

Architectural  
Structural  
Geotechnical



Materials Testing  
Forensic  
Civil/Planning

## FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT

Foundation Lutheran Church

Townners Ave  
Tract C, Paint Brush Hills Filing No. 13A  
Falcon, Colorado

### PREPARED FOR:

Colorado Commercial Construction  
12325 Oracle Blvd, Suite 120  
Colorado Springs, CO 80921

PCD File No. PPR2321  
JOB NO. 191726

October 17, 2023

**Southern Office:**  
Colorado Springs, CO 80918  
719.548.0600

**Central Office:**  
Englewood, CO 80112  
303.688.9475

**Northern Office:**  
Windsor, CO 80550  
970.330.1071

**Monument:** 719.488.2145  
**Woodland Park:** 719.687.6077

[rmg-engineers.com](http://rmg-engineers.com)

SIGNATURE PAGE

TR C PAINT BRUSH HILLS, FILING NO. 13A

ENGINEER'S STATEMENT

This report and plan for the drainage design of Tract C, Paint Brush Hills Filing No. 13A was prepared by me (or under my direct supervision) and is correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Said report and plan has been prepared in accordance with the El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manuals Volumes 1 and 2 and is in conformity with the master plan of the drainage basin. I understand that El Paso County does not and will not assume liability for drainage facilities designed by others. I accept responsibility for any liability caused by any negligent acts, errors or omissions on my part in the preparing this report.

Respectfully Submitted,

RMG – Rocky Mountain Group



David Walker, P.E.  
Sr. Civil Project Manager

OWNER/DEVELOPER'S STATEMENT

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

Foundation Lutheran Church, President, John Wohlrabe  
Name of Owner/Developer, Title

[Signature]  
Authorized Signature

10/17/23  
Date

Foundation Lutheran Church  
Business Name

10367 Mt. Evans Dr., Peyton, CO 80831  
Address

EL PASO COUNTY STATEMENT

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joshua Palmer, P.E.  
County Engineer / ECM Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Conditions:

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT.....	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	4
I. PURPOSE.....	5
II. GENERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION.....	5
A. LOCATION.....	5
B. DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY – EXISTING CONDITIONS.....	5
C. EXISTING SOILS.....	6
D. EXISTING DRAINAGE.....	6
E. DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY – PROPOSED CONDITIONS.....	6
III. DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS.....	7
A. EXISTING MAJOR DRAINAGE BASIN AND SUB-BASINS.....	7
A. DEVELOPED MAJOR DRAINAGE BASIN AND SUB-BASINS.....	7
IV. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA.....	8
A. REGULATIONS.....	8
B. DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA REFERENCE AND CONSTRAINTS.....	8
C. HYDROLOGICAL CRITERIA.....	9
D. FOUR-STEP PROCESS.....	9
V. DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS AND FEES.....	10
A. DRAINAGE AND BRIDGE FEES.....	10
VI. CONCLUSIONS.....	11
A. COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS.....	11
VII. REFERENCES.....	11
VIII. APPENDICES.....	12

### Unresolved Review 1 Comment:

- Include in the appendix excerpts from the Pain Brush Hills drainage report referenced in the report.



## I. PURPOSE

This report is a Final Drainage Report for Foundation Lutheran Church for the development of a church.

The purpose of this report is to identify on-site and off-site drainage patterns, assess stormwater conditions per delineated basin and sub-basins, demonstrate adequate design standards for storm water flow and release into the existing storm water system or right-of-way, and provide a narrative for any other drainage considerations related to the development of this parcel.

## II. GENERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

### A. LOCATION

The proposed development of Foundation Lutheran Church is located at the address of Towners Av in Falcon, Colorado in El Paso County within the Paint Brush Hills subdivision. The parcel schedule number is 5225208001 and the legal description is currently Tract C, Paint Brush Hills Filing No. 13A. The parcel is located in the West half of Section 25, Township 12 South, Range 65 West of the 6<sup>th</sup> P.M. El Paso County, Colorado. The site is bordered to the north by Londonderry Dr, to the east by Towners Ave, and to the south and west by residential single-family homes. The names and descriptions of surrounding platted developments can be seen on plan sets and appendix documents:

### B. DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY – EXISTING CONDITIONS

The project site is approximately 259,865 square feet (5.966 acres) and consists of undeveloped natural vegetation. There is existing curb and gutter along Londonderry Drive and Towners Avenue.

The existing percent imperviousness is approximately 0 percent on Tract C. The existing vegetation consists of shrubs and native grasses.

The existing topography consists of grades between 1 and 25 percent. Drainage patterns sheet flow south across the parcel to a drainage swale that directs flow to the southwest corner.

There is a F.E.S. outlet at the southeast corner of the site that is connected to a 24" RCP storm drain pipe that goes easterly under Towners Ave. A temporary swale runs across the site on the south portion towards the southwest corner, where an F.E.S. inlet is connect to a 36" RCP storm drain pipe. The 36" RCP storm drain pipe leaves the site in a southerly direction and goes to a regional detention facility located off-site known as Pond B1. The detention facility is within a platted tract of land with ownership and maintenance by the Paint Brush Hills Metropolitan District.

The site is not located within a streamside zone.

### C. EXISTING SOILS

**Unresolved Review 1 Comment:**

**- Please discuss any off-site flows entering the site and impacts to the development. If there are none please state so.**

Townners Av  
Brush Hills, Filing No. 13A  
Falcon, Colorado

The soils indicative to the site are classified as Pring coarse sandy loam by the USDA Soil Conservation Service and are listed as NRCS (National Resources Conservation Service) Hydrologic Soil Group B. These soils have a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet and have a moderate rate of water transmission. The USDA Soil Map is provided in the Appendix.

#### **D. EXISTING DRAINAGE**

This parcel is located in the Falcon Drainage Basin.

The project site does not lie within a designated flood plain according to information published in the Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain Map No. 08041C0551G, dated December 7, 2018. The FEMA Floodplain map is provided in the Appendix showing it lies within Zone X, a minimal flood hazard area.

There are no known non-stormwater discharges that contribute to the storm water systems on site and downstream, both private and public.

#### **E. DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY – PROPOSED CONDITIONS**

The proposed development consists of a single story church approximately 9,600 square feet.

There is no existing vehicle entry access point to the property. The proposed development will have two vehicle entry access points, one access directly across from Triborough Trail and the other directly across from the entrance to the Paint Brush Hills Metro District Office.

The proposed development will require an approximate limits of disturbance, including the right of way improvements of pedestrian sidewalk with ADA curb ramps, curb cuts, and utility work of approximately 6.41 acres of drainage area.. The limits of disturbance do not disturb the existing hillsides. The grading limits are kept within the setbacks wherever possible and the developed conditions remain consistent with the historical drainage pattern of the subdivision with the added benefit of reduced release rate from the rain garden. A sub-basin delineation sheet for the proposed conditions is provided in the Appendix C.

### **III. DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS**

#### **A. EXISTING MAJOR DRAINAGE BASIN AND SUB-BASINS**

According to the "Final Drainage Report for Paint Brush Hills – Phase 2 (Filing No. 13)", by Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors LLC dated June 2008:

“At Design Point 10 ( $Q_5 = 11$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 21$  cfs) and existing 24” RCP storm sewer will be allowed to continue to collect flows off of the undeveloped future school site. As stated in this report, upon development of this school site, the maximum flow allowed to enter this facility will remain the ( $Q_5 = 11$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 21$  cfs).”

**Show and label on the drainage map where DP10 and DP11 are located.  
Or provide drainage map from previously approved report in the appendix.**



Unresolved from Submittal 1 - what are the proposed flows for DP3 & DP4? why were those removed from the text but are still shown on the maps?

Townners Av  
TR C Paint Brush Hills, Filing No. 13A  
Falcon, Colorado

"The release from Design Point 10 will temporarily travel across the south portion of the future commercial site within a swale towards Design Point 11. Upon development of this commercial area, it is anticipated that the temporary swale be removed and the 24" RCP be extended to Design Point 11. At this location, the maximum developed flow allowed to discharge from the commercial site is ( $Q_5 = 23$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 45$  cfs). This flow, combined with the discharge from Design Point 10 equals the total developed flow allowed to enter the public storm system at Design Point 11 ( $Q_5 = 23$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 45$  cfs). These flows are then conveyed in a southerly direction in a 36" RCP storm sewer."

The parcel is delineated into sub-basins according to the existing and proposed grading for existing and developed conditions. A drainage plan of the delineated basins for existing conditions can be found in the Appendix.

Basin E is the entirety of the parcel to be redeveloped representing existing conditions in one on-site basin. The Final Drainage Report for Paint Brush Hills – Phase 2 (Filing No. 13), by Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors LLC dated June 2008 shows this property as sub-basin T and sub-basin S.

Sub-basin E-1 (6.41 ac.;  $Q_5 = 1.37$  cfs,  $Q_{100} = 10.05$  cfs) is the entire property that consists of all natural vegetation. The basin flows south across the parcel to a temporary swale that directs flow to the existing F.E.S. inlet in the southwest corner of the site, also known as Existing Point 1 (EP1).

Existing Point 1 (EP1) is the existing design point representing the F.E.S. in the southwest corner of the site that is connected to an existing 36" RCP storm drain pipe that runs southerly off-site and eventually drains into an existing detention facility known as Pond B1. The Final Drainage Report for Paint Brush Hills – Phase 2 (Filing No. 13), by Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors LLC dated June 2008 shows this as design point 11 with an allowable release rate of 23 cfs for the minor storm event (5-year storm) and 45 cfs for the major storm event (100-year storm).

Existing Point 2 (EP2) is the existing design point representing the F.E.S. outlet in the southeast corner of the site that is connected to an existing 24" RCP storm drain pipe under Towners Ave. The Final Drainage Report for Paint Brush Hills – Phase 2 (Filing No. 13), by Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors LLC dated June 2008 shows this as design point 10 with an allowable release rate of 11 cfs for the minor storm event (5-year storm) and 21 cfs for the major storm event (100-year storm).

## B. DEVELOPED MAJOR DRAINAGE BASIN AND SUB-BASINS

Basin D is the entirety of the platted parcel representing developed conditions and consists of two on-site sub-basins. A Drainage Plan for developed conditions can be found in the Appendix C.

Sub-basin D-1 (1.57 ac.;  $Q_5 = 2.61$  cfs,  $Q_{100} = 6.39$  cfs) is the east side of the site consisting of asphalt pavement and concrete sidewalk. Runoff goes through the parking lot and exits on the south side and flows through a grass swale before being captured via an area inlet, Design Point 1 (DP1).

Please verify runoff values shown match with the values shown on the drainage map.

Sub-basin D-2 (4.84 ac.;  $Q_5 = 3.90$  cfs,  $Q_{100} = 14.48$  cfs) is the west side of the site consisting of the church building, asphalt pavement, concrete sidewalk and a play field. Runoff goes through the parking lot and exits at the southwest corner and flows through a grass swale before being captured via an area inlet, Design Point 2 (DP2).

The Final Drainage Report for Paint Brush Hills – Phase 2 (Filing No. 13), by Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors LLC dated June 2008 states the maximum developed flow allowed to discharge from the commercial site is  $Q_5 = 23$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 45$  cfs. The total peak runoff being discharged from the developed church site is  $Q_5 = 17.51$  cfs and  $Q_{100} = 41.87$  cfs. Due to the proposed development yielding less storm water runoff, no downstream facilities require alterations and it is anticipated that there will be no negative impacts to downstream facilities and developments.

## IV. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA

### A. REGULATIONS

The hydrologic and hydraulic calculations and design of the site conform to the El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manual as well as the Mile High Flood District Drainage Criteria Manual (August 2018).

### B. DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA REFERENCE AND CONSTRAINTS

The parcel falls within the Falcon Drainage Basin. The runoff from this parcel will have no adverse effects on downstream infrastructure or facilities, streets, utilities, transit, or further development of adjacent lots. Relevant criteria for the calculations shown further include equations and design criteria for the rational method, volumes and runoff of various storms.

### C. HYDROLOGICAL CRITERIA

The rational method was used to calculate the peak runoff of the delineated basin and sub-basins using the manuals referenced prior with the C, I and PI values from the Drainage Criteria Manual Volume I, Chapter 6 as well as the Colorado Springs designated IDF curve values. Specific calculations and tables are provided further with inputs including design rainfall, sub-basin acreage and percent imperviousness, runoff coefficients, one-hour rainfall depths, rainfall intensities, time of concentration, and peak discharge of various storm events. Weighted runoff coefficients were calculated for each basin and sub-basin due to the mix of impervious surfaces.

### D. FOUR-STEP PROCESS

The selection of appropriate control measures is based on the characteristics of the site and potential pollutants. The Four-Step Process provides a method of going through the selection process. The following applies the four-step process to the Development Plan for the Foundation Lutheran Church.



#### Step 1: Employ Runoff Reduction Practices

Unresolved from Submittal 1 - Engineer must confirm in the Drainage Report that the existing offsite or onsite PBMPs that the site is tributary to are functioning as intended.

The Development Plan including the Landscape Plan utilizes landscaping areas for plantings and grass or mulch wherever possible without obstructing utilities or drainage ways. Given the proposed land use and desired density of the development, the required areas of the site is to be paved for vehicular and pedestrian access and the development of the structures and surrounding hardscape. Within the site, the storm water runoff is kept to the site limits via strategic grading, grass swales and landscaping.

#### Step 2: Provide Water Quality Capture Volume

The Final Drainage Report for Paint Brush Hills – Phase 2 (Filing No. 13), by Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors LLC dated June 2008 indicates a regional detention facility for this area. The detention facility was designed for water quality capture as well as full spectrum detention for the entirety of this site. The detention facility is within a platted tract of land with ownership and maintenance by the Paint Brush Hills Metropolitan District.

#### Step 3: Stabilize Drainage Ways

The drainage within the site is stabilized by way of pavement with curb and gutter to guide flow, as well as a grass-lined swales designed for a 100-year storm. There are no unstabilized drainage ways on this site. The unpaved, grass-lined swales are designed to convey on-site runoff.

All new and re-development projects are required to construct or participate in the funding of channel stabilization measures. Drainage basin fees paid, at the time of platting, go towards channel stabilization within the drainage basin.

#### Step 4: Implement Site Specific and Other Source Control BMPs

Unresolved from submittal 1 - Shown this on the GEC Plans

Site specific BMPs include a concrete wash out, stabilized staging area, and stockpile area are to be designated on site and surrounded with sediment control logs. Vehicle tracking control is to be implemented at both access points. Non-structural BMPs include street sweeping and instructions to the contractor to avoid tracking of mud and dirt off-site, compliance with dust control and construction site cleanup throughout the construction process. Permanent seeding and landscaping is to be done on all areas not slated for hardscape or structures. Storage/handling and spill containment controls are to be implemented per CDPHE regulations. No chemicals or other pollutive materials are required for this project and will not be allowed on site. Fueling and minor maintenance of vehicles or equipment may be allowed only in stabilized staging areas with proper controls in place. No major maintenance of vehicles or equipment is to be performed on site. Any spills that occur are to be addressed according to the requirements of Colorado Department Public Health and Environment, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division. No groundwater and/or stormwater dewatering activities are proposed or expected for the proposed construction activities. Any waste disposal is to be done off-site at the designation of the contractor at a location approved by El Paso County. Waste disposal, spill prevention, and response procedures are to be according to CDPHE and El Paso County standards.

Unresolved Review 1 Comment:  
- Please provide swale calculations.

An Erosion Control Plan showing BMPs for erosion and sediment control to be submitted separately.

## V. DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS AND FEES

### A. DRAINAGE AND BRIDGE FEES

The development falls within the Falcon drainage basin (CHWS1400) which has a drainage basin fee of \$37,256/acre and a bridge fee of \$5,118/acre according to the El Paso County Drainage Basin 2023 fee schedule.

These lots were previously platted as part of Paint Brush Hills. Drainage and Bridge fees are assumed to have been previously paid. No Drainage and Bridge fees to pay at this time.

Any outstanding fees must be paid prior to new plat recordation.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

### A. COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS

This Final Drainage Report is in conformance with the El Paso County Drainage Manual as well as the Mile High Flood District Drainage Criteria Manual. Grading practices for optimal drainage comply with the geotechnical investigative report and County standards. The development of Foundation Lutheran Church is within compliance and standards and meets the requirements for the drainage design.

The proposed grading and drainage is within substantial conformance for the master drainage plan for the Subdivision and Drainage Basin. There is no impact on major drainage way planning studies within the larger drainage basin. Site runoff and storm drain and appurtenances will not adversely affect the downstream and surrounding developments.

## VII. REFERENCES

El Paso County Drainage Manual

Colorado Urban Drainage and Flood Control District Drainage Criteria Manual, Volume I  
(January 2016)

Colorado Urban Drainage and Flood Control District Drainage Criteria Manual, Volume III  
(April 2018)

Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual, Volume III (November, 2015)

FEMA Flood Map Service Center

United States Department of Agriculture National Resources Conservation Service

Final Drainage Report for Paint Brush Hills – Phase 2 (Filing No. 13), dated June 2008, prepared by Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors LLC

Final Drainage Report for Paint Brush Hills Filing No. 13A (Phased Final Plat – Phase 1), dated April 2013, prepared by Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors LLC

Unresolved Review 1 Comment:  
- Please include a cost estimate for all drainage improvements required. Alternatively, state no drainage improvements required.



## VIII. APPENDICES

Unresolved Review 1 Comments:

- State what the capacity of Pond B1 is. Were flows from this site included in the calculations for Pond B1 and what the amount of runoff entering Pond B1 will be with the development of this site.
- Provide copies of pond design from Paintbrush Hills in appendix.

## Appendix A – Vicinity Map

## Vicinity Map



## **Appendix B – Hydrologic and Hydraulic Computations**

Project Number: 191726  
Engineer: DGW  
Date: 10/16/2023  
Address: Towners Ave  
Existing Conditions

Sub-Basin:	E-1	(IDF Curve Equations from Figure 6-5 of the DCM Volume 1)				
t <sub>r</sub> Duration:	26.44					
I <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>5</sub>	I <sub>10</sub>	I <sub>25</sub>	I <sub>50</sub>	I <sub>100</sub>	
2.13798792	2.670799899	3.11609988	3.56139987	4.00669985	4.48250383	

Hydrologic Soil Type:	B
-----------------------	---

Design Points		
Design Point	Q5	Q <sub>100</sub>
E-1	1.37	10.05
Total Site	1.37	10.05

Coefficient (Table 6-6)																						
Land Use or Surface Characteristic	Square Feet	Acreage	Coefficient <sub>2</sub>	Coefficient <sub>5</sub>	Coefficient <sub>10</sub>	Coefficient <sub>25</sub>	Coefficient <sub>50</sub>	Coefficient <sub>100</sub>	2 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	5 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	10 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	25 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	50 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	100 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	2 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	5 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	10 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	25 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	50 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	100 Yr C <sub>c</sub>		
Roof	0	0.00	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.80	0.81	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.020	0.080	0.150	0.250	0.300	0.350		
Pavement	0	0.00	0.89	0.90	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000								
Lawn	279175	6.41	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.128	0.513	0.961	1.602	1.923	2.243								
A <sub>t</sub> :	279175	6.41																				

Q Peak Flow (cfs) (Ci*A)					
2 Year Q	5 Year Q	10 Year Q	25 Year Q	50 Year Q	100 Year Q
0.27	1.37	3.00	5.71	7.70	10.05

## Time of Concentration

$$t_c = t_l + t_t$$

### 3.2.1 - Overland (Initial) Flow Time

$$t_l = \frac{0.395(1.1 - C_s)\sqrt{L}}{S^{0.33}} \quad (\text{Eq. 6-8})$$

Where:

$t_l$  = overland (initial) flow time (min)  
 $C_s$  = runoff coefficient for 5-year frequency (see Table 6-6)  
 $L$  = length of overland flow (300 ft maximum for non-urban land uses, 100 ft maximum for urban land uses)  
 $S$  = average basin slope (ft/ft)

Note that in some urban watersheds, the overland flow time may be very small because flows quickly concentrate and channelize.

Sub-Basin:	E-1
L (initial time):	300 ft
S (initial time):	0.034 ft/ft

#### Composite Runoff Coefficient Calculation:

$$C_c = (C_1A_1 + C_2A_2 + C_3A_3 + \dots + C_nA_n) / A_t$$

Land Use or Surface Characteristic	Square Feet	Acreage	$C_s$
Roof	0	0.00	0.73
Pavement	0	0.00	0.90
Lawn	279175	6.41	0.08
Total :	279175	6.41	

$$C_c = \boxed{0.08}$$

$$t_l = (0.395(1.1 - C_s)\sqrt{L}) / (S^{0.33})$$

$$t_l = \boxed{21.30} \text{ mins}$$

### 3.2.2 Travel Time

For catchments with overland and channelized flow, the time of concentration needs to be considered in combination with the travel time,  $t_t$ , which is calculated using the hydraulic properties of the swale, ditch, or channel. For preliminary work, the overland travel time,  $t_t$ , can be estimated with the help of Figure 6-25 or Equation 6-9 (Guo 1999).

$$V = C_v S_w^{0.5} \quad (\text{Eq. 6-9})$$

Where:

$V$  = velocity (ft/s)

$C_v$  = conveyance coefficient (from Table 6-7)

$S_w$  = watercourse slope (ft/ft)

Conveyance Coeff.:	10
Slope (travel time):	0.03 ft/ft
$V = C_v S_w^{0.5}$	1.73 ft/s

$$L \text{ (travel time): } \boxed{534} \text{ ft}$$

$$t_t = L/V = \boxed{308.31} \text{ sec.}$$

$$t_t = \boxed{5.14} \text{ min.}$$

$$t_c = t_l + t_t = \boxed{26.44} \text{ min.}$$

Table 6-7. Conveyance Coefficient,  $C_v$

Type of Land Surface	$C_v$
Heavy meadow	2.5
Tillage/field	5
Riprap (not buried)*	6.5
Short pasture and lawns	7
Nearly bare ground	10
Grassed waterway	15
Paved areas and shallow paved swales	20

\*For buried riprap, select  $C_v$  value based on type of vegetative cover.

### 3.2.4 Minimum Time of Concentration

If the calculations result in a  $t_c$  of less than 10 minutes for undeveloped conditions, it is recommended that a minimum value of 10 minutes be used. The minimum  $t_c$  for urbanized areas is 5 minutes.

$$\text{Final } t_c: \boxed{26.44} \text{ min.}$$

Project Number: 191726  
Engineer: DGW  
Date: 10/16/2023  
Address: Townner's Ave  
Proposed Conditions

Sub-Basin:	D-1		(IDF Curve Equations from Figure 6-5 of the DCM Volume 1)			
t <sub>e</sub> Duration:	10.31					
I <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>5</sub>	I <sub>10</sub>	I <sub>25</sub>	I <sub>50</sub>	I <sub>100</sub>	
3.258739438	4.083511897	4.76426388	5.44501586	6.12576785	6.85585999	

Hydrologic Soil Type: B

Sub-Basin:	D-2		(IDF Curve Equations from Figure 6-5 of the DCM Volume 1)			
t <sub>e</sub> Duration:	12.36					
I <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>5</sub>	I <sub>10</sub>	I <sub>25</sub>	I <sub>50</sub>	I <sub>100</sub>	
3.042449441	3.810877447	4.44619035	5.08150326	5.71681617	6.39783411	

Hydrologic Soil Type: B

Coefficient (Table 6-6)																				
Land Use or Surface Characteristic	Square Feet	Acreage	Coefficient <sub>2</sub>	Coefficient <sub>5</sub>	Coefficient <sub>10</sub>	Coefficient <sub>25</sub>	Coefficient <sub>50</sub>	Coefficient <sub>100</sub>	2 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	5 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	10 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	25 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	50 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	100 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	2 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	5 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	10 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	25 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	50 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	100 Yr C <sub>c</sub>
Roof	298	0.01	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.80	0.81	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.006	0.368	0.408	0.458	0.526	0.560	0.594
Pavement	27107	0.62	0.89	0.90	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	0.554	0.560	0.573	0.585	0.591	0.597						
Lawn	40883	0.94	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.019	0.075	0.141	0.235	0.282	0.328						
A <sub>t</sub> :	68288	1.57																		

Q Peak Flow (cfs)(Ci*A)					
2 Year Q	5 Year Q	10 Year Q	25 Year Q	50 Year Q	100 Year Q
1.88	2.61	3.42	4.49	5.38	6.39

Coefficient (Table 6-6)																				
Land Use or Surface Characteristic	Square Feet	Acreage	Coefficient <sub>2</sub>	Coefficient <sub>5</sub>	Coefficient <sub>10</sub>	Coefficient <sub>25</sub>	Coefficient <sub>50</sub>	Coefficient <sub>100</sub>	2 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	5 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	10 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	25 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	50 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	100 Yr: C <sub>i</sub> * A <sub>i</sub>	2 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	5 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	10 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	25 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	50 Yr C <sub>c</sub>	100 Yr C <sub>c</sub>
Roof	9335	0.21	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.80	0.81	0.152	0.156	0.161	0.167	0.171	0.174	0.145	0.197	0.260	0.348	0.392	0.436
Pavement	22813	0.52	0.89	0.90	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.96	0.466	0.471	0.482	0.492	0.498	0.503						
Lawn	178739	4.10	0.02	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.082	0.328	0.615	1.026	1.231	1.436						
A <sub>T</sub> :	210887	4.84																		

Q Peak Flow (cfs)(Ci*A)					
2 Year Q	5 Year Q	10 Year Q	25 Year Q	50 Year Q	100 Year Q
2.28	3.90	5.99	9.18	11.64	14.48



## Time of Concentration

$$t_c = t_1 + t_t$$

### 3.2.1 - Overland (Initial) Flow Time

$$t_1 = \frac{0.395(1.1 - C_s)\sqrt{L}}{S^{0.33}} \quad (\text{Eq. 6-8})$$

Where:

$t_1$  = overland (initial) flow time (min)

$C_s$  = runoff coefficient for 5-year frequency (see Table 6-6)

$L$  = length of overland flow (300 ft maximum for non-urban land uses, 100 ft maximum for urban land uses)

$S$  = average basin slope (ft/ft)

Note that in some urban watersheds, the overland flow time may be very small because flows quickly concentrate and channelize.

Sub-Basin:	10.1
L (initial time):	100 ft
S (initial time):	0.074 ft/ft

#### Composite Runoff Coefficient Calculation:

$$C_c = (C_1 A_1 + C_2 A_2 + C_3 A_3 + \dots C_i A_i) / A_t$$

Land Use or Surface Characteristic	Square Feet	Acreage	$C_s$
Roof	0	0.00	0.73
Pavement	27107	0.62	0.90
Lawn	40883	0.94	0.08
Total:	67990	1.56	

$$C_c = 0.41$$

$$t_1 = (0.395 * (1.1 - C_s) * \sqrt{L}) / (S^{0.33})$$

$$t_1 = 6.46 \text{ mins}$$

### 3.2.2 Travel Time

For catchments with overland and channelized flow, the time of concentration needs to be considered in combination with the travel time,  $t_t$ , which is calculated using the hydraulic properties of the swale, ditch, or channel. For preliminary work, the overland travel time,  $t_t$ , can be estimated with the help of Figure 6-25 or Equation 6-9 (Guo 1999).

$$V = C_v S_w^{0.5} \quad (\text{Eq. 6-9})$$

Where:

$V$  = velocity (ft/s)

$C_v$  = conveyance coefficient (from Table 6-7)

$S_w$  = watercourse slope (ft/ft)

Conveyance Coeff.:	20
Slope (travel time):	0.015 ft/ft
$V = C_v S_w^{0.5}$	2.45 ft/s
L (travel time):	565 ft
$t_t = L/V =$	230.66 sec.
$t_t =$	3.84 min.

Table 6-7. Conveyance Coefficient,  $C_v$

Type of Land Surface	$C_v$
Heavy meadow	2.5
Tillagefield	5
Riprap (not buried)	6.5
Short pasture and lawns	7
Nearly bare ground	10
Grassed waterway	15
Paved areas and shallow paved swales	20

For buried riprap, select  $C_v$  value based on type of vegetative cover.

$$t_c = t_1 + t_t = 10.31 \text{ min.}$$

### 3.2.4 Minimum Time of Concentration

If the calculations result in a  $t_c$  of less than 10 minutes for undeveloped conditions, it is recommended that a minimum value of 10 minutes be used. The minimum  $t_c$  for urbanized areas is 5 minutes.

$$\text{Final } t_c: 10.31 \text{ min.}$$

## Time of Concentration

$$t_c = t_i + t_t$$

### 3.2.1 - Overland (Initial) Flow Time

$$t_i = \frac{0.395(1.1 - C_s)\sqrt{L}}{S^{0.33}} \quad (\text{Eq. 6-8})$$

Where:

- $t_i$  = overland (initial) flow time (min)
- $C_s$  = runoff coefficient for 5-year frequency (see Table 6-6)
- $L$  = length of overland flow (300 ft maximum for non-urban land uses, 100 ft maximum for urban land uses)
- $S$  = average basin slope (ft/ft)

Note that in some urban watersheds, the overland flow time may be very small because flows quickly concentrate and channelize.

Sub-Basin:	D-2
L (initial time):	100 ft
S (initial time):	0.068 ft/ft

#### Composite Runoff Coefficient Calculation:

$$C_c = (C_1A_1 + C_2A_2 + C_3A_3 + \dots + C_nA_n) / A_t$$

Land Use or Surface Characteristic	Square Feet	Acreage	$C_s$
Roof	9632.7689	0.22	0.73
Pavement	22813	0.52	0.90
Lawn	178739	4.10	0.08
Total:	211185	4.85	

$C_c =$

0.20

$$t_i = (0.395(1.1 - C_s)\sqrt{L}) / (S^{0.33})$$

$t_i =$

8.65 mins

### 3.2.2 Travel Time

For catchments with overland and channelized flow, the time of concentration needs to be considered in combination with the travel time,  $t_t$ , which is calculated using the hydraulic properties of the swale, ditch, or channel. For preliminary work, the overland travel time,  $t_t$ , can be estimated with the help of Figure 6-25 or Equation 6-9 (Guo 1999).

$$V = C_v S_w^{0.5} \quad (\text{Eq. 6-9})$$

Where:

- $V$  = velocity (ft/s)
- $C_v$  = conveyance coefficient (from Table 6-7)
- $S_w$  = watercourse slope (ft/ft)

Conveyance Coeff.:	20
Slope (travel time):	0.023 ft/ft
$V = C_v S_w^{0.5}$	3.03 ft/s
L (travel time):	676 ft
$t_t = L/V =$	222.87 sec.
$t_t =$	3.71 min.

Table 6-7. Conveyance Coefficient,  $C_v$

Type of Land Surface	$C_v$
Heavy meadow	2.5
Tillage/field	5
Riprap (not bermed)	6.5
Short pasture and lawns	7
Nearly bare ground	10
Grassed waterway	15
Paved areas and shallow paved swales	20

For bermed riprap, select  $C_v$  value based on type of vegetative cover.

$$t_c = t_i + t_t = 12.36 \text{ min.}$$

### 3.2.4 Minimum Time of Concentration

If the calculations result in a  $t_c$  of less than 10 minutes for undeveloped conditions, it is recommended that a minimum value of 10 minutes be used. The minimum  $t_c$  for urbanized areas is 5 minutes.


Final  $t_c$ : 12.36 min.

## **Appendix D – FEMA Floodplain Map**

# National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette



104°37'40"W 38°58'52"N



0 250 500 1,000 1,500 2,000 Feet 1:6,000  
 Basemap: USGS National Map: Orthoimagery: Data refreshed October, 2020

## Legend

SEE FIS REPORT FOR DETAILED LEGEND AND INDEX MAP FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT

- SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS**
- Without Base Flood Elevation (BFE) Zone A, V, AE, AR
  - With BFE or Depth Zone AE, AD, AH, VE, AR
  - Regulatory Floodway
- OTHER AREAS OF FLOOD HAZARD**
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard, Areas of 1% annual chance flood with average depth less than one foot or with drainage areas of less than one square mile Zone X
  - Future Conditions 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard Zone X
  - Area with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee. See Notes, Zone X
  - Area with Flood Risk due to Levee Zone D
- OTHER AREAS**
- NO SCREEN Area of Minimal Flood Hazard Zone X
  - Effective LOMRs
  - Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard Zone D
- GENERAL STRUCTURES**
- Channel, Culvert, or Storm Sewer
  - Levee, Dike, or Floodwall
- OTHER FEATURES**
- Cross Sections with 1% Annual Chance Water Surface Elevation
  - Coastal Transect
  - Base Flood Elevation Line (BFE)
  - Limit of Study
  - Jurisdiction Boundary
  - Coastal Transect Baseline
  - Profile Baseline
  - Hydrographic Feature
- MAP PANELS**
- Digital Data Available
  - No Digital Data Available
  - Unmapped
- The pin displayed on the map is an approximate point selected by the user and does not represent an authoritative property location.

This map complies with FEMA's standards for the use of digital flood maps if it is not void as described below. The basemap shown complies with FEMA's basemap accuracy standards.


The flood hazard information is derived directly from the authoritative NFHL web services provided by FEMA. This map was exported on 2/14/2023 at 1:11 PM and does not reflect changes or amendments subsequent to this date and time. The NFHL and effective information may change or become superseded by new data over time.

This map image is void if the one or more of the following map elements do not appear: basemap imagery, flood zone labels, legend, scale bar, map creation date, community identifiers, FIRM panel number, and FIRM effective date. Map images for unmapped and unmodernized areas cannot be used for regulatory purposes.

## **Appendix E – USDA Soils Survey Map**




# Hydrologic Soil Group—El Paso County Area, Colorado



Natural Resources  
Conservation Service

Web Soil Survey  
National Cooperative Soil Survey

2/14/2023  
Page 1 of 4





## Hydrologic Soil Group

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
71	Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	B	6.4	100.0%
Totals for Area of Interest			6.4	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 C – Drainage Maps**

LAST SAVED: 3/27/2023 12:48 PM PATH: \\sal.lmg-engineers.com\FST\Ten\Projects\Site\_Specific\2023a-COLORADO COMMERCIAL CONSTRUCTION, INC.-191726\CD\Drawings\From RMS\Sheet Sub-Basins\191726\_Lutheran Church-Existing Sub-Basin Analysis.dwg

LEGEND

DESCRIPTION	SYMBOL
EX. STRUCTURE/BUILDING	
EX. CONCRETE PAVEMENT	
EX. ASPHALT PAVEMENT	
EX. GRAVEL ROAD	
PROP. STRUCTURE/BUILDING	
PROP. CONCRETE PAVEMENT	
EX. CONTOUR	
PROP. CONTOUR	
DRAINAGE SUB-BASIN BOUNDARY	
PROPERTY LINE	
BASIN IDENTIFIER	
AREA IN ACRES	
DESIGN POINT ID	
FLOW ARROW	

Unresolved Review 1  
Comment:  
- Label property line since it  
appears to be overlapped by  
basin boundary

Unresolved Review 1  
Comment:  
- Show and label 36"  
RCP

Unresolved Review 1  
Comment:  
- Show & label swale  
discussed within report

Show all drainage and public  
easements on the property as  
previously done on the first submittal.


Unresolved Review 1  
Comment:  
- Label contour  
elevations

Show and label streets  
as previously done on  
the first submittal.

Unresolved Review 1  
Comments:  
- Label contours.  
- Are flows going  
towards Townner  
Avenue, if so then  
break this into a  
different sub-basin.

Unresolved Review 1  
Comment:  
- Show and label 24"  
RCP that crosses  
underneath Townner  
Avenue into the  
property.

Unresolved Review 1  
Comment:  
- Include flows entering  
site from culvert



DESIGN POINT	FLOW (GFS)
EP1	Q <sub>10</sub> = 3.00
	Q <sub>100</sub> = 10.05

BASIN	Q10(GFS)	Q100(GFS)	ACRES(AC)
E-1	3.00	10.05	6.41

FOUNDATION LUTHERAN CHURCH

TOWNERS AVE  
FALCON, COLORADO

COLORADO COMMERCIAL CONSTRUCTION, INC.

These plans are copyrighted 2020 by Geospatial Engineers Inc. dba RMG - Rocky Mountain Group. All rights reserved. Any sale, reproduction, creation of derivative works based on these plans, or use of these plans for any purpose without proper compensation is and the express written consent of RMG, is strictly prohibited.

SHEET NAME  
EXISTING SUB-BASIN ANALYSIS

PROJECT STATUS  
FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT

ENG:	DGW	
DRAWN:	AMH	
CHECKED:	TPT	
DATE		
03/28/2023		
#	REVISION	DATE
JOB NO.		
191726		
SHEET NO.		
01		
of 02		

**RMG**  
Rocky Mountain Group  
Engineers / Architects

Markus T. Boring  
Principal  
Civil / Planning

Architectural  
Structural  
Geotechnical

SOUTHERN COLORADO OFFICE  
1799 S. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100, COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80918  
719.575.8500 - FAX 719.575.8501  
SOUTHERN COLORADO DRIVEWAY: 1000 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100, COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80918

FOR CIVIL ONLY



LAST SAVED: 3/27/2023 1:32:15 PM PATH: \\sdlr\eng\engineers\com\FS\Ten\Projects\Site\_Specific\2023a-COLORADO Commercial Construction, Inc.-112309962-Towner Ave-191726\CD\Drawings\From RMG\Sheet Sub-Basin\191726\_Lutheran Church-Proposed Sub-Basin\_Analysis.dwg

LEGEND

DESCRIPTION	SYMBOL
EX. STRUCTURE/BUILDING	
EX. CONCRETE PAVEMENT	
EX. ASPHALT PAVEMENT	
EX. GRAVEL ROAD	
PROP. STRUCTURE/BUILDING	
PROP. CONCRETE PAVEMENT	
EX. CONTOUR	
PROP. CONTOUR	
DRAINAGE SUB-BASIN BOUNDARY	
PROPERTY LINE	
BASIN IDENTIFIER	
AREA IN ACRES	
DESIGN POINT ID	
FLOW ARROW	

Unresolved Review 1 Comment:  
- Add time of concentration path to legend

Show pipe connecting DP2 to DP3 if proposed. Or grading for flows to reach DP3.

Show and label area inlet.

Unresolved Review 1 Comment:  
- Label proposed and existing contours.

Unresolved Review 1 Comment:  
- Please label and identify proposed grass swale.

Unresolved Review 1 Comment:  
- Label all existing and proposed drainage infrastructure. Include dimensions and sizing.  
- Show and label pipes as done in GEC plan

Show and label proposed rain garden described in the report.

Show and label streets as previously done on the first submittal.

Show and label grass swale.

Show and label area inlet. Provide type.


All DP's should have distinct WSs associated with them and be accounted for in the above table.

Unresolved Review 1 Comment:  
Show and label contours, verify grading matches GEC plan.

Unresolved Review 1 Comment:  
- Show and label all drainage and utility easements.

Show proposed structure and surfaces as previously done in first submittal.

Discuss DP3 and DP4 in the report and include in the summary table.



<u>DESIGN POINT</u>	<u>FLOW (CFS)</u>		
DP1	Q <sub>10</sub> = 3.40 Q <sub>100</sub> = 6.35		
DP2	Q <sub>10</sub> = 6.02 Q <sub>100</sub> = 14.52		
Unresolved from Submittal 1 - add all DPs to this table			
<u>BASIN SUMMARY</u>			
<u>BASIN</u>	<u>Q10(CFS)</u>	<u>Q100(CFS)</u>	<u>ACRES(AC)</u>
D-1	3.40	6.35	1.56
D-2	6.02	14.52	4.85
TOTAL	9.42	20.87	6.41

FOUNDATION LUTHERAN CHURCH

TOWNERS AVE  
FALCON, COLORADO

COLORADO COMMERCIAL CONSTRUCTION, INC.

PROPOSED SUB-BASIN ANALYSIS

FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT

ENG:	DSW	
DRAWN:	AMH	
CHECKED:	TPT	
DATE	03/28/2023	
#	REVISION	DATE
JOB NO.	191726	
SHEET NO.	02 of 02	

Markus T. Gering  
Fengcheng  
Civil / Planning

**RMG**

Architectural  
Structural  
Geotechnical

**Engineers / Architects**

SOUTHERN COLORADO OFFICE  
1719 S. HARRISON  
DENVER, COLORADO 80202  
SOUTHERN COLORADO DRIVEWAY, 10000 N. 100TH AVE., SUITE 100, COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80918

FOR CIVIL ONLY