



**Planning and Community
Development Department**
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910
Phone: 719.520.6300
Fax: 719.520.6695
Website www.elpasoco.com

DEVIATION REQUEST AND DECISION FORM

Updated: 6/26/2019

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name : Meadow Lake Airport | Transient Ramp Reconstruction

Schedule No.(s) :

Legal Description : LOT 6 BLK 2 MEADOW LAKE AIRPORT FIL NO 1 EX S 50 FT TO TAXIWAY IMP LOC. 43050-05-110

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Company : Meadow Lake Airport

Name : Dave Elliott

☒ Owner ☐ Consultant ☐ Contractor

Mailing Address : 13625 Judge Orr Road
Peyton, CO 80831

Phone Number : 719.339.0928

FAX Number :

Email Address : Falcon20Flier@MSN.com

ENGINEER INFORMATION

Company : Bolton-Menk

Name : Kevin Buffington, PE

Colorado P.E. Number : 62966

Mailing Address : 5670 Greenwood Plaza Drive
Suite W505
Denver, CO 80111

Phone Number : 303.531.8848

FAX Number :

Email Address : Kevin.Buffington@Bolton-Menk.com

OWNER, APPLICANT, AND ENGINEER DECLARATION

To the best of my knowledge, the information on this application and all additional or supplemental documentation is true, factual and complete. I am fully aware that any misrepresentation of any information on this application may be grounds for denial. I have familiarized myself with the rules, regulations and procedures with respect to preparing and filing this application. I also understand that an incorrect submittal will be cause to have the project removed from the agenda of the Planning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and/or Board of Adjustment or delay review until corrections are made, and that any approval of this application is based on the representations made in the application and may be revoked on any breach of representation or condition(s) of approval.

Signature of owner (or authorized representative)

Date

Engineer's Seal, Signature
And Date of Signature

DEVIATION REQUEST (Attach diagrams, figures, and other documentation to clarify request)

A deviation from the standards of or in Section **Appendix I.3** of the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) is requested.

Identify the specific ECM standard which a deviation is requested:

Appendix I.3 of the El Paso Engineering Criteria Manual states that it has adopted sections of the City of Colorado Springs and Volume 2 of the Mile High Flood District Drainage Criteria Manuals (DCM). The following deviations are not directly stated in the EPC manuals but rather are stated in the Colorado Springs DCM.

1. Colorado Springs DCM | Chapter 13, Section 5.5
 - a. This section states "*The minimum freeboard for detention facilities is 1.0 foot above the computed water surface elevation when the emergency spillway is conveying its design flow...*".
2. Colorado Springs DCM | Chapter 3, Section 6.5
 - a. This section states, "*Unless an alternative detention concept is approved through the master planning process, the full spectrum detention approach...shall be implemented as the standard detention approach*".

State the reason for the requested deviation:

1. Colorado Springs DCM | Chapter 13, Section 5.5
 - a. The proposed improvements are occurring on an existing site which is both horizontally and vertically constrained. Strict compliance is physically unfeasible because it would require roughly double the footprint of the pond. Additional vertical berming to provide freeboard is also not possible because the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) does not allow vertical intrusions in specific clear zones adjacent to taxiways. In lieu of the 1.0', 0.25' of freeboard is provided.
2. Colorado Springs DCM | Chapter 3, Section 6.5
 - a. These improvements request a deviation from the standard Full Spectrum Detention (FSD) requirement to instead detain post-development runoff strictly to match existing pre-development peak release rates. Due to the horizontal constraints of the existing site, horizontal footprint required for full 100-year FSD volume physically impossible to construct. To mitigate downstream impacts, the basin will utilize a custom multi-stage outlet structure to ensure zero net increase in peak stormwater discharge for storm events, while still fully capturing and treating the standard Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV).

Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards used as basis):

1. Colorado Springs DCM | Chapter 13, Section 5.5
 - a. Due to vertical constraints, strict compliance is physically unfeasible because it would require roughly double the footprint of the pond. Additional, offsite land and additional storm conveyance upgrades would be necessary to convey flow.
2. Colorado Springs DCM | Chapter 3, Section 6.5
 - a. Due to vertical constraints, strict compliance is physically unfeasible because it would require roughly double the footprint of the pond. Additional, offsite land and additional storm conveyance upgrades would be necessary to convey flow.

LIMITS OF CONSIDERATION

(At least one of the conditions listed below must be met for this deviation request to be considered.)

- ☐ The ECM standard is inapplicable to the particular situation.
- ☒ Topography, right-of-way, or other geographical conditions or impediments impose an undue hardship and an equivalent alternative that can accomplish the same design objective is available and does not compromise public safety or accessibility.
- ☐ A change to a standard is required to address a specific design or construction problem, and if not modified, the standard will impose an undue hardship on the applicant with little or no material benefit to the public.

Provide justification:

To provide safe ground travel for aircraft, airports are flat by design. Sharp grade breaks within the pavement, drop-offs adjacent to the pavement, or other vertical intrusions can block or make ground travel unsafe. The FAA has strict guidance on taxilane clear zones. Taxilane C must provide a 79' clear zone where the maximum allowable slope is limited to 5.0%. Similarly, the ditches near the hangers were constructed to be as shallow as practical, which means the allowable depth of the pond is constrained from being deeper. Above-grade berms around the pond are not possible due to the FAA taxilane guidance. The proposed pond footprint was selected to balance the horizontal and vertical site constraints to provide the maximum possible volume.

CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

Per ECM section 5.8.7 the request for a deviation may be considered if the request is **not based exclusively on financial considerations**. The deviation must not be detrimental to public safety or surrounding property. The applicant must include supporting information demonstrating compliance with **all of the following criteria**:

The deviation will achieve the intended result with a comparable or superior design and quality of improvement.

The proposed design attenuates flow to a peak rate from all design-storms that is less than the existing condition. 0.25 foot of freeboard has been provided for this pond.

The deviation will not adversely affect safety or operations.

In the event of a failure, the flat nature of the site, adjacent pavement, and below-grade portions of the pond will limit damage and peak volume released.

The deviation will not adversely affect maintenance and its associated cost.

No increase in maintenance costs is associated with these deviations.

The deviation will not adversely affect aesthetic appearance.

These deviations do not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the site.

The deviation meets the design intent and purpose of the ECM standards.

The current impervious area on the site was constructed circa 1970. While the proposed design does not detain to historical conditions, it releases at a smaller rate than the previous 50+ years.

The deviation meets the control measure requirements of Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable.

The proposed pond provides water quality capture volume which meets the County's MS4 permit.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION:

Approved by the ECM Administrator

This request has been determined to have met the criteria for approval. A deviation from Section _____ of the ECM is hereby granted based on the justification provided.

┌

┐

└

┘

Denied by the ECM Administrator

This request has been determined not to have met criteria for approval. A deviation from Section _____ of the ECM is hereby denied.

┌

┐

└

┘

ECM ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:

--

1.1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this resource is to provide a form for documenting the findings and decision by the ECM Administrator concerning a deviation request. The form is used to document the review and decision concerning a requested deviation. The request and decision concerning each deviation from a specific section of the ECM shall be recorded on a separate form.

1.2. BACKGROUND

A deviation is a critical aspect of the review process and needs to be documented to ensure that the deviations granted are applied to a specific development application in conformance with the criteria for approval and that the action is documented as such requests can point to potential needed revisions to the ECM.

1.3. APPLICABLE STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

Section 5.8 of the ECM establishes a mechanism whereby an engineering design standard can be modified when if strictly adhered to, would cause unnecessary hardship or unsafe design because of topographical or other conditions particular to the site, and that a departure may be made without destroying the intent of such provision.

1.4. APPLICABILITY

All provisions of the ECM are subject to deviation by the ECM Administrator provided that one of the following conditions is met:

- The ECM standard is inapplicable to a particular situation.
- Topography, right-of-way, or other geographical conditions or impediments impose an undue hardship on the applicant, and an equivalent alternative that can accomplish the same design objective is available and does not compromise public safety or accessibility.
- A change to a standard is required to address a specific design or construction problem, and if not modified, the standard will impose an undue hardship on the applicant with little or no material benefit to the public.

1.5. TECHNICAL GUIDANCE

The review shall ensure all criteria for approval are adequately considered and that justification for the deviation is properly documented.

1.6. LIMITS OF APPROVAL

Whether a request for deviation is approved as proposed or with conditions, the approval is for project-specific use and shall not constitute a precedent or general deviation from these Standards.

1.7. REVIEW FEES

A Deviation Review Fee shall be paid in full at the time of submission of a request for deviation. The fee for Deviation Review shall be as determined by resolution of the BoCC.