



October 18, 2019

Lindsay Darden
El Paso County
3275 Akers Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80922

RE: *Green Mountain Falls County Documents Review Comments and Redlines*

Thank you for the comments on October 09, 2019 for the above-mentioned project. In an effort to address your comments concisely and simplify your review process, we have summarized your comments and our responses below.

Construction Documents

GENERAL OVERALL COMMENTS

1. Label the accessible path of travel from HC parking to building entrances.
Response: Accessible path of travel has been added.
2. Provide a detail for the trash enclosure gate. Enclosure height shall be a minimum of 8” above items inside to be screened.
Response: A detail for the trash enclosure and gate has been added.
3. It is understood that only the front façade will undergo renovation. Please provide a sheet with photos showing the existing conditions of the other facades for reference.
Response: These photos have been provided alongside the building elevations.
4. Submit confirmation that the State Non-Jurisdictional Water Impound Structure application form has been submitted to the state.
Response: This form has been filled out and submitted to the state.
5. Per Chapter 11, section 11.3.3 of the El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manual, a Geotechnical report with recommendations for the foundation preparation and embankment construction shall be submitted with the complete design analysis for all permanent detention facilities.
Response: The current Geotechnical report will be included with this submittal.
6. Other than the ownership issue, the County Attorney’s comments on the detention pond agreement from July 30 remain unaddressed or uncorrected.
Response: These comments have been addressed.
7. From PPRBD: Label the existing structure addresses on site. See site plan document emailed to Jared Roberts 10-4-19, showing what numbers were projected to be assigned. Are any

other these number being utilized on site? If the structure shown o site plan are not on site, label as so. Please provide this information so that we can move forward.

Response: The structures have been identified and labeled.

SWMP PLAN REDLINES

1. Please ensure that the latest GEC plans are attached to this report.

Response: Latest GEC plans have been provided.

2. Please indicate the anticipated date of final stabilization.

Response: Final stabilization anticipated in Final 2021.

SWMP CHECKLIST REDLINES

1. Proposed sequence for major activities: Provide a construction schedule of anticipated starting and completion dates for each stage of land-disturbing activity depicting conservation measures anticipated, including the expected date on which the final stabilization will be completed.

Response: Final stabilization anticipated in Final 2021.

SITE PLAN REDLINES

1. The letter of intent and the site plan on sheet 3 indicates 423 seats. Please revise accordingly.

Response: Confirmed to be 423 seats.

2. Parking information does not match which is shown on the previous page. Revise accordingly.

Response: Confirmed to be 423 seats.

3. Unresolved. The building capacity also does not match the previous page. Please revise so that all the information is matching.

Response: Confirmed to be 423 seats.

SDI WORKSHEET REDLINES

1. Be advised, this does not meet the senate bill drain time. Also it does not match the design in the drainage report.

Response: SDI worksheets have been updated and match the design in the drainage report.

MS4 POST CONSTRUCTION REDLINES

1. These ponds are designed for the 100yr storm. Please revise.

Response: Revised.

2. Please list these ponds as EDB's as the ponds do not just function as water quality ponds.

Response: Revised.

GEC PLAN REDLINES

1. Name of receiving waters:
Response: Fountain Creek
2. Please submit the soils report.
Response: Noted.
3. Phone number should end in 6300
Response: Updated.
4. The majority of the comments on the GEC plan from the 1st review have not been addressed. Please address all of review 1 comments.
Response: All prior comments have been addressed.

GEC CHECKLIST REDLINES

1. Adjacent city/town/jurisdictional boundaries, subdivision names, and property parcels numbers labeled.
Response: All adjacent parcels are labeled. The north, east, and south boundaries of the viewport are all the same parcel. A wider extent of the overall area with parcel numbers is shown on the overall site plan in the Development Plan.
2. Limits of disturbance delineating all anticipated areas of soil disturbance.
Response: The limits of disturbance have been identified.
3. Offsite grading clearly shown and called out.
Response: A hatch has been added to identify the area with off-site grading. A separate submittal will be delivered to CDOT with the detailed plans.
4. Conclusions from soils/geotechnical report and geologic hazards report incorporated in grading design (slopes, embankments, materials, mitigation, etc.)
Response: The proposed grading meets the slope requirements laid out in the report.
5. All proposed temporary construction control measures, structural and non-structural. Temporary construction control measures shall be identified by phase of implementation to include "initial," "interim," and "final" or show on separate phased maps identifying each phase.
Response: The construction control measure phases have been identified.
6. Temporary sediment pods provided for disturbed drainage areas greater than 1 acre.
Response: Sediment ponds have been identified and detailed.

7. All proposed temporary construction control measure details. Custom or other jurisdiction's details used must meet or exceed EPC standards.

Response: The details provided meet EPC standards.

8. Existing and proposed permanent storm water management facilities, including areas proposed for stormwater infiltration or subsurface detention.

Response: Noted.

9. Retaining walls (not to be located in County ROW unless approved via license agreement). Design by P.E. and building permit from Regional Building Department required for walls greater than or equal to 4 feet in height, series of walls, or walls supporting a surcharge.

Response: Retaining walls are no longer being used.

FINANCIAL ASSURANCE REDLINES

1. Include the proposed storm drain improvements and permanent BMP (detention ponds)

Response: Revised.

2. Include proposed detention ponds

Response: Revised.

3. Please relocate the storm drain improvements to section 3 as these improvements are not public.

Response: Revised

4. Include items described (As-built plans, Pong/BMP certification)

Response: Revised

DRAINAGE REPORT REDLINES

1. There will be outside agencies that will review this application. Please revise this statement.

Response: This statement has been revised.

2. Per sub-basin R-1, the roof runoff is collected into an existing underground storm sewer that discharges at design point 7 not a drainage ditch on the eastern side. Please revise narrative accordingly.

Response: Updated. Roof runoff flows through 4" PVC to east pond then through existing 24" PVC to drainage ditch.

3. Please elaborate in your discussion of the existing sub-basins to include the existing culverts that are routing flow from these basins.

Response: Culverts are 18" CMP. Discussion was revised.

4. Pg. 7 It does not appear that the roof runoff would enter the pond. The outlet of this storm pipe is directed to the existing 24" pipe. Please revise accordingly.
Response: At the outfall of the roof runoff, an additional pipe will connect the flow to the proposed 18"RCP which outfalls in the West EDB.
5. Pg. 7 Please identify this on the drainage plan. The outlet has been shown but the initial discharge point of the roof drainage system has not been identified.
Response: The current survey does not show the initial discharge point of the roof drain system. Only a pipe size and invert are provided.
6. *Please delete (ROW).*
Response: This word has been deleted. Thank you!
7. Please identify this culvert on the drainage plan.
Response: Identified.
8. The private storm lines route the flow to the east pond.
Response: Revised.
9. Please identify this on the drainage plans. The site plan and GEC show another culvert adjacent to the proposed 5' inlet. Please provide discussion regarding this culvert also.
Response: The two culverts have been called out and the narrative has been revised.
10. The flow from the culvert that is mentioned in sub-basin A1 is directed into this sub-basin. Be sure to account for this in your detention basin design.
Response: An addition will be made to the existing drainage ditch that directs flow southwest, along the site boundary toward the entry road, then to a culvert which crosses beneath the entry road toward the primary CDOT ROW ditch.
11. Culvert (Spelling)
Response: This comment has been addressed.
12. CIA calc comments
Response: The values have been corrected from the DCM
13. Pg. 63 The flow from the culvert mentioned in sub-basin A1 is directed to this detention pond. Please account for this area that is flowing into the pond. Revise the design accordingly.
Response: The existing ditch/culvert will be extended to direct flow around the pond and keep it off-site and toward the CDOT ROW ditch.
14. Pond construction plans and details have not been provided for either pond. Further review of the detention basin calculations will be done upon submittal of the construction plans which may generate additional comments.

- Response: Pond details have been created.*
15. Provide UD-BMP worksheet for the west pond also.
Response: Noted. UD-BMP worksheet has been added for the west pond.
 16. Show and label all existing culverts/storm pipes, providing their size and type. Include discussion in the narrative regarding these culverts/storm pipes.
Response: Noted.
 17. Provide flow arrows for all the basins.
Response: Noted.
 18. Label all existing culverts
Response: Revised.
 19. Construction plans and details for the detention ponds have not been provided on the GEC plans for review. Please provide.
Response: Revised.
 20. Provide greater detail at the outfall location. It is unclear how the flow will make a 90 degree bend as opposed to entering the adjacent property. Also based on the design calc the ditch is not hydraulically adequate. Please analyze and provide the appropriate protection
Response: Noted.
 21. Based on the contours this appears to be a sump condition, yet the narrative indicated that the flow will go to the CDOT ROW ditch to the south.
Response: An additional proposed 24" PVC pipe will be added prior to the existing ultimate outfall to the drainage ditch. Now the pipe will bend 45deg south directly toward the CDOT ROW ditch and outfall to a concrete run-down directly into the ROW
 22. The proposed flow at the ultimate outfall shall be at or below historic. These flows are larger than what is shown on the existing drainage plan. Please revise.
Response: Revised. Commentary had been added to the drainage report and calcs show that proposed flows are below previous levels.
 23. It appears that areas/sub-basins outside of the proposed development area are also tributary to the proposed ponds. The ponds should be designed accordingly for all flows even those outside the development area.
Review 2: unresolved. The flow from the culvert shown is directed to the pond. Please account for this area that flow into the pond.
Response: The existing drainage ditch is being extended so that flows existing the culvert will remain off-site and continue toward the primary ditch that runs along the entry road and eventually into the ROW ditch

LANDSCAPE PLAN REDLINES

8. Limits of disturbance delineating all anticipated areas of soil disturbance.
Response: The limits of disturbance have been identified.
9. The inset on the landscape plan shows the landscape along 24 still shows the proposed landscape in close proximity to the overhead power lines. This was pointed out by the power company as an issue. You need to shift the roadway landscape up the hill and away from the power lines.
Response: Landscaping has been updated.
10. Check internal landscaping calculations: 149 AC site x 0.05% = 7.45 AC (324,522SF).
Response: Landscaping calculations have been updated.
11. Indicate the SF of internal landscape provided. You listed the trees but there is also a SF requirement and that is not listed in the landscape calculations.
Response: Square footage has been provided.
12. Show proposed parking lot pole light fixtures on the landscape plan to alleviate tree/light conflicts.
Response: Fixtures are shown on the plans.
13. Please revise the note 2 to read: "Landscape architect reserves the right to adjust all plan material. El Paso County shall review all proposed changes for consistency with the Land Development Code requirements for plant material."
Response: Note modified.

DRAWING 104

1. Ensure that parking lot islands are at least the size of a parking space. The LDC requires one island per 14 spaces (125 spaces – 9 islands) and the islands should be the size of a parking space. Some of the island proposed appear smaller than required.
Response: A note for the directional bore has added to the plans.

Please contact me at (719) 453-0180 or eric.gunderson@kimley-horn.com should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Eric Gunderson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Eric" and last name "Gunderson" clearly legible.

Eric Gunderson P.E.
Project Manager