orifice Plate: Orifice Vertical Spacing =	19.00	✗	inches		El
Orifice Plate: Orifice Area per Row =	2.97	✗	sq. inches (diameter = 1-15/16 inches)		
User Input: Stage and Total Area of Each Orifice Row (numbered from lowest to highest)					
	Row 1 (required)	Row 2 (optional)	Row 3 (optional)	Row 4 (optional)	Row 5 (optional)
Stage of Orifice Centroid (ft)	0.00	1.56	3.12		
Orifice Area (sq. inches)	2.97	2.97	2.97		

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated Storm & PCM Plans accordingly to match orifice hole sizes and spacing.](#)

Comment 3: (EPC Stormwater – Zachary) ‘Values are flipped’ (Pond 2)

User Input: Overflow Weir (Dropbox with Flat or Sloped Grate and Outlet Pipe OR Rectangular/Trapezoidal Weir and No Outlet Pipe)					
	Zone 3 Weir	Not Selected			
Overflow Weir Front Edge Height, Ho =	4.69	N/A	ft (relative to basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft)		Heigl
Overflow Weir Front Edge Length =	5.00	N/A	feet		O
Overflow Weir Grate Slope =	0.00	N/A	H:V		pen
Horiz. Length of Weir Sides =	7.00	N/A	feet		Overflow Gr
Overflow Grate Type =	Type C Grate	N/A			Overflow C
Debris Clogging % =	50%	N/A	%		

Values are flipped

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated accordingly. Please reference updated MHFD spreadsheet.](#)

Comment 4: (EPC Stormwater – Zachary) ‘Calcs do not match details in plans’ (Pond 2)

User Input: Outlet Pipe w/ Flow Restriction Plate (Circular Orifice, Restrictor Plate, or Rectangular Orifice)			
	Zone 3 Restrictor	Not Selected	
Depth to Invert of Outlet Pipe =	0.25	N/A	ft (distance below basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft)
Outlet Pipe Diameter =	36.00	N/A	inches
Restrictor Plate Height Above Pipe Invert =	21.00		inches

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated Storm & PCM Plans accordingly to match 21”.](#)

Comment 5: (EPC Stormwater – Zachary) ‘Calcs do not match details in plans’ (Pond 3)

User Input: Stage and Total Area of Each Orifice Row (numbered from lowest to highest)

	Row 1 (required)	Row 2 (optional)	Row 3 (optional)	Row 4
Stage of Orifice Centroid (ft)	0.00 ✓	1.16 ✓	2.31 ✓	
Orifice Area (sq. inches)	2.50 ✗	2.10 ✓	2.00 ✓	

M&S Response: This value is consistent with both the Storm & PCM Plans and the MHFD spreadsheet, confirmed this should be 2.5 sq inches.

Comment 6: (EPC Stormwater – Zachary) ‘Values flipped’ (Pond 3)

User Input: Overflow Weir (Dropbox with Flat or Sloped Grate and Outlet Pipe OR Rectangular/Trapezoidal Weir and No Outlet P

	Zone 3 Weir	Not Selected	
Overflow Weir Front Edge Height, Ho =	3.48 ✓	N/A	ft (relative to basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft)
Overflow Weir Front Edge Length =	5.00 ✗	N/A	feet
Overflow Weir Grate Slope =	0.00 ✓	N/A	H:V
Horiz. Length of Weir Sides =	7.00 ✗	N/A	feet
Overflow Grate Type =	Type C Grate ✓	N/A	
Debris Clogging % =	50% ✓	N/A	%

Values flipped

M&S Response: Acknowledged. Updated accordingly. Please reference updated MHFD spreadsheet.

Comment 7: (EPC Stormwater – Zachary) ‘CDs for pond 4 were not provided with this submission. If you want pond 4 to be reviewed with this project please provide CDs, otherwise remove pond 4 calcs from report.’ (Pond 4)

M&S Response: Acknowledged and removed throughout ‘Falcon Reserve Ponds’ FDR accordingly. Pond 4 to be included as part of the ‘Falcon Reserve Filing No. 1’ project.

Comment 8: (eschoenheit) ‘CDR2511’

M&S Response: Acknowledged. Updated accordingly.

Comment 9: (eschoenheit) ‘Stamp and signatures’

M&S Response: XXX

Comment 10: (eschoenheit) Update to ‘Falcon Reserve Ponds’

EPURKI

ING NO. 1

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated accordingly.](#)

Comment 11: (eschoenheit) ‘List pond cost in FAE’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Pond cost estimates moved to 2026 FAE and a detailed cost estimate for Ponds 1, 2, and 3 is included in the Appendix.](#)

Comment 12: (eschoenheit) ‘Update basin and bridge fees to 2025. If plat is not submitted until 2026 then 2026 fee will apply’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Please reference updated Drainage & Bridge Fees section in report narrative for 2026 fee assessment.](#)

Comment 13: (eschoenheit) ‘Provide swale calculations that show new flows with lining and/or check dams that are not supercritical. DBPS called for check dams along meridian. This may have to be provided in the Final Plat Final Drainage Report’

M&S Response:

[Section P1-P1 pertains to a drainage swale intended for the emergency overflow scenario \(storm events that exceed the 100-yr storm event\) from Pond 1 to Pond 2.](#)

[Section P2-P2 is to be riprap lined.](#)

[Section P3-P3 is to be riprap lined.](#)

[Section EX1-EX1 is outside the limits of disturbance for the project and therefore no modifications are anticipated.](#)

[Section EX2-EX2 is outside the limits of disturbance for the project and therefore no modifications are anticipated.](#)

[Section E3-E3 is outside the limits of disturbance for the project and therefore no modifications are anticipated.](#)

Section E1-E1 and Section E2-E2 drainage swales were updated to reduce to ‘subcritical’ flow. These swales are to be lined with an erosion control blanket (North American Green SC 150 or equivalent). Also, riprap check dams were added provide stabilization. Please reference updated calculations in the FDR Appendix.

Comment 14: (EPC Engineering – Jeff Rice) ‘Only include what’s needed for the pond construction’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated accordingly.](#)

Comment 15: (EPC Engineering – Jeff Rice) ‘Supercritical flows in any area require full stabilization’

M&S Response:

Section P1-P1 pertains to a drainage swale intended for the emergency overflow scenario (storm events that exceed the 100-yr storm event) from Pond 1 to Pond 2.

Section P2-P2 is to be riprap lined.

Section P3-P3 is to be riprap lined.

Section EX1-EX1 is outside the limits of disturbance for the project and therefore no modifications are anticipated.

Section EX2-EX2 is outside the limits of disturbance for the project and therefore no modifications are anticipated.

Section E3-E3 is outside the limits of disturbance for the project and therefore no modifications are anticipated.

Section E1-E1 and Section E2-E2 drainage swales were updated to reduce to ‘subcritical’ flow. These swales are to be lined with an erosion control blanket (North American Green SC 150 or equivalent). Also, riprap check dams were added provide stabilization. Please reference updated calculations in the FDR Appendix.

Comment 16: (Mikayla Hartford) ‘Ponds’ & ‘Update nomenclature throughout. This is not for filing 1 it is a standalone CDR for the construction of the 3 existing ponds’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. This FDR reflects ‘Falcon Reserve Ponds’ only throughout.](#)

Comment 17: (Mikayla Hartford) ‘Per the ESQCP, this project is a subsection that will only disturb 10 ac’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated accordingly.](#)

Comment 18: (Mikayla Hartford) ‘Remove Pond 4 from the discussion as pond 4 isn’t constructed under this project.’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated accordingly.](#)

Comment 19: (Mikayla Hartford) ‘Cater to this project with Ponds 1-3 costs. Include a cost estimate for each PCM with line items for all components (ex: riprap, road base, forebay, trickle channel, outlet structure, outlet pipe, spillway, etc). Input the total value into the FAE form under “Permanent Pond/BMP (provide engineer’s estimate)” in Section 1.’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Please refer to the Appendix section of the report for a detailed cost estimate. FAE 2026 updated accordingly to reflect these cost estimates.](#)

Comment 20: (Mikayla Hartford) ‘The entire storm drain for F1 isn’t going in with this project’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated accordingly.](#)

Comment 21: (Mikayla Hartford) ‘Clearly identify which basins are for this CDR vs the final plat. You can hatch or grey out what doesn’t apply’

M&S Response: [Acknowledged. Updated accordingly. Please reference updated Proposed Conditions Drainage Map which clearly delineates CDR vs. Filing No. 1.](#)