

GMS, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
611 NORTH WEBER, SUITE 300
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903-1074

TELEPHONE (719) 475-2935
TELEFAX (719) 475-2938

EDWARD D. MEYER, P.E.
ROGER J. SAMS, P.E.
GREGORY R. WORDEN, P.E.
THOMAS A. McCLERNAN, P.E.

KEN L. WHITE, P.L.S.
DAVID R. FRISCH, P.L.S.
MARK A. MORTON, P.E.
JASON D. MEYER, P.E.

June 22, 2026

Mr. Zach Jannusch, Associate Engineer - Stormwater
El Paso County – Department of Public Works
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

RE: PPR262 Security Water District IXWTP Building Addition

Dear Mr. Jannusch:

This transmittal letter has been prepared to demonstrate the responses to the comments from your June 17, 2026, review.

1. SWMP Comments -

- PFD Sheet 2 - Include placeholder tab for the signed ESQCP form (to be provided at or by pre-con meeting)
GMS Response: The signed ESQCP form has been signed and attached as Tab F in the Addendum No. 1.
- PDF Sheet 8 and 9 – Are these supposed to be 2026? Construction dates should be future.
GMS Response: The construction dates in Table 10 of the SWMP Addendum No. 1 have been updated accordingly.
- PDF Sheet 13 - Update GEC plan in SWMP with GEC comments once complete.
GMS Response: The approved and complete GEC plan is attached at Tab B of Addendum No. 1.

2. GEC Plan Comments

- Sheet 3 – Show all proposed drainage improvements.
GMS Response: Sheet 3 now shows the updated SWD Pond No. 1 improvements.
- Sheet 4 – Is this area tributary to the rain garden as well? It appears that the swale here will carry flows to the riprap pad.
GMS Response: This area is mostly tributary to the new SWD Pond No. 1. The tributary areas can be seen in the Drainage Letter. The magenta line displays the limits of construction disturbance and not the tributary areas.
- Sheet 4A – Provide details of temporary sediment basin including riser pipe diameter and perforation sizing, number of rows of holes, required volume, location of outlet pipe and spillway, and tributary area to the sediment basin. And provide contours for sediment basin. If using the MHFD sediment basin detail, highlighting the row with the correct tributary area is sufficient.
GMS Response: Sheet 4A has been updated with the MHFD sediment basin detail. The correct tributary area is highlighted in green.

3. GEC Checklist

- PDF Sheet 2 – Item X
GMS Response: Sheet 4 and 4A include the updated locations and details of all temporary erosion and sediment control measures including the sediment basin detail.

- PDF Sheet 2 – Item Y
GMS Response: The new bioretention pond is named SWD Pond No. 1 and has been labeled accordingly in attached documents.

4. Drainage Letter Comments

- PDF Sheet 23 (page IV-3 of the Drainage Letter) – Assign a name/number to all PCMs and then update all submitted text and drawings accordingly with consistent labeling throughout (example: “Pond A” or “Pond 1”).
GMS Response: The new bioretention pond has been named SWD Pond No. 1. The Drainage Letter has been updated with the new naming convention. The Grading and Erosion Control Plan and Site Development Plans have been updated.
- PDF Sheet 36 (Page V-3 of the Drainage Letter) – Provide pond name.
GMS Response: The new bioretention pond has been named SWD Pond No. 1. The Drainage Letter has been updated with the new naming convention.
- PDF Sheet 38 (page V-4 of the Drainage Letter) – Include a cost estimate for the rain garden with line items for all components (ex. Riprap, road base, underdrain, outlet pipe, spillway, etc.). Input the value into the FAE form under “Permanent Pond/BMP (provide engineer’s estimate)” in Section 1. The total should not include grading, which is separate line item in Section 1: “Earthwork.” The cost estimate should include labor costs (as separate or added into the cost of each component).
GMS Response: An engineer’s estimate for SWD Pond No. 1 has been included in the Drainage Letter with individual line items. The FAE has also been updated and signed with the updated costs.
- PDF Sheet 103 – Appendix G – Bioretention Pond Sizing: Plans unclear. See comments in site development plan. Plans show 4:1.
GMS Response: The invert of the underdrain is 28-inches below the surface of the media. Details have been provided in the Grading and Erosion Control Plan and Site Development Plans with text and references. The spillway end slope has been updated to reflect the 4:1 slope in the plans.

5. Site Development Plan

- Sheet 3 –
 - Please show all drainage improvements on the site development plan.
GMS Response: Sheet 3 now shows the updated SWD Pond No. 1 improvements.
- Sheet 6 –
 - Provide this sheet (or just the area in the orange box) in the GEC plan, where the design is approved by the engineering department).
GMS Response: The details and sheet are updated in the GEC Plan, Sheet 4.
 - Assign a name/number to all PCMs and then update all submitted text and drawings accordingly with consistent labeling throughout (Example: “Pond A” or “Pond 1”).
GMS Response: The PCM has been named SWD Pond No. 1 and all sheets have been updated accordingly.
 - Provide callout for end cap and orifice hole of outlet pipe.
GMS Response: Appropriate text has been added for the underdrain discharge on Sheet 6.
 - Please provide a maintenance access road to the bottom of the basin, see example cross section below.
GMS Response: A 12’ wide maintenance access road and detail have been included in the site development plan on Sheets 6 and 6A and the grading and erosion control (GEC) plan on Sheets 4 and 4B.

Mr. Zach Jannusch, Associate Engineer - Stormwater
June 22, 2026
Page 3

- Sheet 6A –
 - Please move these details to the GEC plan. The site development plan is approved by the EPC planning and community development department, not the department of public works (county engineer).
GMS Response: This sheet is now also included in the GEC Plan as Sheet 4B. We have also left these details in the Site Development Plan to keep separate plans users informed of the required scope of work.
 - Dimensions and elevations conflict. Dimensions show invert is 2.67' below media surface and elevations show 2.33'. Please revise.
GMS Response: This comment is unclear. The dimensions and elevations both indicate a distance of 2.33'.
 - MHFD spreadsheet has 15:1. Please revise plans or calcs.
GMS Response: The calculations in the Drainage Letter have been updated to show 4:1 side slopes.
- 6. FAE (Financial Assurance Estimate)
 - Page 1 – See comment in drainage letter. Confirm estimate in letter and this value match.
GMS Response: The updated cost estimate in the Drainage Letter matches the value listed here.
 - Page 3 – Please add cost for As-Built Plans and Pond/BMP Certification Letter. The minimum cost shall be \$1,500 for each.
GMS Response: The As-Built Plans and Pond/BMP Certification Letter costs have been included in the updated FAE.

If you have any questions, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,



Roger J. Sams, P.E.

cc: Ms. Kylie Bagley, Project Manager, EPCPCD
Mr. Roy E. Heald, General Manager, Security Water District