

October 24, 2018

Kari Parsons  
Attn: Jeff Rice  
El Paso County  
Development Services Dept.  
2880 International Circle, Ste 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

RE: **Response** to Sterling Ranch MDDP Comments  
EPC File No. SF-17-024 / SKP-18-003 Review 2

#### Notes from EPC

Planning and Community Development (PCD)-Engineering reviews plans and reports to ensure general conformance with El Paso County standards and criteria. The project engineer is responsible for compliance with all applicable criteria, including other governmental regulations. Notwithstanding anything depicted in the plans in words or graphic representation, all design and construction related to roads, storm drainage and erosion control shall conform to the standards and requirements of the most recent version of the relevant adopted El Paso County standards, including the Land Development Code (LDC), the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), the Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM), and the Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 2 (DCM2). Any deviations from regulations and standards must be requested, and approved by the ECM Administrator, in writing. Any modifications necessary to meet overlooked criteria after-the-fact will be entirely the developer's responsibility to rectify.

The comments include unresolved previous comments and new comments resulting from the re-submittal in **bold**. All previous comments that have been resolved have been noted or deleted. A written response to all comments and redlines is required for review of the re-submittal. Please arrange a meeting between the developer's team and County staff to review and discuss these comments and prepared revisions/responses prior to the next submittal. **Response: Meeting held on 10/18/18.**

Note: Condition of approval #12 from Sterling Ranch Filing No. 1 requires the MDDP to be approved prior to replatting any of the tracts within that final plat. **Response: Noted**

#### MDDP

1. Address ECM Section I.7.2.A - Four Step Process and how these steps will be provided for on this site. Specifically address LID concepts to be used in the diverted basin area. **Partially resolved; see redlines.**  
**Response: Redlines addressed.**
2. The proposed diversion of flows from the East Fork to DP63 needs to be handled with a deviation request in regard to ECM Section 3.2.6 and DCM Section 1.2.6. **Note: the deviation request is still under review and additional clarification may be requested.**  
**Response: Noted, revisions made to deviation as requested by staff.**
  - a. **Resolved**
  - b. **Resolved**

Address what types of improvements would be required to release flows in the historic manner and quantity along the south property line and why the improvements would not be feasible.

**Unresolved; address in the deviation request. Response: Addressed in text/deviation request. Additional deviation request may be required for DP56/8 in future.**

- c. Provide a map or maps (8-1/2"x11") in the deviation request showing the diverted area and where the East Fork merges with the main stem of Sand Creek.  
**Response: An exhibit has been created and added to the deviation request to provided clarity regarding the area of diversion.**

- d. Add the diversions within the East Fork (to DP 56) to the deviation request (or provide a separate deviation request) along with appropriate justification.  
**Response: Proposed flow rates leaving site at DP56 are limited to existing conditions flows and thus no deviation is required.**

Specifically address LID concepts to be used in the diverted basin areas (East Fork west to SC and sub-basins east to DP 56) (see report redlines).

**Response: Additional language has been added to the report which LID concepts have been addressed in the report. See response above regarding DP56.**

3. Regarding the proposed increase in flows at DP56/8:
- Address why the flows cannot be reduced to historic rates by the use of FSD throughout the East Fork basin. **Partially resolved; per the comment response letter it is also stated that there is no intent to increase discharged flows offsite without suitable outfalls and easements; state this in the MDDP and deviation request.**  
**Response: See response above, flows will be reduced to historic.**
  - Resolved**  
Address City and property owner approval of increased flows at Woodmen Road and downstream and the extent of offsite drainage easements necessary. (Note: the City is in the procurement process for a Sand Creek DBPS update.) **Partially resolved; see redlines and comment #3a, above. Response: See response above, flows will be reduced to historic.**

#### 4. through 7 – Resolved

8. More detail is necessary to confirm the conceptual design for Pond W-3:
- Attenuation of increased flows and volumes from both higher development intensity and the diverted East Fork flows need to be thoroughly addressed. The deviation request for the diversion needs to include this information. **(See comment #2 above.)**  
**Response: Addressed**
  - Approval of the MDDP does not imply approval of conceptual design details for this pond. The pond should be revised not to use the road as an embankment unless the outlet structure is designed to handle undetained developed flows. **Resolved in text.**
  - The report states that the pond is online; additional detail will be required addressing SB15-212/ §37-92-602(8) CRS Compliance rules in regard to the facility being in the Fountain Creek basin.
9. See MDDP redlines, including those specified below, for additional cursory comments, further revisions and clarification of these comments. Additional comments may result from revisions. Label DBPS design points and flows on both existing and proposed plans. **Partially resolved; label East Fork flows; see redlines. Response: Addressed Redlines**
- through d – Resolved
10. Note: The request that certain facilities be reimbursable is not being approved with this MDDP review and will need to occur through the separate DBPS/fee amendment process.

11. Provide the electronic HEC-HMS model. Note: modeling parameters including updated CN values will be verified on the next review. **Resolved**
12. **On the DBPS Map Overlay plan, show proposed improvements where they differ from the DBPS in the East Fork sub-basin. Note or cross out DBPS improvements that are not proposed. See redlines.**  
**Response: Maps revised as requested**
13. **Provide DBPS Tables VIII in the appendix.**  
**Response: Table added to the appendix.**
14. **Note: Comments from the City of Colorado Springs are anticipated and will be forwarded when available.**  
**Response: City comments provided by EPC staff since this response letter. Comments Were not issues that had to be addressed within the report. They were simply inquiries (two questions) for additional information. Answers to these questions were sent to City staff via email.**

Attachments/Electronic Files

1. MDDP redlines