MDDP	HAY CREEK VALLEY
Preliminary Drainage	Prepared for: VIEW HOMES, INC.
	555 WILLIUCK I AIKWAY SUILE 500

Colorado Springs, CO 80921 (719) 382-9433

Prepared by: Matrix

2435 Research Parkway, Suite 300 Colorado Springs, CO 80920 (719) 575-0100 fax (719) 572-0208

January 2023



Please update to PCD File SP-23-01

Engineer's Statement:

The attached drainage plan and report were prepared under my direction and supervision and are correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Said drainage report has been prepared according to the criteria established by the County for drainage reports and said report is in conformity with the applicable master plan of the drainage basin. I accept responsibility for any liability caused by any negligent acts, errors or omissions on my part in preparing this report.

Jesse Sullivan
Registered Professional Engineer
State of Colorado
No. 55600

Date

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.

View Homes, Inc.

Business Name

By:

Timothy Buschar

Date

Title: Director of land Acquisition and Development

Address: <u>555 Middle Creek Parkway Suite 500</u> Colorado Springs, CO 80921

El Paso County:

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

Joshua Palmer, P.E. County Engineer / ECM Administrator Conditions:

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERT	FIFICATION		I
I. 1	INTRODUCI	LION	1
II.	HYDROLO	GIC METHODOLOGY	2
III.	PROJECT C	CHARACTERISTICS	4
IV.	BASIN HYD	DROLOGY	5
V.	HYDRAULI	IC ANALYSIS	
VI.	STORM WA	TER QUALITY	
VII.	EROSION	I CONTROL PLAN	13
VIII	. FLOODPI	LAINS	13
IX.	FEE DEVE	LOPMENT	
X.	SUMMARY.		15
XI.	REFERENC	CES	16
6.	APPENDICE	2S	
АРРЕ	ENDIX		
	 A. Hydrolog 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. B. Standard 1. 2. 3. C. Report R 1. 	gic and Hydraulic Calculations Rational Calculations Pipe Sizing Calculations Inlet Calculations Culvert Calculations Pond Calculations Swale Calculations Design Charts and Tables Runoff Coefficients Shallow Flow Velocities Basin Fee Schedule References FIRMette	
	2. D. Maps 1. 2. 3.	Soil Survey Vicinity Map Existing Conditions Drainage Basin Map Proposed Conditions Drainage Basin Map	

Hay Creek Valley drainage report. MDDP / Final Draine Typical for all.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Hay Creek Valley site is comprised of approximately 214.6 acres of unplatted and mostly undeveloped land. The site is located on Smow Mountain Heights approximately 700 feet south of its intersection with Hay Creek Road. The site is currently comprised of six (6) parcels which are to be subdivided into 20 lots and three (3) tracts. The existing access road will be replaced with a private road having a 60-foot right of way that will terminate with a cul-de-sac in the southwestern section of the site.

a. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

The purpose of this Final Drainage Report (FDR) is to evaluate the specific drainage infrastructure requirements which will provide compliance with the County Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM) and provide storm water conveyance for associated developments. This study will identify off-site, and on-site drainage patterns associated with respective land uses, provide hydrologic and hydraulic analysis of tributary basins and conveyance structures to a detention pond, and identify effective, safe routing to the downstream outfall. The improvements associated with this report maintain compliance with the DCM by providing full spectrum detention where necessary, which is to be constructed concurrently with the improvements associated with this FDR.

b. DBPS RELATED INVESTIGATIONS

The proposed development is located within the Beaver Creek Drainage Basin. No Drainage Basin Planning Study (DBPS) has been completed for this basin.

c. GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Hay Creek Valley Subdivision is located to the southwest of the intersection of Hay Creek Road and Smow Mountain Heights. The site is located as follows:

- <u>General Location</u>: Southwest ¹/₄ of Section 34 and the Southeast ¹/₄ of Section 33, Township 11 South, Range 67 West of the 6th P.M. in the County of El Paso, State of Colorado.
- 2. <u>Drainageway:</u> The Hay Creek Subdivision is located on the southern edge of the Beaver Creek Drainage Basin. Most of the site drains north and into Hay Creek located approximately 200 feet north of the site. Hay Creek is a tributary to Beaver Creek which ultimately drains into Monument Creek. A small portion of the southeast corner of the site drains south into the Air Force Academy Major Drainage Basin.
- 3. <u>Surrounding Developments:</u> The site is bound Lots 1 through 8 Hay Creek Ranch Subdivision, and 4 unplatted parcels to the north, and by the Air Force Academy the south. The site is bound by Lot 2 Rush Subdivision and Lot 2 Block 1 Smiley Subdivision to the west, and an unplatted parcel to the east.
- 4. Lots to be Platted: The site is to be subdivided into 20 lots zoned RR-5 and 3 tracts.
- 5. <u>Area of Disturbance:</u> The Hay Creek Valley development is expected to disturb a total area of approximately 14.5 acres.
- 6. <u>Streamside Zone</u>: This project is not located within a streamside zone.
- 7. <u>Vegetation</u>: The Hay Creek Valley site contains a single-family residence, a barn and Smow Mountain Heights, a private road that provided access to the site from hay Creek Road. The vegetation of the site consists of sparse, natural vegetative land cover in the form of grasses and shrubs with sparse trees throughout.

Refer to Appendix D for the Vicinity Map.

d. SOILS CONDITIONS

Soils can be classified in four different hydrologic groups, A, B, C, or D to help predict stormwater runoff rates. Hydrologic group "A" is characterized by deep, well-drained coarse-grained soils with a rapid infiltration rate when thoroughly wet and having a low runoff potential. Group "D" typically has a clay layer at or near to the surface, or a very shallow depth to impervious bedrock and has a very slow infiltration rate and a high runoff potential. See Soils Map, Appendix A. The following soil types are present in the Bradley Heights Metro District:

Soil ID Number	Soil	Hydrologic Classification	Drainage Class	Percent of Site
38	Jarre-Tecolote Complex, 8 to 65 percent slopes	В	Well Drained	50.8%
71	Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	В	Well Drained	14.5%
93	Tomah-Crowfoot complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes	В	Well Drained	34.7%

Table 1.1 – NRCS Soil Survey for El Paso County – Hay Creek Valley

DATA SOURCES

Topographical information for the district was found using a combination of *United States Geological Survey* (USGS) mapping as well as field surveying. The *Web Soil Survey*, created by the *Natural Resources Conservation Service*, was utilized to investigate the existing general soil types within the district. Offsite contours are taken from the *2018 El Paso County LIDAR* survey and/or USGS Quad Sheets.

e. APPLICABLE CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

This report has been prepared in accordance to the criteria set forth in the City of Colorado Springs and El Paso County DCM, El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) and El Paso County Resolutions 15-042 and 19-245. In addition to the DCM, the **Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manuals, Volumes 1 through 3**, dated 2016 have been used to supplement the County's Criteria Manual.

II. Hydrologic Methodology

a. MAJOR BASINS AND SUBBASINS

The majority of the Hay Creek Valley site is located within the Beaver Creek Drainage Basin with a small portion of the site tributary to the Air Force Academy Major Drainage Basin. Runoff presently flows overland until reaching an existing natural drainage swale located within the site. This drainage swale directs flows internally until discharging from near the northeastern corner of the site. Drainage from the developed road will be directed to a detention pond, where the runoff will be treated for water quality and detained to maintain the historic major event discharge rate from the site.

b. METHODOLOGY

i. UD Methods

The hydrology for this project uses the **Rational Method** as recommended by the Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM) for the minor and major storms. The Rational Method is used for drainage basins less than 100-acres in size. The Rational Method uses the following equation:

Q=C*i*A

Where:

Q = Maximum runoff rate in cubic feet per second (cfs)
 C = Runoff coefficient
 i = Average rainfall intensity (inches per hour)
 A = Area of drainage sub-basin (acres)

Rational Method coefficients from 6-6 of the Drainage Criteria Manual for developed land were utilized in the Rational Method calculations. This method will be used primarily for sizing of storm sewer infrastructure. See Appendix B for more information.

Time of Concentration

The time of concentration consists of the initial time of overland flow and the travel time in a channel to the inlet or point of interest. A minimum time of concentrations of 5 minutes is utilized for urban areas. The Rational Calculation spreadsheet included in Appendix A shows an initial overland flow length, a channel or street flow length for each sub-basin, and also demonstrates the time of concentration calculations for initial (overland) and channel (or street) conditions. A maximum "True Initial" Flow Length of 300 feet will be used for pre-developed sub-basins and a maximum length of 100 feet will be used for Developed sub-basins for time of concentration calculations in compliance with the DCM.

Rainfall Intensity

The hypothetical rainfall depths for the 1-hour storm duration were derived using Table 6-2 of the El Paso County DCM (shown below). See Appendix B.

	110ai Kaiman Depui
Storm Recurrence Interval	Rainfall Depth (inches)
5-year	1.50
100-year	2.52

Table 2.1 – Project Area 1-Hour Rainfall Depth

The rainfall intensity equation for the Rational Method was taken from Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 1 Figure 6-5.

C-Factors

C-factors for the Rational Method are based on anticipated land use and are taken from Tables 3-1 and 6-6 of the DCM. Anticipated single-family areas are considered under the single family – 5 acre lots category in table 3-1 with a percent imperviousness of 7%, which corresponds to the Parks and Cemeteries category in table 6-6. The paved road is considered under the Paved Areas category. Areas which will be future open spaces or detention facilities are modeled under the Parks and

Cemeteries category. Undeveloped or predevelopment areas are model under Undeveloped Areas-Historic Flow Analysis—Greenbelts, Agriculture category.

ii. HGL Profile Methods

Preliminary sizing of storm sewer has been completed using the Manning's channel flow calculation.

Each future phase of development will be required to analyze the storm sewer to confirm DCM compliant capacity and velocity values. These future FDRs will provide HGL profiles modeled in Storm CAD using the Standard head loss method and head loss values taken from Table 9-4 of the DCM or via other methodology allowed by the DCM. HGL profiles may alternately be submitted with construction drawings as addenda to the appropriate Final Drainage Report as the project area is developed.

Bend Loss								
Bend Angle	Bend Angle K Coefficient							
0°	0.0	5						
22.5°	0.1	0						
45°	0.4	0						
60°	0.6	4						
90°	1.3	2						
	LATERAL LOSS							
(One Lateral K Coeffic	ient						
Bend Angle	Non-surcharged	Surcharged						
45°	0.27	0.47						
60°	0.52	0.90						
90°	1.02	1.77						
r	Two Laterals K Coefficient							
45°	45° 0.96							
60°	1.16							
90°	1.5	52						

Table 9-4. STORMCAD Standard Method Coefficients

III. Project Characteristics

a. BASIN LOCATION AND FLOWS

The Hay Creek Valley site is found on the southern border of the Beaver Creek Drainage Basin. In addition to the 214.6-acre site, there are off-site basins east, west, and south of the site that contribute a total tributary area of 98.5 acres. The Hay Creek Valley Road & Storm improvements are anticipated to disturb approximately 14.5 acres.

b. MAJOR DRAINAGEWAYS

Beaver Creek

The majority of the Hay Creek Valley site is located within the Beaver Creek Drainage Basin. Runoff generated within this basin presently flows overland with slopes ranging from 5 to 50% until reaching an existing natural drainage swale located within the site. This drainage swale directs the sites flows internally until discharging from the site near the northeastern corner. Drainage from the developed road will be directed to a detention pond, where the runoff will be treated for water quality and detained to maintain the historic major event discharge rate from the site.

Air Force Academy

The area along the southeastern border of the site drains southeast into the Air Force Academy Major Drainage Basin. Runoff generated within this basin presently flows overland with slopes ranging from 15 to 45% until exiting the site to the southeast into the adjacent property.

c. LAND USES

Presently, the site is unplatted and consists mostly of undeveloped land. The 214.6-acre area is entirely zoned RR-5. The site will consist of residential lots containing 5-acres or more and three tracts, one containing the proposed detention pond, one containing the proposed roadway, and the other containing the Preble's mouse habitat which is undevelopable.

IV. BASIN HYDROLOGY

a. The <u>*Pre-development conditions*</u> for the Hay Creek Valley site have been analyzed and are presented by design points and are described as follows:

Predevelopment conditions have been analyzed using rational routed flow. The existing conditions will discuss the entry of runoff from off-site basins as it relates to the respective design point. Runoff generated, either on-site or off-site, drains overland towards the northeastern corner of the site where it is captured by the existing natural swale that runs northeast, exiting the site and releasing flows to be collected in Hay Creek. Generally, all undeveloped basins are considered to be vegetated with sparse grasses. A delineation of the basin boundaries can be found in Appendix D in drawings DR-01 and DR-02. Runoff calculations can be found in Appendix A. The existing runoff design points are described below:

Design Point 1 ($Q_5 = 3.5$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 18.9$ cfs) (sub-basin: EX-OS1a; Area: 9.4 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 15%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin EX-OS1a into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the east and into sub-basin EX-1.

Design Point 2 ($Q_5 = 12.3$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 74.6$ cfs) (sub-basin: EX-OS1b; Area: 59.2 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 10%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin EX-OS1b into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the east and into sub-basin EX-2.

Design Point 3 ($Q_5 = 7.8$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 42.0$ cfs) (sub-basin: EX-OS2a; Area: 15.9 Ac.) (Slopes: 20 to 50%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin EX-OS2a into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north and into sub-basin EX-2.

Design Point 4 ($Q_5 = 1.3$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 6.7$ cfs) (sub-basin: EX-OS2b; Area: 2.8 Ac.) (Slopes: 10 to 40%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin EX-OS2b into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north and into sub-basin EX-3.

Design Point 5 ($Q_5 = 1.6$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 8.2$ cfs) (sub-basin: EX-OS2c; Area: 3.2 Ac.) (Slopes: 10 to 50%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin EX-OS2c into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north and into sub-basin EX-3.

Design Point 6 ($Q_5 = 2.7$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 17.7$ cfs) (sub-basin: EX-OS3; Area: 8.2 Ac.) (Slopes: 10 to 45%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin EX-OS3 into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the west and into sub-basin EX-5.

Design Point 7 ($Q_5 = 2.3 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 15.6 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basin: EX-4; Area: 5.9 Ac.) (Slopes: 10 to 50%) This point represents the discharge from sub-basin EX-4 into the adjacent property. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the south and into the adjacent property then continue south along historic paths.

Provide Design point and analysis for the Hay Creek Road intersection to include existing/upgraded culvert analysis. Show on drainage maps.

Design Point 8 ($Q_5 = 26.1 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 153.1 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basins: EX-OS1b, EX-OS2a, EX-2; Area: 123.3 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 30%) This point represents the combined discharge from sub-basins EX-OS1b, EX-OS2a, and EX-2 into sub-basin EX-1. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north to combine with the flows from sub-basin EX-1 before continuing along historic paths.

Design Point 9 ($Q_5 = 17.6 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 106.5 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basins: EX-OS2b, EX-OS2c, EX-3; Area: 67.6 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 60%) This point represents the combined discharge from sub-basins EX-OS2b, EX-OS2c, and EX-3 into sub-basin EX-1. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north to combine with the flows from sub-basin EX-1 before continuing along historic paths.

Design Point 10 ($Q_5 = 13.5 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 85.3 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basins: EX-OS3, EX-5; Area: 51.0 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 50%) This point represents the combined discharge from sub-basins EX-OS3, and EX-5 into sub-basin EX-1. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north to combine with the flows from sub-basin EX-1 before continuing along historic paths.

Design Point 11 ($Q_5 = 35.0 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 210.9 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basins: EX-OS1a, EX-OS1b, EX-OS2a, EX-OS2b, EX-OS2, EX-OS3, EX-1, EX-2, EX-3, EX-5; Area: 307.3 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 50%) This point represents the total discharge from the site. Stormwater runoff is collected in a natural swale and directed to the northeast. The channelized flow exits the site near the northeast corner of the site and continues north before draining into Hay Creek approximately 300 feet north of the site.

b. The <u>*fully developed conditions*</u> for the site are as follows:

Post development conditions have been analyzed using rational routed flow. The proposed conditions will discuss the entry of runoff from off-site basins as it relates to the respective design point. Runoff generated, either on-site or off-site, drains overland towards the northeastern corner of the site where it is captured by the existing natural swale that runs northeast, exiting the site and releasing flows to be collected in Hay Creek. Generally, the developed lots are considered to be residential lots containing 5 acres or more, having an imperviousness of 7.0%. Sub-basin PR-8, which contains the proposed roadway and ditch, has an imperviousness of 62.0%. Sub basins PR-9, and PR-10, containing the proposed pond and open space are considered to have an imperviousness of 2.0%. A delineation of the basin boundaries can be found in Appendix D in drawing DR-03. Runoff calculations can be found in Appendix A. The existing runoff design points are described below:

Design Point 1 ($Q_5 = 3.5$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 18.9$ cfs) (sub-basin: OS1a; Area: 9.4 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 15%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin OS1a into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the east and into sub-basin PR-1.

Design Point 2 ($Q_5 = 12.3$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 74.6$ cfs) (sub-basin: OS1b; Area: 59.2 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 10%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin OS1b into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the east and into sub-basin PR-1.

Design Point 3 ($Q_5 = 2.2$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 12.4$ cfs) (sub-basin: OS2a; Area: 5.0 Ac.) (Slopes: 20 to 50%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin OS2a into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north and into sub-basin PR-1.

Design Point 4 ($Q_5 = 4.0 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 21.6 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basin: OS2b; Area: 8.6 Ac.) (Slopes: 20 to 50%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin OS2b into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north and into sub-basin PR-2.

Design Point 5 ($Q_5 = 1.3$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 6.5$ cfs) (sub-basin: OS2c; Area: 2.3 Ac.) (Slopes: 20 to 50%) This point represents the discharge from offsite sub-basin OS2c into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north and into sub-basin PR-3.

Design Point 6 ($Q_5 = 2.9$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 14.4$ cfs) (sub-basin: OS2d, OS2e; Area: 5.9 Ac.) (Slopes: 10 to 50%) This point represents the combined discharge from offsite sub-basins OS2d and OS2e into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north and into sub-basin PR-4.

Design Point 7 ($Q_5 = 1.5$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 10.1$ cfs) (sub-basin: OS3a; Area: 4.9 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 40%) This point represents the discharge from sub-basin OS2f into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the north and into sub-basin PR-6.

Design Point 8 ($Q_5 = 1.1 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} 7.6 = \text{cfs}$) (sub-basins: OS3b; Area: 3.3 Ac.) (Slopes: 10 to 45%) This point represents the discharge from sub-basin OS3b into the site. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the west and into sub-basin PR-10.

Design Point 9 ($Q_5 = 3.1 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 17.0 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basins: PR-5; Area: 5.9 Ac.) (Slopes: 10 to 50%) This point represents the discharge from sub-basin PR-5 into the adjacent property. Stormwater runoff will sheet flow to the south and into the adjacent property then continue south along historic paths.

Design Point 10 ($Q_5 = 9.0$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 48.8$ cfs) (sub-basins: OS2b, PR-2; Area: 24.7 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 30%) This point represents the flows from sub-basins OS2b and PR-2 that have been collected in the roadside ditch that runs along the south side of the proposed roadway. The roadside ditch located upstream of Design Point 10 will be lined with Type M Rip Rap. These flows travel northeast in the ditch before being collected in the proposed private 36-inch Flared End Section (FES) at Design Point 10 (DP-10). These flows are conveyed under the proposed roadway to the north, discharging via a proposed private 36-inch FES before continuing along historic paths.

Design Point 11 ($Q_5 = 4.5$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 24.0$ cfs) (sub-basins: OS2c, PR-3; Area: 12.1 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 30%) This point represents the flows from sub-basins OS2c and PR-3 that have been collected in the roadside ditch that runs along the south side of the proposed roadway. The roadside ditch along this stretch will be protected with Type L Rip Rap. These flows travel northeast in the ditch before being collected in the proposed private 30-inch FES at Design Point 11 (DP-11). These flows are conveyed under the proposed roadway to the north, discharging via a proposed private 30-inch FES before continuing along historic paths.

Design Point 12 ($Q_5 = 8.7$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 46.8$ cfs) (sub-basins: OS2d, OS2e, PR-4; Area: 34.3 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 60%) This point represents the flows from sub-basins OS2d, OS2e and PR-4 that have been collected in the roadside ditch that runs along the south side of the proposed roadway. The roadside ditch along this stretch will be protected with Type L Rip Rap. These flows travel northeast in the ditch before being collected in the proposed private 36-inch FES at Design Point 12 (DP-12).

These flows are conveyed under the proposed roadway to the north, discharging via a proposed private 36-inch FES before continuing along historic paths.

Design Point 13 ($Q_5 = 18.1$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 100.1$ cfs) (sub-basins: OS3a, PR-6; Area: 63.1 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 60%) This point represents the flows from sub-basins OS3a and PR-6 that have been collected in the roadside ditch that runs along the south side of the proposed roadway. The roadside ditch along this stretch will be protected with Type L Rip Rap. These flows travel northeast in the ditch before being collected in the two proposed private 30-inch FES at Design Point 13 (DP-13). These flows are conveyed under the proposed roadway to the west, discharging via two proposed private 30-inch FES into the proposed stilling basin at Design Point 17 (DP-17).

Design Point 14 ($Q_5 = 27.4$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 153.0$ cfs) (sub-basins: OS1a, OS1b, OS2a, OS2b, OS2c, OS2d, OS2e, PR-1, PR-2, PR-3, PR-4; Area: 215.4 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 50%) This point represents the outfall from the proposed private swale located along the northwestern border of the proposed private pond. The combined flows from sub-basins OS1a, OS1b, OS2a, OS2b, OS2c, OS2d, OS2e, PR-1, PR-2, PR-3, and PR-4 are collected in the proposed swale and diverted around the pond toward the proposed stilling basin at Design Point 17. The proposed swale will be lined with Type L Rip Rap.

Design Point 15 ($Q_5 = 0.4 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 2.5 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basin: PR-7; Area: 1.2 Ac.) (Slopes: 5 to 10%) This point represents the discharge from sub-basin PR-7 into the proposed roadside ditch that runs along the north side of the proposed roadway. The collected runoff will combine with flows from sub-basin PR-8 and continue north in the ditch toward design point 17.

Design Point 16 ($Q_5 = 5.4 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 12.3 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basins: PR-7, PR-8a; Area: 6.32 Ac.) (Slopes: 2.8 to 6%) This point represents the Proposed Private Type-C inlet located on the north side of the proposed roadway southwest of the proposed pond. The flows collected in the inlet will be conveyed downstream towards Design Point EDB-IN via proposed private 18-inch RCP pipe.

Design Point EDB-IN ($Q_5 = 6.4$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 16.4$ cfs) (sub-basin: PR-7, PR-8a, PR-8b, PR-9; Area: 9.2 Ac.) (Slopes: 2.8 to 50%) This point represents the total discharge into the Proposed Private Extended Detention Basin (EDB). Flows will be treated for water quality and released at such a rate that the overall discharge from the site does not increase under proposed conditions.

Design Point EDB-OUT ($Q_5 = 0.2$ cfs, $Q_{100} = 1.8$ cfs) (sub-basins: PR-7, PR-8a, PR-8b, PR-9; Area: 9.2 Ac.) (Slopes: 2.8 to 50%) This point represents the discharge from the EDB. The discharge from the pond will be routed downstream via proposed private 18-inch RCP pipe that will convey the flows to the proposed private stilling basin located at Design Point 17.

Design Point 17 ($Q_5 = 38.1 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} 207.8 = \text{cfs}$) (design points: DP-EDB-OUT, DP-13, DP-14; Area: 287.6 Ac.) (Slopes: 2.8 to 50%) This point represents the proposed private stilling basin located north of the proposed pond. Flows from Design Points 13, 14, and EDB-OUT all discharge to the stilling basin which will release the flows at a velocity of 4.02 ft/sec.

Design Point 18 ($Q_5 = 37.6 \text{ cfs}$, $Q_{100} = 211.9 \text{ cfs}$) (sub-basins: DP-17, OS3b, PR-10; Area: 307.3 Ac.) (Slopes: 2.8 to 60%) This point represents the total discharge from the site. Stormwater runoff

from the site will continue north in the existing channel before draining into Hay Creek, a tributary of Beaver Creek.

Notes:

- MHFD-Detention Analysis for the proposed detention pond which will be constructed as part of the Improvements associated with Hay Creek Valley can be found in Appendix A of this report.
- Tables summarizing inlet sizes and capacities, storm pipe sizes and capacities and swale capacities for the proposed improvements can be found in Appendix A and/or in the following section.
- All ponds and associated infrastructure are to be owned and maintained by the HOA.
- The ratio of the total site discharge in proposed conditions vs existing conditions is 1.0, representing no significant increase in flows in the proposed condition.
- The hydraulic model for Beaver Creek indicated approximately 127 cfs from the entire Hay Creek tributary basin which contains the development. We therefore believe the above hydrological analysis with the Rational Method to be quite conservative.

V. Hydraulic Analysis

a. Proposed Inlets

INLET SUMMARY HAY CREEK VALLEY										
DESIGN POINT or SUB- BASIN	SUB-BASINS/ DESCRIPTION	TOTAL AREA (AC)	INLET SIZE (Ft.) TYPE CONDITION		Q(5) TOTAL INFLOW	Q5 INLET CAPACTIY	Q(100) BYPASS FLOWS (cfs)	Q(100) TOTAL INFLOW (cfs)	MAX INLET CAPACITY	
16	PR-7, PR-8a	6.32	3	С	SUMP	5.4	5.4	0.0	12.3	12.3

Note: Inlet sizes indicated are minimums. Larger sizes may be used in the construction plans for conservative design.



	Inlet Overflow Routing						
Inlet	Overflow Routing Under Sump Inlet Blockage Conditions						
16	Blockage of this inlet will cause runoff to surcharge the sump and direct runoff into the proposed Extended Detention Basin.						

b. Swales

The initial swale analysis was performed using Hydraflow Express to determine flow depths and velocities. Per the El Paso County DCM Volume 1, Chapter 6, section 6.5.2. Channel Velocity, "Concrete, riprap, or soil cement linings as approved by the City/County shall be used where channel bottom velocities exceed 6.0 ft/sec." Table 10-4 is included in Appendix B for reference. Further analysis was performed using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Hydraulic Toolbox for those sections having flow velocities initially calculated to be greater than 6 ft/sec. This tool helps determine the stability of each proposed swale cross section based on the flows, cross section, and type of material used for the swale. The swale calculations have been applied to the most critical swale scenarios for the Site. The table below summarizes the various swales included as part of these improvements.

Swale Capacities HAY CREEK VALLEY									
Design Point	Armoring Type	Anticipated Slope %	CHANNEL CAPACITY MAJOR STORM (cfs)	Q(100) TOTAL FLOW (cfs)	Q(100) VELOCTIY (FT/S)	Q100 Flow Depth (ft)			
10	Type M Rip Rap*	6.0%	48.8	48.8	4.71	1.72			
11	Vegetation	2.8%	24.0	24.0	4.39	1.25			
12	Type L Rip Rap*	4.8%	46.8	46.8	4.63	1.70			
13 (2.8%)	Type L Rip Rap*	2.8%	100.1	100.1	4.36	2.56			
13 (3.6%)	Type M Rip Rap*	3.6%	100.1	100.1	4.80	2.44			
14	Type L Rip Rap*	4.5%	153.0	153.0	4.78	2.00			
16 (2.8%)	Vegetation	2.8%	12.3	12.3	3.74	0.97			
16 (3.6%)	Vegetation	3.6%	12.3	12.3	4.06	0.93			
16 (4.8%)	Vegetation	4.8%	12.3	12.3	4.54	0.88			
16 (6.0%)	Vegetation	6.0%	12.3	12.3	4.86	0.85			

* Turf Reinforcement Mat (TRM) may be used in place of Rip Rap.

c. Driveway Culverts

Upon the development of the proposed lots, it will be necessary to place culverts along the roadside ditches to convey flows through driveways. Initial calculations for driveway culvert sizing at each lot is summarized in the table below:

Driveway Culvert Sizes HAY CREEK VALLEY								
Lot	Q(100) TOTAL FLOW IN DITCH (cfs)	Anticipated Slope %	Minimum Culvert Inside Diameter (in)					
1-10	12.3	2.8%	18					
11-12	48.8	6.0%	30					
13	14.4	2.8%	24					
14-16	46.8	4.8%	24					
17-20	100.1	2.8%	30 x 2	K				

Discuss the reason for needing detention. Is the increase in imperviouness from the road and homes enough to warrant needing detention?

Given the anticipated culvert size is a v-ditch the appropriate design for the road side ditch along Lots 17-20? It seems the road side ditch should be transitioned to a trapezoidal channel at this section to accommodate the 2x30" culverts.

d. Detention homes er

The proposed private Extended Detention Basin (EDB) will provide detention and water quality treatment for stormwater runoff generated within the Hay Creek Valley site. The pond will outfall to a stilling basin to the north. Flows from the pond will combine with flows from Design Points 13 and 14 in the stilling basin which will release the flows with a velocity of 4.02 ft/sec which is considered by the DCM to be stable for open channel flows. The stilling basin will provide a suitable outfall for the concentrated flows into the existing natural swale. Design information including calculations are included in Appendix A. The table below summarizes the detention provided for this development.

Proposed Pond Summary HAY CREEK VALLEY									
Pond	Tributary Area	% Impervious	Pre-Devel	opment Peak	Pond (Outflow	Pre vs	. Post Ratio	NOTES
		1	Q5	Q100	Q5	Q100	Q5	Q100	
EDB	9.15	38.93	1.2	6.0	0.3	2.1	0.2	0.4	

Emergency Overflow

EDB: If the emergency overflow weir receives flows, these flows will continue downstream along the existing natural swale and drain into Hay Creek.

VI. Storm Water Quality

Per the DCM Volume 1, Chapter 7, Section 2, El Paso County recommends the MHFD Four Step Process for receiving water protection that focuses on reducing runoff by disconnecting impervious area, eliminating "unnecessary" impervious area and encouraging infiltration into soils that are suitable, treat and slowly release the WQCV, stabilize stream channels, and implement source controls. The four-step process has been completed below.

<u>Step 1:</u> Employ Runoff Reduction Practices.

• The low-density nature of this development and the fact that none of the streets will have curb and gutter, means that most, if not all, runoff from impervious surfaces will sheet flow across pervious areas to grass lined swales.

<u>Step 2:</u> Stabilize Drainageways.

The site is in the Beaver Creek Drainage Fee Basin. Drainage fees, to be paid by the relevant Hay Creek Valley developers at the time of platting, will help fund proposed channel improvements. Information on planned future improvements to the Beaver Creek channel was unavailable for this report.

Step 3: Provide Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV). in the MHFD-Detention spreadsheet.

• As required by the DCM, runoff from the proposed streets which is feasible to detain, is directed into a proposed detention pond. The pond has been designed to meet the DCM standards for the release rates of Full Spectrum Detention Ponds for Water Quality Capture Volumes.

Step 4: Consider Need for Industrial and Commercial BMPs.

• There are no commercial or industrial componer no BMPs of this nature are required.

VII. Erosion Control Plan

A grading and erosion control plan (GEC) for the proposed i review as separate submittals by the various developments. These

bale check dams, silt fence, vehicle tracking control, inlet & outlet control, sedimentation basins and other best management practices (CMs) identified in the DCM Volume 2.

VIII. Floodplains

Per the *Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 08041CO267 G*, effective date December 7, 2018, published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Hay Creek, a Tributary to Beaver Creek runs along the northern bound of the Hay Creek Valley area and has designated 100-year floodplain, however, no portion of the Improvements associated with Hay Creek Valley is located within the designated 100-year regulatory floodplain, Refer to the map in Appendix C.

Correct the statement. A portion of the property and road are contained in the FEMA floodplain. Discuss the FEMA approved BFEs. Draft model backed BFEs for this area have been developed as part of Phase 1 for the ongoing El Paso County, CO, Risk MAP Project". The data have been reviewed and approved through FEMA's QA/QC process (May 11, 2022) and are currently in the MIP (Case No. 19-08-0037s). This data is considered "FEMA APPROVED BFEs" This will need to be shown on the prelim plan and plat.

Page 13



IX. Fee Development

a. UNDEVELOPED PLATTABLE LAND

The Hay Creek Valley site is located within the Beaver Creek Drainage Fee Basin and within previously unplatted land. The 2023 Drainage Basin Fees for the Beaver Creek Drainage Fee Basin are: \$13,797/impervious acre for the Drainage Fee and \$0.00/impervious acre for the Bridge Fee. Per the *El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual*, Appendix L, Section 3.10.1a Fee Reductions for Low Density Lots, with the site being developed into 5-acre lots, drainage fees may be reduced by 25%.

rc his	s compute	ko d י	value					
				Hay Creek Final Drainage Report 2023 Drainage and Bridge Fees				
	Platted Area (Imp. ad			Fee/ Imp. Acre	Total Fee	Drainage Fee Reduction	Fee Due at Platting	
	Drainage Fee		17.085	\$13,797.00	\$235,715.51	\$58,928.88	\$176,786.63	
	Bridge Fee TOTAL	э`	17.085	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00 \$176,786.63	

Cost Estimate

Table 12.1												
Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs												
BEAVER CREEK												
HAY CREEK VALLEY												
Private Non-Reimbursable												
Item Unit Quantity Unit Cost Extension												
18" RCP/HP	LF	185	\$76.00	\$14,060.00								
30" RCP/HP	LF	575	\$114.00	\$65,550.00								
36" RCP/HP	LF	385	\$140.00	\$53,900.00								
18" FES	EA	1	\$456.00	\$456.00								
30" FES	EA	6	\$684.00	\$4,104.00								
36" FES	EA	4	\$840.00	\$3,360.00								
Type C Inlet	EA	1	\$5,611.00	\$5,611.00								
STM MH	EA	3	\$7,734.00	\$23,202.00								
RIPRAP	CY	2,740	\$135.00	\$369,900.00								
			Sub Total	\$540,143.00								

10% Contingency	\$54,014.30
TOTAL:	\$594,157.30

Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs											
BEAVER CREEK											
HAY C	REEKV	ALLEY									
Permanent BMP (EDB): Private Non-reimbursable											
Item	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Extension							
DETENTION POND GRADING	EA	1	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00							
2' TRICKLE CHANNEL	LF	316	\$200.00	\$63,200.00							
FOREBAY	EA	1	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00							
OUTLET STRUCTURE	EA	1	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00							
EMERGENCY SPILLWAY	EA	1	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00							
STILLING BASIN	EA	1	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00							
			Sub Total	\$213,200.00							
		10%	Contingency	\$21,320.00							
TOTAL: \$234,520.00											
		(Overall Total	\$828 677 30							

Since the engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or services furnished by others, or over the contractor's method of determining prices, or over the competitive bidding or market conditions, the opinion of probable construction costs provided herein are made on the basis of the engineer's experience and qualifications and represents the best judgment as an experienced and qualified professional familiar with the construction industry. The engineer cannot, and does not guarantee that proposals, bid or actual construction costs will not vary from the opinion of probable costs.

X. Summary

This report demonstrates that the proposed infrastructure associated with Hay Creek Valley is in conformance with the El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manual, Volumes 1 and 2, October 2018 and all previously approved studies related to the project site. These proposed improvements should not adversely affect downstream or surrounding developments and are in conformance with the pertinent studies for the area.

XI. References

- El Paso County and City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual, Volume 1 & 2, El Paso County, May 2014
- 2. *El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual*, El Paso County, Rev. December 2016
- 3. Web Soil Survey of El Paso County Area, Colorado. Unites States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service.
- 4. Flood Insurance Rate Maps for El Paso County, Colorado and Incorporated Areas, Panel 279 of 1275, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Effective Date December 7, 2018.
- 5. *Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual, Vol. 1-3* by Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD), January 2016

6. Appendices

<u>Appendixa</u>

HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC CALCULATIONS

Ha El I W(y Creek Paso County, Colorado CG		Channel Flow Type Key Heavy Meadow 2
/elocity	EXISTING CONDITIONS 4 ft/s	(If specific channel vel is used, this will be ignored)	Tillage/Field 3 Short Pasture and Lawns 4 Nearly Bare Ground 5
mual	0.04 ft/ft	(If Elevations are used, this will be ignored)	Grassed Waterway 6 Paved Areas 7

						7	%		100%			2%																				
			Area						Rational	'C' Values	3							Flow Let	ngths								Tc	Rainfall	Intensity &	د Rational F	ow Rate	
Sub-basin	Comments				Soil Group	5-Acr (7% Imp	e Lots pervious)	(10	Pavement 00% Imperviou	s)	Undev (2%	eloped/I Areas 6 Impervi	Pervious ious)	Compos	ite Ir	Percent mpervious	Initial	True Initial	Channel	Гrue Channe	Average (decimal)	Initial	Average (%)	Channel Flow Type (See Key above)	Velocity	Channel	Total	i5	Q5	i100	Q100	Sub-basin
		sf	acres	Sq. Mi.		C5 C10	0 Area (SF)	C5	C100	Area (SF) C5	C100	Area	C5 C	100		ft	Length ft	ft	Length ft	Slope	Tc (min)	Slope	Ground Typ	(ft/s)	Tc (min)	(min)	in/hr	cfs	in/hr	cfs	
EX-OS1a		407292	9.35	0.0146	В	0.12 0.3	9 407292	0.90	0.96	Ì	0.09	0.36		0.12 0	.39	7.00%	300	300	672	672	0.10	14.23	9.9	4	2.20	5.09	19.31	3.07	3.5	5.15	18.9	EX-OS1a
EX-OS1b		2579029	59.21	0.0925	В	0.12 0.3	9 1173596	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36	1405433	0.10 0	.37	4.28%	300	300	2754	2754	0.07	16.48	6.7	4	1.81	25.33	41.80	1.99	12.3	3.34	74.6	EX-OS1b
EX-OS2a		692771	15.90	0.0248	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	25423	0.09	0.36	667348	0.12 0	.38	5.60%	300	300	84	84	0.31	9.70	31.3	4	3.50	0.40	10.10	4.09	7.8	6.87	42.0	EX-OS2a
EX-OS2b		120503	2.77	0.0043	В			0.90	0.96	6033	0.09	0.36	114470	0.13 (.39	6.91%	300	300	113	113	0.15	12.31	14.8	4	2.69	0.70	13.00	3.69	1.3	6.20	6.7	EX-OS2b
EX-OS2c		137929	3.17	0.0049	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	6548	0.09	0.36	131381	0.13 (.39	6.65%	268	268	0	0	0.17	11.09	17.2	4	2.90	0.00	11.09	3.94	1.6	6.62	8.2	EX-OS2c
EX-OS3		354850	8.15	0.0127	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	475	0.09	0.36	354375	0.09 (.36	2.13%	300	300	265	265	0.16	12.54	15.8	4	2.78	1.59	14.12	3.56	2.7	5.98	17.7	EX-OS3
EX-1		2441168	56.04	0.0876	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	30061	0.09	0.36	2411107	0.10 0	.37	3.21%	300	300	4763	4763	0.05	18.23	5.0	4	1.57	50.72	68.94	1.44	8.2	2.43	50.4	EX-1
EX-2		2100638	48.22	0.0754	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	46438	0.09	0.36	2054200	0.11 0	.37	4.17%	300	300	2795	2795	0.06	16.66	6.4	4	1.77	26.31	42.96	1.96	10.3	3.29	59.7	EX-2
EX-3		2684942	61.64	0.0963	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	31890	0.09	0.36	2653052	0.10 0	.37	3.16%	300	300	2002	2002	0.11	13.86	11.4	4	2.36	14.12	27.97	2.52	15.6	4.23	96.6	EX-3
EX-4		256265	5.88	0.0092	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	256265	0.09 (.36	2.00%	206	206	0	0	0.29	8.53	28.6	4	3.50	0.00	8.53	4.35	2.3	7.30	15.6	EX-4
EX-5		1865454	42.82	0.0669	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	18117	0.09	0.36	1847337	0.10 0	.37	2.95%	300	300	1427	1427	0.11	14.18	10.7	4	2.29	10.39	24.56	2.71	11.4	4.55	71.8	EX-5
DESIGN POINTS	Sub-basins																															DESIGN POINTS
1	EX-OS1a	407292	9.35	0.0146	В	0.12 0.3	9 407292	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	0	0.12 0	.39	7.0%	300	300	672	672	0.10	14.23	9.9	4	2.20	5.09	19.31	3.07	3.5	5.15	18.9	1
2	EX-OS1b	2579029	59.21	0.0925	В	0.12 0.3	9 1173596	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	1405433	0.10 0	.37	4.3%	300	300	2754	2754	0.07	16.48	6.7	4	1.81	25.33	41.80	1.99	12.3	3.34	74.6	2
3	EX-OS2a	692771	15.90	0.0248	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	25423	0.09	0.36	667348	0.12 (.38	5.6%	300	300	84	84	0.31	9.70	31.3	4	3.50	0.40	10.10	4.09	7.8	6.87	42.0	3
4	EX-OS2b	120503	2.77	0.0043	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	6033	0.09	0.36	114470	0.13 (.39	6.9%	300	300	113	113	0.15	12.31	14.8	4	2.69	0.70	13.00	3.69	1.3	6.20	6.7	4
5	EX-OS2c	137929	3.17	0.0049	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	6548	0.09	0.36	131381	0.13 (.39	6.7%	268	268	0	0	0.17	11.09	17.2	4	2.90	0.00	11.09	3.94	1.6	6.62	8.2	5
6	EX-OS3	354850	8.15	0.0127	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	475	0.09	0.36	354375	0.09 (.36	2.1%	300	300	265	265	0.16	12.54	15.8	4	2.78	1.59	14.12	3.56	2.7	5.98	17.7	6
7	EX-4	256265	5.88	0.0092	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	256265	0.09 0	.36	2.0%	206	206	0	0	0.29	8.53	28.6	4	3.50	0.00	8.53	4.35	2.3	7.30	15.6	7
8	EX-OS1b, EX-OS2a, EX-2	5372438	123.33	0.1927	В	0.12 0.3	9 1173596	0.90	0.96	71861	0.09	0.36	4126981	0.11 (.37	4.4%	300	300	2795	2795	0.06	16.67	6.4	4	1.77	26.31	42.97	1.96	26.1	3.29	153.1	8
9	EX-OS2b, EX-OS2c, EX-3	2943374	67.57	0.1056	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	44471	0.09	0.36	2898903	0.10 0	.37	3.5%	300	300	2002	2002	0.11	13.82	11.4	4	2.36	14.12	27.93	2.52	17.6	4.24	106.5	9
10	EX-OS3, EX-5	2220304	50.97	0.0796	В	0.12 0.3	9	0.90	0.96	18592	0.09	0.36	2201712	0.10 0	.37	2.8%	300	300	1427	1427	0.11	14.19	10.7	4	2.29	10.39	24.58	2.71	13.5	4.55	85.3	10
11	DP-8, DP-9, DP-10, EX-OS1a, EX-1	13384576	307.27	0.4801	В	0.12 0.3	9 1580888	0.90	0.96	164985	0.09	0.36	11638703	0.10 0	.37	3.8%	300	300	8062	8062	0.05	18.17	5.0	4	1.57	85.84	104.01	1.09	35.0	1.84	210.9	11
																													1	4		

Project Name: Project Location: Designer Notes:	Hay Creek El Paso County, Colorado WCG Proposed Condition																					ſ	Short P	<u>Channel Flow T</u> Heavy Meadov Tillage/Fiel Pasture and Lawn	<u>l'ype Key</u> w 2 ld 3 18 4								
Average Channel Velocity Average Slope for Initial Flow	4.0 0.0	0 ft/s 4 ft/ft	(If spec (If Elev	ific channel vel rations are used,	is used, thi this will b	is will be ignored) e ignored)																	Ne	arly Bare Groun Grassed Waterwa Paved Area	id 5 ay 6 as 7								
		1	Area			79	/6			100%	al 'C' Values		2%)					El	ow Lonotha		-						T-	Painf	all Intensity	& Pational F	low Pata	-
			Alea							Kation	ai C values	1							11	ow Lengths								10	Kann	an intensity	& Rational 11	low Rate	
Sub-basin	Comments			S Gi	soil roup	5-Acre (7% Imp	e Lots ervious)		(Pavement 100% Imperv	t ious)	Uı	ndeveloped/Pe (2% Impe	ervious Areas rvious)	Compo	osite	Percent Impervious	Initial	True Initial	Channel	True Channel	Average (decimal)	Initial	Average (%)	Channel Flow Type (See Key above)	Velocity	Channel	Total	i5	Q5	i100	Q100	Sub-basin
		sf	acres	Sq. Mi.	D	C5 C1	00		C5	C100	Area (SF)	C5	C100	Area	C5	C100	2 000/	ft	Length ft	ft	Length ft	Slope	Tc (min)	Slope	Ground Type	(ft/s)	Tc (min)	(min)	in/hr	cfs	in/hr	cfs	
OSI2		40/292	2 9.35	0.0146	B	0.12 0.3	59 40 30 11	07292	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36	1405422	0.12	0.39	/.00%	300	300	6/2	6/2	0.10	14.23	9.9	4	2.20	25.22	19.31	3.07	3.5	3.15	18.9	OS1a OS1h
0520		218316	6 5.01	0.0925	B	0.12 0.3	39 11	175590	0.90	0.96	6435	0.09	0.36	211881	0.10	0.37	4.28%	300	300	203	203	0.25	10.48	24.8	4	3.49	0.97	41.00	3.88	2.2	6.52	12.4	0524
OS2b		373332	2 8.57	0.0134	B	0.12 0.3	39		0.90	0.96	13773	0.09	0.36	359559	0.12	0.38	5.62%	300	300	33	33	0.20	11.18	20.4	4	3.16	0.17	11.35	3.90	4.0	6.56	21.6	OS2b
OS2c		99203	2.28	0.0036	В	0.12 0.3	39		0.90	0.96	5222	0.09	0.36	93981	0.13	0.39	7.16%	280	280	0	0	0.35	8.91	35.0	4	3.50	0.00	8.90	4.28	1.3	7.19	6.5	OS2c
OS2d		120503	3 2.77	0.0043	В	0.12 0.3	39		0.90	0.96	6033	0.09	0.36	114470	0.13	0.39	6.91%	300	300	44	44	0.13	12.72	13.4	4	2.56	0.29	13.01	3.69	1.3	6.19	6.7	OS2d
OS2e		137929	9 3.17	0.0049	В	0.12 0.3	39		0.90	0.96	6548	0.09	0.36	131381	0.13	0.39	6.65%	285	285	0	0	0.15	11.87	15.4	4	2.75	0.00	11.86	3.83	1.6	6.44	8.0	OS2e
OS3a		212463	3 4.88	0.0076	B	0.12 0.3	39		0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36	212463	0.09	0.36	2.00%	300	300	27	27	0.09	15.39	8.6	4	2.05	0.22	15.61	3.40	1.5	5.71	10.1	OS3a
0536		14315/	7 3.29	0.0051	B	0.12 0.3	59 20 20	087210	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36	143157	0.09	0.36	2.00%	200	200	195	195	0.22	11.24	22.0	4	3.28	0.99	74.50	3.79	1.1	6.36	7.6	OS36
PR-1 DP 2		700274	4 16.08	0.0251	B	0.12 0.3	39 30	00274	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36	-	0.12	0.39	7.00%	300	300	576	576	0.03	13.54	3.2	4	2.37	4.04	17.58	3.21	6.2	5.40	34.1	PR-I DP 2
PR-3		425946	6 9.78	0.0153	B	0.12 0.3	39 42	25946	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36		0.12	0.39	7.00%	300	300	764	764	0.12	14.28	9.8	4	2.19	5.81	20.08	3.01	3.6	5.05	19.4	PR-3
PR-4		123503	28.35	0.0443	В	0.12 0.3	39 12	235031	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36		0.12	0.39	7.00%	300	300	1015	1015	0.10	14.09	1.0	4	0.70	24.17	38.25	2.10	7.2	3.53	39.3	PR-4
PR-5		255265	5 5.86	0.0092	В	0.12 0.3	39 25	55265	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36		0.12	0.39	7.00%	206	206	0	0	0.29	8.28	28.6	4	3.50	0.00	8.27	4.39	3.1	7.38	17.0	PR-5
PR-6		253504	1 58.20	0.0909	В	0.12 0.3	39 25	535041	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36	0	0.12	0.39	7.00%	300	300	2112	2112	0.10	14.18	10.0	4	2.21	15.90	30.08	2.42	17.0	4.06	93.0	PR-6
PR-7		52400	1.20	0.0019	В	0.12 0.3	39 5:	52400	0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36		0.12	0.39	7.00%	300	300	163	163	0.05	17.42	5.4	4	1.63	1.67	19.08	3.09	0.4	5.19	2.5	PR-7
PR-8a		222700	0 5.11	0.0080	В	0.12 0.3	39		0.90	0.96	129912	0.09	0.36	92788	0.56	0.71	59.17%	300	300	3558	3558	0.05	9.93	4.8	4	1.53	38.67	48.60	1.81	5.3	3.04	11.1	PR-82
PR-8b		17696	0.41	0.0006	B	0.12 0.3	39		0.90	0.96	17173	0.09	0.36	523	0.88	0.94	97.10%	50	50	0	0	0.03	1.98	3.0	4	1.21	0.00	5.00	5.10	1.8	8.58	3.3	PR-8b
PR-9 BB 10		713344	5 2.41	0.0058	B	0.12 0.3	39		0.90	0.96		0.09	0.36	712246	0.11	0.45	2.48%	260	260	205	205	0.01	30.14	0.5	4	1.43	0.00	24.10	2.1/	0.6	3.65	4.0	PR-9
DESIGN POINTS	Sub Basing	/13340	0 10.56	0.0250	D	0.12 0.,	,,,		0.90	0.90		0.09	0.50	/15540	0.09	0.50	2.0070	500	0	373	0	0.04	19.32	4.2	4	1.45	4.39	24.10	2.75	4.1	4.37	21.3	DESIGN POINTS
1	OS1a	407292	2 9.35	0.0146	В	0.12 0.3	39 40	07292	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	0	0.12	0.39	7.00%	300	300	672	672	0.10	14.23	9.9	4	2.20	5.09	19.31	3.07	3.5	5.15	18.9	1
2	OS1b	257902	9 59.21	0.0925	В	0.12 0.3	39 11	73596	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	1405433	0.10	0.37	4.28%	300	300	2754	2754	0.07	16.48	6.7	4	1.81	25.33	41.80	1.99	12.3	3.34	74.6	2
3	OS2a	218310	6 5.01	0.0078	В	0.12 0.3	39	0	0.90	0.96	6435	0.09	0.36	211881	0.11	0.38	4.89%	300	300	203	203	0.25	10.54	24.8	4	3.49	0.97	11.51	3.88	2.2	6.52	12.4	3
4	OS2b	373332	2 8.57	0.0134	В	0.12 0.3	39	0	0.90	0.96	13773	0.09	0.36	359559	0.12	0.38	5.62%	300	300	33	33	0.20	11.18	20.4	4	3.16	0.17	11.35	3.90	4.0	6.56	21.6	4
5	OS2c	99203	2.28	0.0036	B	0.12 0.3	39	0	0.90	0.96	5222	0.09	0.36	93981	0.13	0.39	7.16%	280	280	0	0	0.35	8.91	35.0	4	3.50	0.00	8.90	4.28	1.3	7.19	6.5	5
6	OS2d, OS2e	258432	2 5.93	0.0093	B	0.12 0.3	39	0	0.90	0.96	12581	0.09	0.36	245851	0.13	0.39	6.77%	300	300	44	44	0.13	12.74	13.4	4	2.56	0.29	13.02	3.69	2.9	6.19	14.4	6
/	0538	212403	5 4.88 7 3.20	0.0076	B	0.12 0.3	39	0	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	142157	0.09	0.36	2.00%	300	300	2/	2/	0.09	15.39	22.0	4	2.05	0.22	12.01	3.40	1.5	6.36	10.1	/
8	PR-5	255265	5 5.86	0.0092	B	0.12 0.3	39 25	55265	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	0	0.12	0.39	7.00%	206	206	0	0	0.22	8.28	28.6	4	3.50	0.00	8.27	4.39	3.1	7.38	17.0	9
10	OS2b. PR-2	107360	24.65	0.0385	B	0.12 0.3	39 70	00274	0.90	0.96	13773	0.09	0.36	359559	0.12	0.39	6.52%	300	300	908	908	0.12	13.54	11.5	4	2.37	6.38	19.91	3.02	9.0	5.08	48.8	10
11	OS2c, PR-3	525149	9 12.06	0.0188	В	0.12 0.3	39 42	25946	0.90	0.96	5222	0.09	0.36	93981	0.12	0.39	7.03%	300	300	764	764	0.10	14.24	9.8	4	2.19	5.81	20.05	3.01	4.5	5.06	24.0	11
12	OS2d, OS2e, PR-4	149346	34.29	0.0536	В	0.12 0.3	39 12	235031	0.90	0.96	12581	0.09	0.36	245851	0.12	0.39	6.96%	300	300	1059	1059	0.10	14.06	1.0	4	0.70	25.21	39.27	2.07	8.7	3.47	46.8	12
13	OS32, PR-6	274750	63.07	0.0986	В	0.12 0.3	39 25	535041	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	212463	0.12	0.39	6.61%	300	300	2112	2112	0.10	14.22	10.0	4	2.21	15.90	30.11	2.42	18.1	4.06	100.1	13
14	OS1a, OS1b, OS2a, PR-1, DP-10, DP-11, DP- 12	938317	4 215.41	0.3366	в	0.12 0.3	39 70:	28458	0.90	0.96	38011	0.09	0.36	2316705	0.12	0.38	6.14%	300	300	8302	8302	0.05	17.71	5.2	4	1.60	86.68	104.39	1.09	27.4	1.83	153.0	14
15	PR-7	52400	1.20	0.0019	В	0.12 0.3	39 5:	52400	0.90	0.96	0	0.09	0.36	0	0.12	0.39	7.00%	300	300	163	163	0.05	17.42	5.4	4	1.63	1.67	19.08	3.09	0.4	5.19	2.5	15
16	PR-7, PR-8a	275100	0 6.32	0.0099	B	0.12 0.3	39 5:	52400	0.90	0.96	129912	0.09	0.36	92788	0.48	0.65	49.23%	300	300	3558	3558	0.05	11.49	4.8	4	1.53	38.67	50.15	1.78	5.4	2.98	12.3	16
EDB-IN	PR-7, PR-8a, PR-8b, PR-9	397841	1 9.13	0.0143	B	0.12 0.3	59 5	52400	0.90	0.96	147085	0.09	0.36	223803	0.40	0.61	39.02%	300	300	3558	3558	0.05	12.95	4.8	4	1.53	38.67	51.61	1.74	6.4	2.93	16.4	EDB-IN
EDB-OUT	FR-7, FR-88, FR-80, FR-9	1252951	1 9.13	0.0143	B	0.12 0.3	30 06	52400	0.90	0.96	14/085	0.09	0.36	223803	0.40	0.61	7 20%										+			38.1	<u> </u>	1.8	EDB-OUT
17	DP-8 DP-17 PR-10	1338502	207.02	3 0.4801	B	0.12 0.3	39 96	515899	0.90	0.96	185096	0.09	0.36	3609474	0.12	0.39	6.95%										-			37.6	<u> </u>	207.0	18
			0.07120				70						0.00	0001 // 1																			

Rational Method - Proposed Conditions

vi	<u>pe Key</u>
N	2
d	3
s	4
d	5
y	6
s	7

	INITIAL STORM SEWER	CAPACITY (CALCULAT	TONS	- MAN	NIN	GS C	HAN	NEL	FLOV	W MI	ETHOD				
Design Point	Notes		Flow Type / Capacity Analysis	Storm Pipe Calculated Max Q for Pipe (CFS)	Percent of Pipe Channel Capacity Used	n(full)	Slope (ft/ft)	n	Pipe Diameter (ft)	Width (ft) Box Culvert Only	Pipe Depth (inches)	Optimum Flow Depth (+/- 0.94 x D)	Θ (Radians)	A (Sq. Ft.)	Wetted Perimeter (ft)	Velocity Max Pi Capaci
10		48.8	Channel/Adequate	76.5	64%	0.013	0.012	0.013	3		36	2.82	0.990	6.895	7.940	11.10
11		24.0	Channel/Adequate	27.0	89%	0.013	0.013	0.013	2		24	1.88	0.990	3.065	5.293	8.81
12		46.8	Channel/Adequate	49.4	95%	0.013	0.005	0.013	3		36	2.82	0.990	6.895	7.940	7.16
13		100.1	Channel/Adequate	106.4	94%	0.013	0.005	0.013	4		48	3.76	0.990	12.259	10.587	8.68
16		12.3	Channel/Adequate	25.6	48%	0.013	0.054	0.013	1.5		18	1.41	0.990	1.724	3.970	14.83



Flow In Partially Full Pipes

0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1 y/D

	INLET SUMMARY													
	Hay Creek													
DESIGN POINT		τοται		INLE	T	Q(5) BYPASS	0(5) TOTAL		Q(100)	Q(100)				
or SUB-BASIN	SUB-BASINS	AREA (AC)	SIZE (Ft.) TYPE		CONDITION	FLOWS (cfs)	INFLOW	CAPACTIY	FLOWS (cfs)	INFLOW (cfs)	CAPACITY	NOTES:		
16	PR-7, PR-8a	6.32	3x3	С	SUMP	0.0	5.41	5.4	0.0	12.33	12.3			
			10	Type	C Inlet - Standa	ard Grate	50	60						

Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Monday, Jan 16 2023

DP-10 Culvert

Invert Elev Dn (ft) Pipe Length (ft)	= 7030.00 = 40.00	Calculations Qmin (cfs)	= 0.00
Slope (%)	= 6.00	Qmax (cfs)	= 48.81
Invert Elev Up (ft)	= 7032.40	Tailwater Elev (ft)	= (dc+D)/2
Rise (in)	= 30.0		
Shape	= Circular	Highlighted	
Span (in)	= 30.0	Qtotal (cfs)	= 48.80
No. Barrels	= 1	Qpipe (cfs)	= 48.80
n-Value	= 0.013	Qovertop (cfs)	= 0.00
Culvert Type	= Circular Concrete	Veloc Dn (ft/s)	= 10.10
Culvert Entrance	= Square edge w/headwall (C)	Veloc Up (ft/s)	= 10.38
Coeff. K,M,c,Y,k	= 0.0098, 2, 0.0398, 0.67, 0.5	HGL Dn (ft)	= 7032.39
		HGL Up (ft)	= 7034.68
Embankment		Hw Elev (ft)	= 7037.93
Top Elevation (ft)	= 7038.25	Hw/D (ft)	= 2.21
Top Width (ft)	= 24.00	Flow Regime	= Inlet Cont

Το Top Width (ft) Crest Width (ft)

=	7038.25
=	24.00
=	30.00

= Inlet Control



Update culvert design to maintain an Hw/D of 1.5 or less.

Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Monday, Jan 16 2023

DP-11 Culvert

Invert Elev Dn (ft)	= 7000.00	Calculations	
Pipe Length (ft)	= 40.00	Qmin (cfs)	= 0.00
Slope (%)	= 2.80	Qmax (cfs)	= 24.00
Invert Elev Up (ft)	= 7001.12	Tailwater Élev (ft)	= (dc+D)/2
Rise (in)	= 24.0		()
Shape	= Circular	Highlighted	
Span (in)	= 24.0	Qtotal (cfs)	= 14.40
No. Barrels	= 1	Qpipe (cfs)	= 14.40
n-Value	= 0.013	Qovertop (cfs)	= 0.00
Culvert Type	= Circular Concrete	Veloc Dn (ft/s)	= 5.10
Culvert Entrance	= Square edge w/headwall (C)	Veloc Up (ft/s)	= 6.30
Coeff. K,M,c,Y,k	= 0.0098, 2, 0.0398, 0.67, 0.5	HGL Dn (ft)	= 7001.68
		HGL Up (ft)	= 7002.49
Embankment		Hw Elev (ft)	= 7003.28
Top Elevation (ft)	- 7009.25		- 1 09

Top Elevation (ft) Top Width (ft) Crest Width (ft)

=	7008.25
=	24.00
=	30.00

= 14.40
= 14.40
= 0.00
= 5.10
= 6.30
= 7001.68
= 7002.49
= 7003.28
= 1.08
= Inlet Control



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

DP-12 Culvert

Invert Elev Dn (ft) Pipe Length (ft) Slope (%) Invert Elev Up (ft) Rise (in)	= 6950.00 = 40.00 = 4.80 = 6951.92 = 24.0	Calculations Qmin (cfs) Qmax (cfs) Tailwater Elev (ft)	= 0.00 = 46.80 = (dc+D)/2
Shape	= Circular	Highlighted	
Span (in)	= 24.0	Qtotal (cfs)	= 46.80
No. Barrels	= 2	Qpipe (cfs)	= 46.80
n-Value	= 0.013	Qovertop (cfs)	= 0.00
Culvert Type	= Circular Concrete	Veloc Dn (ft/s)	= 7.69
Culvert Entrance	= Square edge w/headwall (C)	Veloc Up (ft/s)	= 8.15
Coeff. K,M,c,Y,k	= 0.0098, 2, 0.0398, 0.67, 0.5	HGL Dn (ft)	= 6951.86
		HGL Up (ft)	= 6953.64
Embankment		Hw Elev (ft)	= 6955.42

Em Top Elevation (ft) Top Width (ft)

Crest Width (ft)

=	6957.77
=	24.00
=	30.00

Qmin (cfs)	= 0.00
Qmax (cfs)	= 46.80
Tailwater Elev (ft)	= (dc+D)/2

Qtotal (cfs)	=	46.80
Qpipe (cfs)	=	46.80
Qovertop (cfs)	=	0.00
Veloc Dn (ft/s)	=	7.69
Veloc Up (ft/s)	=	8.15
HGL Dn (ft)	=	6951.86
HGL Up (ft)	=	6953.64
Hw Elev (ft)	=	6955.42
Hw/D (ft)	=	1.75
Flow Regime	=	Inlet Control



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Monday, Jan 16 2023

DP-13 Culvert

Invert Elev Dn (ft)	= 6870.00	Calculations	
Pipe Length (ft)	= 40.00	Qmin (cfs)	= 0.00
Slope (%)	= 2.80	Qmax (cfs)	= 100.11
Invert Elev Up (ft)	= 6871.12	Tailwater Élev (ft)	= (dc+D)/2
Rise (in)	= 30.0		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Shape	= Circular	Highlighted	
Span (in)	= 30.0	Qtotal (cfs)	= 100.10
No. Barrels	= 2	Qpipe (cfs)	= 100.10
n-Value	= 0.013	Qovertop (cfs)	= 0.00
Culvert Type	= Circular Concrete	Veloc Dn (ft/s)	= 10.34
Culvert Entrance	= Square edge w/headwall (C)	Veloc Up (ft/s)	= 10.60
Coeff. K,M,c,Y,k	= 0.0098, 2, 0.0398, 0.67, 0.5	HGL Dn (ft)	= 6872.40
		HGL Up (ft)	= 6873.42
Embankment		Hw Elev (ft)	= 6876.90
Top Elevation (ft)	= 6876.97	Hw/D (ft)	= 2.31
Top Width (ft)	= 24.00	Flow Regime	= Inlet Cont

Τc Top Width (ft) Crest Width (ft)

=	6876.97
=	24.00
_	20 00

= 30.00

= Inlet Control



Update culvert design to maintain an Hw/D of 1.5 or less.

Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Monday, Jan 16 2023

DP-16 Culvert

Invert Elev Dn (ft)	= 6870.00	Calculations	
Pipe Length (ft)	= 40.00	Qmin (cfs)	= 0.00
Slope (%)	= 2.80	Qmax (cfs)	= 12.30
Invert Elev Up (ft)	= 6871.12	Tailwater Élev (ft)	= (dc+D)/2
Rise (in)	= 18.0		, ,
Shape	= Circular	Highlighted	
Span (in)	= 18.0	Qtotal (cfs)	= 12.30
No. Barrels	= 1	Qpipe (cfs)	= 12.30
n-Value	= 0.013	Qovertop (cfs)	= 0.00
Culvert Type	= Circular Concrete	Veloc Dn (ft/s)	= 7.13
Culvert Entrance	= Square edge w/headwall (C)	Veloc Up (ft/s)	= 7.45
Coeff. K,M,c,Y,k	= 0.0098, 2, 0.0398, 0.67, 0.5	HGL Dn (ft)	= 6871.41
		HGL Up (ft)	= 6872.45
Embankment		Hw Elev (ft)	= 6874.03
Top Elevation (ft)	= 6876.97	Hw/D (ft)	= 1.94

Top Elevation (ft) Top Width (ft) Crest Width (ft)

=	6876.97
=	24.00
=	30.00

	_	12.00
Qpipe (cfs)	=	12.30
Qovertop (cfs)	=	0.00
Veloc Dn (ft/s)	=	7.13
Veloc Up (ft/s)	=	7.45
HGL Dn (ft)	=	6871.41
HGL Up (ft)	=	6872.45
Hw Elev (ft)	=	6874.03
Hw/D (ft)	=	1.94
Flow Regime	=	Inlet Control



Update culvert design to maintain an Hw/D of 1.5 or less.

DETENTION BASIN STAGE-STORAGE TABLE BUILDER

MHFD-Detention, Version 4.05 (January 2022)

Project:	HAY CREEK	VALLEY												
Basin ID: BAVER CREEK														
	2 ONE 1		~											
VOLUME EURY WQCV		T												
		100-YE	AR		Dopth Incromont -	0.20	A.							
PERMANENT ORIFI	1 AND 2	ORIFIC	E		Deptil Increment -	0.20	Optional				Optional			
POOL Example Zone	Configurati	on (Retenti	ion Pond)		Stage - Storage Description	Stage (ft)	Override Stage (ft)	Length (ft)	Width (ft)	Area (ft ²)	Override Area (ft ²)	Area (acre)	(ft ³)	Volume (ac-ft)
Watershed Information					Top of Micropool		0.00				500	0.011	(12)	(22.13)
Selected BMP Type =	EDB	1	Note: L / V	V Ratio > 8		-	0.50				53,856	1.236	13,587	0.312
Watershed Area =	9.13	acres	L / W Ratio	o = 22.63			1.00				55,705	1.279	40,977	0.941
Watershed Length =	3,000	ft					1.50				57,577	1.322	69,298	1.591
Watershed Length to Centroid =	1,500	ft					2.00				59,476	1.365	98,561	2.263
Watershed Slope =	0.048	ft/ft					2.50				61,399	1.410	128,780	2.956
Watershed Imperviousness =	39.02%	percent					3.00				63,34/	1.454	159,966	3.672
Percentage Hydrologic Soil Group B =	100.0%	percent					4.00				67,320	1.545	225,293	5.172
Percentage Hydrologic Soil Groups C/D =	0.0%	percent					4.50				69,343	1.592	259,459	5.956
Target WQCV Drain Time =	40.0	hours								-				
Location for 1-hr Rainfall Depths =	User Input													
After providing required inputs above inc	luding 1-hour	rainfall												
depths, click 'Run CUHP' to generate run the embedded Colorado Urban Hvdro	off hydrograph ograph Proced	ns using ure.	Ontional Line	. Ouemidee										
Water Quality Capture Volume (WOCV) -	0.135	acre-feet	Optional Use	acre-feet										
Excess Urban Runoff Volume (EURV) =	0.373	acre-feet		acre-feet										
2-yr Runoff Volume (P1 = 1.19 in.) =	0.369	acre-feet	1.19	inches								_		
5-yr Runoff Volume (P1 = 1.5 in.) =	0.555	acre-feet	1.50	inches										
10-yr Runoff Volume (P1 = 1.75 in.) =	0.724	acre-feet	1.75	inches										
25-yr Runoff Volume (P1 = 2 in.) =	0.966	acre-feet	2.00	inches										
50-yr kunott Volume (P1 = 2.25 in.) =	1.155	acre-feet	2.25	inches										
500-yr Runoff Volume (P1 = 2.52 IR.) =	2.217	acre-feet	3.55	inches	-									
Approximate 2-yr Detention Volume =	0.275	acre-feet	5.55											
Approximate 5-yr Detention Volume =	0.384	acre-feet												
Approximate 10-yr Detention Volume =	0.531	acre-feet										-		
Approximate 25-yr Detention Volume =	0.596	acre-feet												
Approximate 50-yr Detention Volume =	0.625	acre-feet												
Approximate 100-yr Detention Volume =	0./18	acre-feet												
Define Zones and Basin Geometry														
Zone 1 Volume (WQCV) =	0.135	acre-feet												
Zone 2 Volume (EURV - Zone 1) =	0.239	acre-feet												
Zone 3 Volume (100-year - Zones 1 & 2) =	0.345	acre-feet												
Total Detention Basin Volume =	0.718	acre-feet												
Initial Surcharge Volume (ISV) =	user	ft ³												
Initial Surcharge Depth (ISD) =	user	π e												
Depth of Trickle Channel (H ₂₂) =	user	ft ft												
Slope of Trickle Channel (STC) =	user	ft/ft												
Slopes of Main Basin Sides (S _{main}) =	user	H:V												
Basin Length-to-Width Ratio $(R_{L/W}) =$	user													
	r	٦.												
Initial Surcharge Area (A _{ISV}) =	user	ft ²												
Surcharge Volume Length (LISV) =	user	π A												
Depth of Basin Floor (HFLOOR) =	user	ft												
Length of Basin Floor $(L_{FLOOR}) =$	user	ft												
Width of Basin Floor (W_{FLOOR}) =	user	ft												
Area of Basin Floor $(A_{FLOOR}) =$	user	ft ²												
Volume of Basin Floor (V _{FLOOR}) =	user	ft ³												
Depth of Main Basin (H _{MAIN}) =	user	π e												
Width of Main Basin (UMAIN) =	User	ft												
Area of Main Basin (A _{MAIN}) =	user	ft 2												
Volume of Main Basin (V _{MAIN}) =	user	ft ³												
Calculated Total Basin Volume (V_{total}) =	user	acre-feet												
														<u> </u>
					-							-		
												-		
						-								

DETENTION BASIN STAGE-STORAGE TABLE BUILDER

MHFD-Detention, Version 4.05 (January 2022)



DETENTION BASIN OUTLET STRUCTURE DESIGN

	Project:	HAY CREEK VALLE	MH. Y	IFD-Detention, Vei	rsion 4.05 (Januar)	y 2022)					
Basin ID: BEAVER CREEK											
	ZONE 3				Estimated	Estimated					
10					Stage (ft)	Volume (ac-ft)	Outlet Type	•			
				Zone 1 (WQCV)	0.33	0.135	Orifice Plate	-			
ZONE 1 AND 2 ORIFICE				Zone 2 (EURV)	0.55	0.239	Circular Orifice	-			
	PERMANENT ORIFICES POOL Example Zone	Configuration (Re	tention Pond)	Zone 3 (100-year)	0.83	0.345	Weir&Pipe (Restrict)				
	an Innut: Orifice at Underdrain Outlet (braice)	www.usad.ta.drain.WC	CV in a Filtration B		Total (all zones)	0.718]	Coloulated Davame	tore for Underdroit		
<u>U:</u>	Underdrain Orifice Invert Depth =	N/A	ft (distance below	the filtration media	surface)	Under	drain Orifice Area =	N/A		1	
	Underdrain Orifice Diameter =	N/A	inches		burrace)	Underdrair	n Orifice Centroid =	N/A	feet		
									-		
<u>U</u>	ser Input: Orifice Plate with one or more orific	es or Elliptical Slot	Weir (typically used	(typically used to drain WQCV and/or EURV in a sedimentation BMP)					ters for Plate		
	Centroid of Lowest Orifice =	0.00	ft (relative to basi	relative to basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft) WQ Orifice Area per Row =					ft ²		
	Orifice Plate: Orifice Vertical Spacing -	inches	relative to basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft) Elliptical Half-Width =					feet			
	Orifice Plate: Orifice Area per Row =	2.78	sq. inches (diamet	ter = $1-7/8$ inches)		E	Elliptical Slot Area =	N/A	ft ²		
				3 rc	ows of hole	s are			1		
				reco	ommender	4					
<u>U</u>	ser Input: Stage and Total Area of Each Orific	e Row (numbered f	rom lowest to bigh	lest)			De C(estres)	D. 76.0000		٦	
	Stage of Orifice Centroid (ft)	Row I (required)	Row 2 (optional)	Row 3 (optional)	Row 4 (optional)	Row 5 (optional)	Row 6 (optional)	Row 7 (optional)	Row 8 (optional)	-	
	Orifice Area (sg. inches)	2.78									
					·	·	·	·	•	-	
		Row 9 (optional)	Row 10 (optional)	Row 11 (optional)	Row 12 (optional)	Row 13 (optional)	Row 14 (optional)	Row 15 (optional)	Row 16 (optional)		
	Stage of Orifice Centroid (ft)									-	
	Orifice Area (sq. inches)									J	
U	ser Input: Vertical Orifice (Circular or Rectang	ular)						Calculated Parame	eters for Vertical Or	ifice	
		Zone 2 Circular	Not Selected]				Zone 2 Circular	Not Selected]	
	Invert of Vertical Orifice =	0.33	N/A	ft (relative to basi	n bottom at Stage =	= 0 ft) Vei	rtical Orifice Area =	0.10	N/A	ft ²	
	Depth at top of Zone using Vertical Orifice =	0.55	N/A	ft (relative to basin	n bottom at Stage =	= 0 ft) Vertica	l Orifice Centroid =	0.18	N/A	feet	
	Vertical Orifice Diameter =	4.32	N/A	inches							
Us	ser Input: Overflow Weir (Dropbox with Flat o	r Sloped Grate and	Outlet Pipe OR Re	ctangular/Trapezoic	al Weir and No Out	tlet Pipe)		Calculated Parame	ters for Overflow V	Veir	
		Zone 3 Weir	Not Selected					Zone 3 Weir	Not Selected		
	Overflow Weir Front Edge Height, Ho =	1.00	N/A	N/A ft (relative to basin bottom at Stage = 0 ft) Height of Grate Upper Edge, $H_t = 1.00$						feet	
	Overflow Weir Front Edge Length =	3.00	N/A	feet		/eir Slope Length =	3.00	N/A	feet		
	Overflow Weir Grate Slope =	0.00	N/A	A H:V Grate Open Area / 100-yr Orifice Area =					N/A	en ²	
	Overflow Grate Type =	Type C Grate	N/A N/A	leet		Overflow Grate Open	n Area w/ Debris =	3.13	N/A	π ft ²	
	Debris Clogging % =	N/A	N/A %								
			•	-							
<u>U</u>	ser Input: Outlet Pipe w/ Flow Restriction Plate	e (Circular Orifice, R	estrictor Plate, or F	<u>Rectangular Orifice)</u> T		<u>Ca</u>	alculated Parameter	s for Outlet Pipe w	Flow Restriction P	<u>late</u>	
	Depth to Invert of Outlet Pipe -	Zone 3 Restrictor	Not Selected	ft (distance below b	asia bottom at Stago	- 0 ft) 0	utlet Orifice Area -	Zone 3 Restrictor	Not Selected	en ²	
	Outlet Pipe Diameter =	18.00	N/A N/A	inches	asin bottom at Stage	Outle	t Orifice Centroid =	0.29	N/A	feet	
	Restrictor Plate Height Above Pipe Invert =	6.00		inches Half-Central Angle of Restrictor Plate				1.23	N/A	radians	
										_	
<u>U</u>	ser Input: Emergency Spillway (Rectangular or	Trapezoidal)	la /					Calculated Parame	ters for Spillway		
Spillway Invert Stage= 1.50 f			ft (relative to basil	n bottom at Stage =	= 0 ft)	Spillway D	esign Flow Depth=	0.23	feet		
	Spillway End Slopes =	4.00	H:V			Basin Area at 1	Top of Freeboard =	1.43	acres		
Ereeboard above Max Water Surface =		1.00	feet			Basin Volume at 1	Top of Freeboard =	3.28	acre-ft		
									-		
R	outed Hydrograph Results	The user can over	ride the default CU	IHP hydroaraphs an	d runoff volumes b	y entering new valu	ies in the Inflow Hv	drographs table (C	olumns W through	AF).	
	Design Storm Return Period =	WQCV	EURV	2 Year	5 Year	10 Year	25 Year	50 Year	100 Year	500 Year	
	One-Hour Rainfall Depth (in) =	N/A	N/A	1.19	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.25	2.52	3.55	
	נטחד אטוטוד volume (acre-ft) = Inflow Hydrograph Volume (acre-ft) =	N/A	0.373 N/A	0.369	0.555	0.724	0.966	1.155	1.400	2.217	
	CUHP Predevelopment Peak Q (cfs) =	N/A	N/A	0.4	1.2	1.8	3.5	4.4	5.8	9.9	
	OPTIONAL Override Predevelopment Peak Q (cfs) = Predevelopment Unit Peak Flow, g (cfs/acre) =	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	0.05	0.13	0.20	0.38	0.48	0.64	1.08	
Peak Inflow Q (cfs) = N/A		N/A	2.5	3.9	4.9	7.3	8.7	10.5	16.4		
	Peak Outflow Q (cfs) =	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.8	1.8	4.7	
Ratio Peak Outflow to Predevelopment Q = N/A N Structure Controlling Flow = Vertical Orifice 1 Vertical			N/A Vertical Orifice 1	N/A Vertical Orifice 1	0.2 Vertical Orifice 1	0.2 Vertical Orifice 1	0.1 Vertical Orifice 1	0.2 Overflow Weir 1	0.3 Overflow Weir 1	0.5 Outlet Plate 1	
Max Velocity through Grate 1 (fps) = N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.1	0.2	0.7	
	Max Velocity through Grate 2 (fps) =	N/A 39	N/A	N/A 70	N/A	N/A	N/A 97	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Time to Drain 99% of Inflow Volume (nours) =	40	72	73	83	89	95	97	97	95	
	Lindoto to most criteria	Stoff	0.55	0.52	0.65	0.77	0.95	1.07	1.17	1.44	
	opuate to meet criteria	i. Staff	1.24	1.24	1.25 0.498	1.26	1.27 0.864	1.28	1.29	1.32	
	recommends the drain	age repor	t <u>0.5/1</u>		0.150	0.013	T-0.00	1.010	1.1.10	1.312	
	provide a statement th	vide a statement that									
	hydraulic computation	draulic computation will be									
	nyuraulic computation										
Ha	finalized with the Final	Drainage							1/*	17/2023, 4:32 PM	
	Report.									.,	



DETENTION BASIN OUTLET STRUCTURE DESIGN

Outflow Hydrograph Workbook Filename:

Inflow Hydrographs

The user can override the calculated inflow hydrographs from this workbook with inflow hydrographs developed in a separate program.

	SOURCE	СШНР	СПНЬ	СШНР	СПНЬ	СШНР	СШНР	СШНР	СШНР	CLIHP
Timo Inton/ol	TIME			2 Voor [cfc]	E Voor [cfc]	10 Voor [cfc]	2E Voor [cfc]	EQ Voor [cfc]	100 Voor [cfc]	E00 Voor [cfc]
Time Interval		WQCV [CIS]	EURV [CTS]	2 Year [crs]	5 Year [crs]	10 Year [crs]	25 Year [crs]	50 Year [crs]	100 Year [cts]	SUU Year [CTS]
5.00 min	0:00:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0:05:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0:10:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.08
	0:15:00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.22	0.27	0.18	0.23	0.22	0.41
	0:20:00	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.69	0.89	0.52	0.61	0.65	1.14
	0:25:00	0.00	0.00	1.35	2.13	2.88	1.35	1.62	1.82	3.71
	0:30:00	0.00	0.00	2.12	3.32	4.25	4.19	5.08	5.81	9.62
	0:35:00	0.00	0.00	2.43	3.74	4.74	5.91	7.09	8.43	13.42
	0:40:00	0.00	0.00	2.55	3.86	4.90	6.80	8.12	9.67	15.23
	0:45:00	0.00	0.00	2.52	3.83	4.90	7.12	8.49	10.30	16.14
	0:50:00	0.00	0.00	2.44	3.74	4.76	7.26	8.66	10.52	16.43
	1:00:00	0.00	0.00	2.35	3.59	4.58	7.07	8.43	10.39	16.22
	1:05:00	0.00	0.00	2.27	3.46	4.45	6.81	8.13	10.17	15.91
	1:10:00	0.00	0.00	2.20	3.34	4.33	6.30	7.67	9.53	14.98
	1:15:00	0.00	0.00	2.11	3.10	4 10	5.96	7.52	9.00	14.50
	1:20:00	0.00	0.00	1.92	2.96	3 94	5.50	6.73	8 41	13 30
	1:25:00	0.00	0.00	1.92	2.50	3.77	5.01	6.35	7.84	12.43
	1:30:00	0.00	0.00	1.77	2.73	3.60	4,99	5.99	7.35	11.66
	1:35:00	0.00	0.00	1.71	2.63	3.44	4.71	5.65	6.91	10.95
	1:40:00	0.00	0.00	1.65	2.51	3.28	4.45	5.33	6.49	10.29
	1:45:00	0.00	0.00	1.59	2.38	3.12	4.20	5.02	6.09	9.65
	1:50:00	0.00	0.00	1.53	2.25	2.97	3.95	4.72	5.70	9.03
	1:55:00	0.00	0.00	1.44	2.12	2.80	3.71	4.43	5.32	8.42
	2:00:00	0.00	0.00	1.35	1.99	2.62	3.46	4.13	4.95	7.83
	2:05:00	0.00	0.00	1.24	1.82	2.40	3.17	3.79	4.53	7.15
	2:10:00	0.00	0.00	1.13	1.66	2.18	2.88	3.44	4.11	6.50
	2:15:00	0.00	0.00	1.04	1.53	2.02	2.62	3.12	3.73	5.92
	2:20:00	0.00	0.00	0.96	1.42	1.87	2.41	2.88	3.43	5.46
	2:25:00	0.00	0.00	0.90	1.32	1.74	2.23	2.67	3.18	5.05
	2:30:00	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.23	1.62	2.08	2.48	2.95	4.69
	2:35:00	0.00	0.00	0.78	1.15	1.51	1.93	2.31	2.74	4.35
	2:40:00	0.00	0.00	0.73	1.07	1.40	1.80	2.15	2.55	4.04
	2:45:00	0.00	0.00	0.67	0.99	1.30	1.68	2.00	2.37	3.75
	2:50:00	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.92	1.20	1.56	1.85	2.20	3.48
	2:55:00	0.00	0.00	0.58	0.85	1.11	1.44	1.72	2.04	3.22
	3:00:00	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.78	1.02	1.33	1.58	1.89	2.97
	3:05:00	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.71	0.93	1.22	1.46	1.73	2.72
	2:15:00	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.65	0.85	1.12	1.33	1.58	2.48
	3:20:00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.59	0.77	1.01	1.20	1.43	2.23
	3:25:00	0.00	0.00	0.37	0.53	0.69	0.91	1.08	1.28	1.99
	3:30:00	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.41	0.53	0.01	0.90	0.99	1.70
	3:35:00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.35	0.35	0.61	0.03	0.85	1.32
	3:40:00	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.30	0.38	0.51	0.60	0.70	1.06
	3:45:00	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.24	0.31	0.41	0.48	0.56	0.84
	3:50:00	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.19	0.25	0.32	0.37	0.43	0.63
	3:55:00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.15	0.20	0.24	0.27	0.31	0.47
	4:00:00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.12	0.17	0.18	0.21	0.23	0.36
	4:05:00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.10	0.14	0.14	0.16	0.18	0.28
	4:10:00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.22
	4:15:00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.17
	4:25:00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.08	0.13
	4:30:00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.08
	4:35:00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06
	4:40:00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05
	4:45:00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.04
	4:55:00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
	5:00:00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
	5:05:00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	5:10:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
	5:20:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5:25:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5:30:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5:35:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5:45:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5:50:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5:55:00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6.00.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Figure 13-12b. Emergency Spillway Profile at Embankment



Figure 13-12d. Riprap Types for Emergency Spillway Protection
Weir Report

Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Stilling Basin Outfall

Т	ra	р	ez	oi	da	١V	N	e	ir

Crest	= Sharp
Bottom Length (ft)	= 20.00
Total Depth (ft)	= 3.00
Side Slope (z:1)	= 4.00
,	

Calculations

Weir Coeff. Cw	= 3.10
Compute by:	Known Q
Known Q (cfs)	= 207.80

Hin	hli	ahte	ha
1114		MIILL	-0

Depth (ft)	= 1.88
Q (cfs)	= 207.80
Area (sqft)	= 51.74
Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.02
Top Width (ft)	= 35.04



Wednesday, Jan 18 2023

Swale Calculations

Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Monday, Jan 16 2023

DP-10

Triangular		Highlighted	
Side Slopes (z:1)	= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= 1.72
Total Depth (ft)	= 4.50	Q (cfs)	= 48.80
		Area (sqft)	= 10.35
Invert Elev (ft)	= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.71
Slope (%)	= 6.00	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 12.53
N-Value	= 0.068	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 1.65
		Top Width (ft)	= 12.04
Calculations		EGL (ft)	= 2.07
Compute by:	Known Q		
Known Q (cfs)	= 48.80		



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Wednesday, Jan 18 2023

DP-11

Triangular		Highlighted	
Side Slopes (z:1)	= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= 1.25
Total Depth (ft)	= 4.00	Q (cfs)	= 24.00
		Area (sqft)	= 5.47
Invert Elev (ft)	= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.39
Slope (%)	= 2.80	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 9.11
N-Value	= 0.040	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 1.24
		Top Width (ft)	= 8.75
Calculations		EGL (ft)	= 1.55
Compute by:	Known Q		
Known Q (cfs)	= 24.00		



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Tuesday, Jan 17 2023

DP-12

Triangular		Highlighted	
Side Slopes (z:1)	= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= 1.70
Total Depth (ft)	= 4.00	Q (cfs)	= 46.80
		Area (sqft)	= 10.11
Invert Elev (ft)	= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.63
Slope (%)	= 4.80	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 12.39
N-Value	= 0.061	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 1.62
		Top Width (ft)	= 11.90
Calculations		EGL (ft)	= 2.03
Compute by:	Known Q		
Known Q (cfs)	= 46.80		



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Tuesday, Jan 17 2023

DP-13 (2.8%)

Triangular

Triangular		Highlighted	
Side Slopes (z:1)	= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= 2.56
Total Depth (ft)	= 4.00	Q (cfs)	= 100.10
		Area (sqft)	= 22.94
Invert Elev (ft)	= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.36
Slope (%)	= 2.80	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 18.65
N-Value	= 0.015	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 2.20
		Top Width (ft)	= 17.92
Calculations		EGL (ft)	= 2.86
Compute by:	Known Q		
Known Q (cfs)	= 100.10		



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Tuesday, Jan 17 2023

DP-13 (3.6%)

Triangular

	Highlighted	
= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= 2.44
= 4.00	Q (cfs)	= 100.10
	Area (sqft)	= 20.84
= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.80
= 3.60	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 17.78
= 0.065	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 2.20
	Top Width (ft)	= 17.08
	EGL (ft)	= 2.80
Known Q		
= 100.10		
	= 4.00, 3.00 = 4.00 = 1.00 = 3.60 = 0.065 Known Q = 100.10	= 4.00, 3.00 $= 4.00$ $= 4.00$ $= 1.00$ $= 1.00$ $= 3.60$ $= 0.065$ $Crit Depth, Yc (ft)$ $Top Width (ft)$ $EGL (ft)$ $EGL (ft)$



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Tuesday, Jan 17 2023

DP-14

Trapezoidal		Highlighted	
Bottom Width (ft)	= 8.00	Depth (ft)	= 2.00
Side Slopes (z:1)	= 4.00, 4.00	Q (cfs)	= 153.00
Total Depth (ft)	= 3.00	Area (sqft)	= 32.00
Invert Elev (ft)	= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.78
Slope (%)	= 4.50	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 24.49
N-Value	= 0.078	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 1.70
		Top Width (ft)	= 24.00
Calculations		EGL (ft)	= 2.36
Compute by:	Known Q		
Known Q (cfs)	= 153.00		



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Wednesday, Jan 18 2023

DP-16 (2.8%)

Triangular

	Highlighted	
= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= 0.97
= 2.00	Q (cfs)	= 12.30
	Area (sqft)	= 3.29
= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 3.74
= 2.80	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 7.07
= 0.040	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 0.95
	Top Width (ft)	= 6.79
	EGL (ft)	= 1.19
Known Q		
= 12.30		
	= 4.00, 3.00 = 2.00 = 1.00 = 2.80 = 0.040 Known Q = 12.30	= 4.00, 3.00 $= 2.00$ $= 1.00$ $= 2.80$ $= 0.040$ $= 12.30$ $Highlighted$ $Depth (ft)$ $Q (cfs)$ $Area (sqft)$ $Velocity (ft/s)$ $Wetted Perim (ft)$ $Crit Depth, Yc (ft)$ $Top Width (ft)$ $EGL (ft)$



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Wednesday, Jan 18 2023

DP-16 (3.6%)

Triangular

	Highlighted		
= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= C).93
= 2.00	Q (cfs)	= 1	2.30
	Area (sqft)	= 3	3.03
= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4	1.06
= 3.60	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 6	6.78
= 0.040	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= C).95
	Top Width (ft)	= 6	6.51
	EGL (ft)	= 1	1.19
Known Q			
= 12.30			
	= 4.00, 3.00 = 2.00 = 1.00 = 3.60 = 0.040 Known Q = 12.30	= 4.00, 3.00 Depth (ft) = 2.00 Q (cfs) = 1.00 Velocity (ft/s) = 3.60 Wetted Perim (ft) = 0.040 Crit Depth, Yc (ft) Top Width (ft) EGL (ft) Known Q = 12.30	Highlighted= $4.00, 3.00$ Depth (ft)= 0 = 2.00 Q (cfs)= 1 = 1.00 Velocity (ft/s)= 2 = 3.60 Wetted Perim (ft)= 6 = 0.040 Crit Depth, Yc (ft)= 0 Top Width (ft)= 6 EGL (ft)= 12.30



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Wednesday, Jan 18 2023

DP-16 (4.8%)

Triangular

	Highlighted	
= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= 0.88
= 2.00	Q (cfs)	= 12.30
	Area (sqft)	= 2.71
= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.54
= 4.80	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 6.41
= 0.040	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 0.95
	Top Width (ft)	= 6.16
	EGL (ft)	= 1.20
Known Q		
= 12.30		
	= 4.00, 3.00 = 2.00 = 1.00 = 4.80 = 0.040 Known Q = 12.30	= 4.00, 3.00 Depth (ft) = = 2.00 Q (cfs) = Area (sqft) = = 1.00 Velocity (ft/s) = = 4.80 Wetted Perim (ft) = = 0.040 Crit Depth, Yc (ft) = Top Width (ft) = EGL (ft) = 12.30 = 12.30



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Wednesday, Jan 18 2023

DP-16 (6.0%)

Triangular

	Highlighted	
= 4.00, 3.00	Depth (ft)	= 0.85
= 2.00	Q (cfs)	= 12.30
	Area (sqft)	= 2.53
= 1.00	Velocity (ft/s)	= 4.86
= 6.00	Wetted Perim (ft)	= 6.19
= 0.040	Crit Depth, Yc (ft)	= 0.95
	Top Width (ft)	= 5.95
	EGL (ft)	= 1.22
Known Q		
= 12.30		
	= 4.00, 3.00 = 2.00 = 1.00 = 6.00 = 0.040 Known Q = 12.30	= 4.00, 3.00 Depth (ft) = = 2.00 Q (cfs) = = 1.00 Velocity (ft/s) = = 6.00 Wetted Perim (ft) = = 0.040 Crit Depth, Yc (ft) = Top Width (ft) = EGL (ft)



Hydraulic Analysis Report

Project Data

Project Title: Hay Creek Designer: Project Date: Thursday, January 12, 2023 Project Units: U.S. Customary Units Notes:

Channel Analysis: DP-10

Notes:

Input Parameters

Channel Type: Triangular Side Slope 1 (Z1): 3.0000 ft/ft Side Slope 2 (Z2): 4.0000 ft/ft Longitudinal Slope: 0.0600 ft/ft Manning's n: 0.0681 Flow: 48.8000 cfs

Result Parameters

Depth: 1.7205 ft Area of Flow: 10.3602 ft^2 Wetted Perimeter: 12.5344 ft Hydraulic Radius: 0.8265 ft Average Velocity: 4.7103 ft/s Top Width: 12.0434 ft Froude Number: 0.8950 Critical Depth: 1.6526 ft Critical Velocity: 5.1053 ft/s Critical Slope: 0.0744 ft/ft Critical Top Width: 11.81 ft Calculated Max Shear Stress: 6.4415 lb/ft^2 Calculated Avg Shear Stress: 3.0946 lb/ft^2

Channel Lining Analysis: Channel Lining Design Analysis DP-10

Notes:

Lining Input Parameters

Channel Lining Type: Riprap, Cobble, or Gravel D50: 1 ft Riprap Specific Weight: 165 lb/ft^3 Water Specific Weight: 62.4 lb/ft^3 Riprap Shape is Angular Safety Factor: 1 Calculated Safety Factor: 1.34342

Lining Results

Angle of Repose: 41.7 degrees Relative Flow Depth: 0.860654 Manning's n method: Bathurst Manning's n: 0.0680594

Channel Bottom Shear Results

V*: 1.82361 Reynold's Number: 149845 Shield's Parameter: 0.117713 shear stress on channel bottom: 6.44458 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for channel bottom: 10.5606 lb/ft^2 channel bottom is stable Stable D50: 0.819817 ft

Channel Side Shear Results

K1: 0.934 K2: 1 Kb: 0 shear stress on side of channel: 6.44458 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for side of channel: 10.5606 lb/ft^2 Stable Side D50: 0.765709 lb/ft^2 side of channel is stable

Channel Lining Stability Results

the channel is stable

Channel Summary

Name of Selected Channel: DP-10

Channel Analysis: DP-12

Notes:

Input Parameters

Channel Type: Triangular Side Slope 1 (Z1): 3.0000 ft/ft Side Slope 2 (Z2): 4.0000 ft/ft Longitudinal Slope: 0.0480 ft/ft Manning's n: 0.0605 Flow: 46.8000 cfs

Result Parameters

Depth: 1.6903 ft Area of Flow: 9.9996 ft^2 Wetted Perimeter: 12.3143 ft Hydraulic Radius: 0.8120 ft Average Velocity: 4.6802 ft/s Top Width: 11.8319 ft Froude Number: 0.8972 Critical Depth: 1.6252 ft Critical Velocity: 5.0627 ft/s Critical Slope: 0.0592 ft/ft Critical Top Width: 11.61 ft Calculated Max Shear Stress: 5.0627 lb/ft^2 Calculated Avg Shear Stress: 2.4322 lb/ft^2

Channel Lining Analysis: Channel Lining Design Analysis DP-12

Notes:

Lining Input Parameters

Channel Lining Type: Riprap, Cobble, or Gravel D50: 0.75 ft Riprap Specific Weight: 165 lb/ft^3 Water Specific Weight: 62.4 lb/ft^3 Riprap Shape is Angular Safety Factor: 1 Calculated Safety Factor: 1.18646

Lining Results

Angle of Repose: 41.7 degrees Relative Flow Depth: 1.12705 Manning's n method: Bathurst Manning's n: 0.0605469

Channel Bottom Shear Results

V*: 1.61646 Reynold's Number: 99617.6 Shield's Parameter: 0.0853788 shear stress on channel bottom: 5.0636 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for channel bottom: 6.5699 lb/ft^2 channel bottom is stable Stable D50: 0.685828 ft

Channel Side Shear Results

K1: 0.934 K2: 0.931169 Kb: 0 shear stress on side of channel: 5.0636 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for side of channel: 6.11768 lb/ft^2 Stable Side D50: 0.687913 lb/ft^2 side of channel is stable

Channel Lining Stability Results

the channel is stable

Channel Summary

Name of Selected Channel: DP-12

Channel Analysis: DP-13 (3.6%)

Notes:

Input Parameters

Channel Type: Triangular Side Slope 1 (Z1): 3.0000 ft/ft Side Slope 2 (Z2): 4.0000 ft/ft Longitudinal Slope: 0.0360 ft/ft Manning's n: 0.0653 Flow: 100.1000 cfs

Result Parameters

Depth: 2.4405 ft Area of Flow: 20.8462 ft^2 Wetted Perimeter: 17.7800 ft Hydraulic Radius: 1.1725 ft Average Velocity: 4.8018 ft/s Top Width: 17.0835 ft Froude Number: 0.7660 Critical Depth: 2.2028 ft Critical Velocity: 5.8942 ft/s Critical Slope: 0.0622 ft/ft Critical Slope: 0.0622 ft/ft Critical Top Width: 15.74 ft Calculated Max Shear Stress: 5.4823 lb/ft^2 Calculated Avg Shear Stress: 2.6338 lb/ft^2

Channel Lining Analysis: Channel Lining Design Analysis DP-13 (3.6%)

Notes:

Lining Input Parameters

Channel Lining Type: Riprap, Cobble, or Gravel D50: 1 ft Riprap Specific Weight: 165 lb/ft^3 Water Specific Weight: 62.4 lb/ft^3 Riprap Shape is Angular Safety Factor: 1 Calculated Safety Factor: 1.30708

Lining Results

Angle of Repose: 41.7 degrees Relative Flow Depth: 1.22039 Manning's n method: Bathurst Manning's n: 0.0652905

Channel Bottom Shear Results

V*: 1.68207 Reynold's Number: 138214 Shield's Parameter: 0.110225 shear stress on channel bottom: 5.48297 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for channel bottom: 11.3091 lb/ft^2 channel bottom is stable Stable D50: 0.633705 ft

Channel Side Shear Results

K1: 0.934 K2: 0.931169 Kb: 0 shear stress on side of channel: 5.48297 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for side of channel: 10.5307 lb/ft^2 Stable Side D50: 0.635632 lb/ft^2 side of channel is stable

Channel Lining Stability Results

the channel is stable

Channel Summary

Name of Selected Channel: DP-13 (3.6%)

Channel Analysis: DP-13 (2.8%)

Notes:

Input Parameters

Channel Type: Triangular Side Slope 1 (Z1): 4.0000 ft/ft Side Slope 2 (Z2): 3.0000 ft/ft Longitudinal Slope: 0.0280 ft/ft Manning's n: 0.0766 Flow: 100.1000 cfs

Result Parameters

Depth: 2.7164 ft Area of Flow: 25.8262 ft^2 Wetted Perimeter: 19.7901 ft Hydraulic Radius: 1.3050 ft Average Velocity: 3.8759 ft/s Top Width: 19.0149 ft Froude Number: 0.5861 Critical Depth: 2.2028 ft Critical Velocity: 5.8942 ft/s Critical Slope: 0.0856 ft/ft Critical Top Width: 15.74 ft Calculated Max Shear Stress: 4.7461 lb/ft^2 Calculated Avg Shear Stress: 2.2801 lb/ft^2

Channel Lining Analysis: Channel Lining Design Analysis DP-13 (2.8%)

Notes:

Lining Input Parameters

Channel Lining Type: Riprap, Cobble, or Gravel D50: 0.75 ft Riprap Specific Weight: 165 lb/ft^3 Water Specific Weight: 62.4 lb/ft^3 Riprap Shape is Angular Safety Factor: 1 Calculated Safety Factor: 1.17654

Lining Results

Angle of Repose: 41.7 degrees Relative Flow Depth: 1.81094 Manning's n method: Blodgett Manning's n: 0.0766124

Channel Bottom Shear Results

V*: 1.56497 Reynold's Number: 96444.1 Shield's Parameter: 0.0833359 shear stress on channel bottom: 4.74612 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for channel bottom: 6.4127 lb/ft^2 channel bottom is stable Stable D50: 0.653081 ft

Channel Side Shear Results

K1: 0.934 K2: 0.931169 Kb: 0 shear stress on side of channel: 4.74612 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for side of channel: 5.9713 lb/ft^2 Stable Side D50: 0.655067 lb/ft^2 side of channel is stable

Channel Lining Stability Results

the channel is stable

Channel Summary

Name of Selected Channel: DP-13 (2.8%)

Channel Analysis: DP-14

Notes:

Input Parameters

Channel Type: Trapezoidal Side Slope 1 (Z1): 4.0000 ft/ft Side Slope 2 (Z2): 4.0000 ft/ft Channel Width: 8.0000 ft Longitudinal Slope: 0.0450 ft/ft Manning's n: 0.0775 Flow: 153.0000 cfs

Result Parameters

Depth: 1.9839 ft Area of Flow: 31.6139 ft^2 Wetted Perimeter: 24.3594 ft Hydraulic Radius: 1.2978 ft Average Velocity: 4.8396 ft/s Top Width: 23.8709 ft Froude Number: 0.7411 Critical Depth: 1.6940 ft Critical Velocity: 6.1127 ft/s Critical Slope: 0.0854 ft/ft Critical Top Width: 21.55 ft Calculated Max Shear Stress: 5.5707 lb/ft^2 Calculated Avg Shear Stress: 3.6443 lb/ft^2

Channel Lining Analysis: Channel Lining Design Analysis DP-14

Notes:

Lining Input Parameters

Channel Lining Type: Riprap, Cobble, or Gravel D50: 0.75 ft Riprap Specific Weight: 165 lb/ft^3 Water Specific Weight: 62.4 lb/ft^3 Riprap Shape is Angular Safety Factor: 1 Calculated Safety Factor: 1.20173

Lining Results

Angle of Repose: 41.7 degrees Relative Flow Depth: 1.76635 Manning's n method: Blodgett Manning's n: 0.0775146

Channel Bottom Shear Results

V*: 1.69577 Reynold's Number: 104505 Shield's Parameter: 0.0885253 shear stress on channel bottom: 5.57269 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for channel bottom: 6.81202 lb/ft^2 channel bottom is stable Stable D50: 0.737324 ft

Channel Side Shear Results

K1: 0.934 K2: 0.931169 Kb: 0 shear stress on side of channel: 5.57269 lb/ft^2 Permissible shear stress for side of channel: 6.34314 lb/ft^2 Stable Side D50: 0.739566 lb/ft^2 side of channel is stable

Channel Lining Stability Results

the channel is stable

Channel Summary

Name of Selected Channel: DP-14

<u>Appendix B</u>

STANDARD DESIGN CHARTS AND TABLES

Land Harris Conferen	Demonst	Runoff Coefficients											
Characteristics	Impervious	2-y	ear	5-y	ear	10-y	/ear	25-	/ear	50-1	year	100-	year
		HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D	HSG A&B	HSG C&D
Business													
Commercial Areas	95	0.79	0.80	0.81	0.82	0.83	0.84	0.85	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.89
Neighborhood Areas	70	0.45	0.49	0.49	0.53	0.53	0.57	0.58	0.62	0.60	0.65	0.62	0.68
Residential													
1/8 Acre or less	65	0.41	0.45	0.45	0.49	0.49	0.54	0.54	0.59	0.57	0.62	0.59	0.65
1/4 Acre	40	0.23	0.28	0.30	0.35	0.36	0.42	0.42	0.50	0.46	0.54	0.50	0.58
1/3 Acre	30	0.18	0.22	0.25	0.30	0.32	0.38	0.39	0.47	0.43	0.52	0.47	0.57
1/2 Acre	25	0.15	0.20	0.22	0.28	0.30	0.36	0.37	0.46	0.41	0.51	0.46	0.56
1 Acre	20	0.12	0.17	0.20	0.26	0.27	0.34	0.35	0.44	0.40	0.50	0.44	0.55
Industrial													
Light Areas	80	0.57	0.60	0.59	0.63	0.63	0.66	0.66	0.70	0.68	0.72	0.70	0.74
Heavy Areas	90	0.71	0.73	0.73	0.75	0.75	0.77	0.78	0.80	0.80	0.82	0.81	0.83
Parks and Cemeteries	7	0.05	0.09	0.12	0.19	0.20	0.29	0.30	0.40	0.34	0.46	0.39	0.52
Playgrounds	13	0.07	0.13	0.16	0.23	0.24	0.31	0.32	0.42	0.37	0.48	0.41	0.54
Railroad Yard Areas	40	0.23	0.28	0.30	0.35	0.36	0.42	0.42	0.50	0.46	0.54	0.50	0.58
Undeveloped Areas													
Historic Flow Analysis	2												
Greenbelts, Agriculture	2	0.03	0.05	0.09	0.16	0.17	0.26	0.26	0.38	0.31	0.45	0.36	0.51
Pasture/Meadow	0	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.30	0.44	0.35	0.50
Forest	0	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.30	0.44	0.35	0.50
Exposed Rock	100	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96
Offsite Flow Analysis (when	45												
landuse is undefined)	45	0.26	0.31	0.32	0.37	0.38	0.44	0.44	0.51	0.48	0.55	0.51	0.59
Streets	100									0.05	0.05	0.05	
Paved	100	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96
Gravel	80	0.57	0.60	0.59	0.63	0.63	0.66	0.66	0.70	0.68	0.72	0.70	0.74
Drive and Walks	100	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96
Roofs	90	0.71	0.73	0.73	0.75	0.75	0.77	0.78	0.80	0.80	0.82	0.81	0.83
Lawns	0	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.30	0.44	0.35	0.50

Table 6-6. Runoff Coefficients for Rational Method (Source: UDFCD 2001)

3.2 Time of Concentration

One of the basic assumptions underlying the Rational Method is that runoff is a function of the average rainfall rate during the time required for water to flow from the hydraulically most remote part of the drainage area under consideration to the design point. However, in practice, the time of concentration can be an empirical value that results in reasonable and acceptable peak flow calculations.

For urban areas, the time of concentration (t_c) consists of an initial time or overland flow time (t_i) plus the travel time (t_i) in the storm sewer, paved gutter, roadside drainage ditch, or drainage channel. For nonurban areas, the time of concentration consists of an overland flow time (t_i) plus the time of travel in a concentrated form, such as a swale or drainageway. The travel portion (t_i) of the time of concentration can be estimated from the hydraulic properties of the storm sewer, gutter, swale, ditch, or drainageway. Initial time, on the other hand, will vary with surface slope, depression storage, surface cover, antecedent rainfall, and infiltration capacity of the soil, as well as distance of surface flow. The time of concentration is represented by Equation 6-7 for both urban and non-urban areas. IF.

Type of Development	Percent Impervious
Commercial	95%
Industrial	85%
Multi-Family	65%
Single Family - 0.1377 acre lots (6,000 SF)	53%
Single-Family - 0.20 acre lots	43%
Single-Family - 0.25 acre lots	40%
Single-Family - 0.33 acre lots	30%
Single-Family - 0.5 acre lots	25%
Single-Family - 1.0 acre lots	20%
Single-Family - 2.5 acre lots	11%
Single-Family - 5 acre lots	7%



Figure 6-25. Estimate of Average Concentrated Shallow Flow

El Paso County Drainage Basin Fees

Resolution No. 22-442

Basin	Receiving	Year	Drainage Basin Name	2023 Drainage Fee	2023 Bridge Fee	
Number	Waters	Studied	_	(per Impervious Acre)	(per Impervious Acre)	
Drainage Basins with DBPS's:						
CHMS0200	Chico Creek	2013	Haegler Ranch	\$12,985	\$1,916	
CHWS1200	Chico Creek	2001	Bennett Ranch	\$14,536	\$5,576	
CHWS1400	Chico Creek	2013	Falcon	\$37,256	\$5,118	
FOFO2000	Fountain Creek	2001	West Fork Jimmy Camp Creek	\$15,802	\$4,675	
FOFO2600	Fountain Creek	1991*	Big Johnson / Crews Gulch	\$23,078	\$2,980	
FOFO2800	Fountain Creek	1988*	Widefield	\$23,078	\$0	
FOFO2900	Fountain Creek	1988*	Security	\$23,078	\$0	
FOFO3000	Fountain Creek	1991*	Windmill Gulch	\$23,078	\$346	
FOFO3100 / FOFO3200	Fountain Creek	1988*	Carson Street / Little Johnson	\$14,077	\$0	
FOFO3400	Fountain Creek	1984*	Peterson Field	\$16,646	\$1,262	
FOFO3600	Fountain Creek	1991*	Fisher's Canyon	\$23,078	\$0	
FOFO4000	Fountain Creek	1996	Sand Creek	\$23,821	\$9,743	
FOFO4200	Fountain Creek	1977	Spring Creek	\$11,969	\$ 0	
FOFO4600	Fountain Creek	1 984*	Southwest Area	\$23,078	\$ 0	
FOFO4800	Fountain Creek	1991	Bear Creek	\$23,078	\$1,262	
FOFO5800	Fountain Creek	1964	Camp Creek	\$2,557	\$0	
FOMO1000	Monument Creek	1981	Douglas Creek	\$14,514	\$321	
FOMO1200	Monument Creek	1977	Templeton Gap	\$14,900	\$346	
FOMO2000	Monument Creek	1971	Pulpit Rock	\$7,653	\$0	
FOMO2200	Monument Creek	1994	Cottonwood Creek / S. Pine	\$23,078	\$1,262	
FOMO2400	Monument Creek	1966	Dry Creek	\$18,219	\$660	
FOMO3600	Monument Creek	1989*	Black Squirrel Creek	\$10,478	\$660	
FOMO3700	Monument Creek	1987*	Middle Tributary	\$19,259	\$0	
FOMO3800	Monument Creek	1 987*	Monument Branch	\$23,078	\$0	
FOMO4000	Monument Creek	1996	Smith Creek	\$9,409	\$1,262	
FOMO4200	Monument Creek	1989*	Black Forest	\$23,078	\$628	
FOMO5200	Monument Creek	1993*	Dirty Woman Creek	\$23,078	\$1,262	
FOMO5300	Fountain Creek	1993*	Crystal Creek	\$23,078	\$1,262	
<u>Miscellaneous Drainae</u>	<u>e Basins; 1</u>					
CHBS0800	Chico Creek		Book Ranch	\$21,654	\$3,135	
CHEC0400	Chico Creek		Upper East Chico	\$11,797	\$342	
CHWS0200	Chico Creek		Telephone Exchange	\$12,962	\$304	
CHWS0400	Chico Creek		Livestock Company	\$21,351	\$254	
CHWS0600	Chico Creek		West Squirrel	\$11,129	\$4,619	
CHWS0800	Chico Creek		Solberg Ranch	\$23,078	\$ 0	
FOFO1200	Fountain Creek		Crooked Canyon	\$6,968	\$0	
FOFO1400	Fountain Creek		Calhan Reservoir	\$5,817	\$339	
FOFO1600	Fountain Creek		Sand Canyon	\$4,203	\$ 0	
FOFO2000	Fountain Creek		Jimmy Camp Creek ³	\$23,078	\$1,079	
FOFO2200	Fountain Creek		Fort Carson	\$18,219	\$660	
FOFO2700	Fountain Creek		West Little Johnson	\$1,521	\$0	
FOFO3800	Fountain Creek		Stratton	\$11,070	\$495	
FOFO5000	Fountain Creek		Midland	\$18,219	\$660	
FOFO6000	Fountain Creek		Palmer Trail	\$18,219	\$660	
FOFO6800	Fountain Creek		Black Canyon	\$18,219	\$660	
FOMO4600	Monument Creek		Beaver Creek	\$13,797	\$0	
FOMO3000	Monument Creek		Kettle Creek	\$12,463	\$0	
FOMO3400	Monument Creek		Elkhorn	\$2,094	\$0	
FOMO5000	Monument Creek		Monument Rock	\$10,003	\$ 0	
FOMO5400	Monument Creek		Paimer Lake	\$15,995	\$0	
FOMO5600	Monument Creek		Raspberry Mountain	\$5,380	\$0	
PLPL0200	Monument Creek		Bald Mountain	\$11,465	\$0	
<u>Interim Drainage Basi</u>	<u>15: 2</u>					
FOFO1800	Fountain Creek		Little Fountain Creek	\$2,950	\$ 0	
FOMO4400	Monument Creek		Jackson Creek	\$9,135	\$0	
r0M04800	Monument Creek		I eachout Creek	\$6,343	\$953	

1. The miscellaneous drainage fee previous to September 1999 resolution was the average of all drainage fees for basins with Basin Planning Studies performed within the last 14 years.

2. Interim Drainage Fees are based upon draft Drainage Basin Planning Studies or the Drainage Basin Identification and Fee Estimation Report. (Best available information suitable for setting a fee.)

3. This is an interim fee and will be adjusted when a DBPS is completed. In addition to the Drainage Fee a surety in the amount of \$7,285 per impervious acre shall be provided to secure payment of additional fees in the event that the DBPS results in a fee greater than the current fee. Fees paid in excess of the future revised fee will be reimbursed. See Resolution 06-326 (9/14/06) and Resolution 16-320 (9/07/16).

Channel Slope	Lining	Permissible Mean Channel Velocity* (ft/sec)
0 - 5%	Sodded grass	7
	Bermudagrass	6
	Reed canarygrass	5
	Tall fescue	5
	Kentucky bluegrass	5
	Grass-legume mixture	4
	Red fescue	2.5
	Redtop	2.5
	Sericea lespedeza	2.5
	Annual lespedeza	2.5
	Small grains (temporary)	2.5
5 - 10%	Sodded grass	6

Channel Slope	Lining	Permissible Mean Channel Velocity* (ft/sec)				
	Bermudagrass	5				
	Reed canarygrass	4				
	Tall fescue	4				
	Kentucky bluegrass	4				
	Grass-legume mixture	3				
Greater than 10%	Sodded grass	5				
	Bermudagrass	4				
	Reed canarygrass	3				
	Tall fescue	3				
	Kentucky bluegrass	3				
*For highly erodible soils, decrease permissible velocities by 25%.						
*Grass lined channels are dependent upon assurances of continuous growth and maintenance of grass.						

<u>APPENDIX C</u>

REPORT REFERENCES

NOTES TO USERS

his map is for use in administering the National Flood Insurance Program. It does tot necessarily identify all areas subject to flooding, particularly from local drainage ources of small size. The **community map repository** should be consulted for ossible updated or additional flood hazard information.

o obtain more detailed information in areas where Base Flood Elevations (REF To obtain more defauled information in areas where tiles Flood Elevations (EFEs) and/infording-type to been determined, uses is encouraged to charalt the Flood within the Flood Inscarses Stavy (FIS) report that accompanies this FIRM. Users should be avant that EFEs alwoin on the FIRM represent rounded whole-food elevations. These BFEs are intended for flood elevation information. Accordingly, flood elevation, the FIRM represent do using a constraint of the FIRM representation. Accordingly, flood elevation, all the FIRM representation flood elevation information. Accordingly, flood elevation, all the FIRM representation of the FIRM representation with the FIRM for purpose of construction and the flood plan intragramment.

Costal Base Flood Elevations shown on this map appy only landward of 0.0° North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVDB8). Users of this FIRM should be aware that costal flood elevators are also provided in the Summary of Sillware Elevations table in the Flood Insurance Study report for this jurisdiction. Televators shown in the Summary of Sillware Elevations table should be used for construction and/or floodplain management purposes when they are higher than the elevators shown on this FIRM.

Boundaries of the **floodways** were computed at cross sections and interpolated between cross sections. The floodways were based on hydraulic considerations with regard to requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program. Floodway withs and other pertinent floodway data are provided in the Flood Insurance Study report for this jurisdiction.

Contain areas not in Special Flood Hazard Areas may be protected by **flood cont** structures. Refer to section 2.4 "Flood Protection Measures" of the Flood Insurar Study report for information on flood control structures for this jurisdiction.

The projection used in the proparation of this map was Universal Transverse Meccalor (UTM) zone 13. The horizontal datum was NADS3. GPS50 spin-ol-poduction of FINAME for adjacent jurisdictions may result in sight peational differences in map features across jurisdiction boundaries. These differences do not affect the accuracy of this FIRAM.

Flood elevations on this map are referenced to the **North American Vertical Data** of **1988** (**NAVD88**). These food elevations must be constant to the functure are the second to the second second second second second second second second conversion between the haloral Geodetic Vertical Datam of 1903 and the Nor American Vertical Datum of **198**, with the National Geodetic Survey website http://www.ngs.noas.gov/ or contact the National Geodetic Survey are between address:

NGS Information Services NOAA, N/NGS12 National Geodetic Survey SSMC-3, #9202 315 East-West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910-3282

o obtain current elevation, description, and/or location information for bench mar hown on this map, please contact the Information Services Branch of the Natio Seodetic Survey at (301) 713-3242 or visit its website at http://www.ngs.noaa.gov/.

Base Map information shown on this FIRM was provided in digital format by El Pasc County, Cotorado Springs Utilities, City of Fountain, Bureau of Land Management National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, United States Geological Survey and Anderson Consulting Engineers, Inc. These data are current as of 2006.

The map which containing a significantly, non-tains stream charmed configurations and the map which contained the significant of the these been adjusted to confirm to these we stream charmed configurations. As a first base been adjusted to confirm to these we stream charmed distances that differ merely and distances that differ merely and the significant of the significant of the distances that differ merely and the significant of the significant of the significant of the significant of the the size base merely contained is provided baselines my contains significantly, not the RFS proort. As a result the profile baselines my contains significantly, not the RFS proort. As a result the profile aselines may deviate significantly fi ind may appear outside of the floodp

Corporate limits shown on this map are based on the best data available at the firm if publication. Because changes due to annexations or de-annexations may have courred after this map was published, map users should contact appropriate ommunity officials to verify current corporate limit locations.

Please refer to the separately printed Map Index for an overview map of the county showing the layout of map panels; community map repository addresses; and Listing of Communities table containing National Flood Insurance Program dates to each community as well as a listing of the panels on which each community is lowered.

Contact FEMA Map Service Center (MSC) via the FEMA Map Information eXchang (FMX) 1477-336-8277 for information on available products associated with The Theorem 2014 Contact of the Service S

I you have questions about this map or questions concerning the National Floot nsurance Program in general, please call **1-877.FEMA MAP** (1-877-336-2627) o isit the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/business/nfip. FI Pase County Vertical Datum Offset Table



Panel Location Map



This Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (DFIRM) was produced through a Cooperating Technical Partner (CTP) agreement between the State of Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

dditional Flood Hazard i vailable from local con



0297

MAP NUMBER 08041C0267G

MAP REVISED


Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey National Cooperative Soil Survey 12/27/2022 Page 1 of 4





Hy	ydrol	ogic	Soil	Gro	up	

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
38	Jarre-Tecolote complex, 8 to 65 percent slopes	В	109.5	50.8%
71	Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	В	31.1	14.5%
93	Tomah-Crowfoot complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes	В	74.8	34.7%
Totals for Area of Intere	est		215.4	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





United States Department of Agriculture

Natural Resources Conservation

Service

A product of the National Cooperative Soil Survey, a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local participants

Custom Soil Resource Report for El Paso County Area, Colorado



Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/? cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require

alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

Preface	2
How Soil Surveys Are Made	5
Soil Map	
Soil Map	9
Legend	10
Map Unit Legend	11
Map Unit Descriptions	11
El Paso County Area, Colorado	
38—Jarre-Tecolote complex, 8 to 65 percent slopes	
71—Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	14
93—Tomah-Crowfoot complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes	15
References	

How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil

scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and

identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.

Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.



	MAP L	EGEND		MAP INFORMATION
Area of Int	erest (AOI)	8	Spoil Area	The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at
	Area of Interest (AOI)	۵	Stony Spot	1:24,000.
Soils		0	Very Stony Spot	Warning: Soil Man may not be valid at this scale
	Soil Map Unit Polygons	Ŵ	Wet Spot	Warning. Soir Map may not be valid at this scale.
~	Soil Map Unit LinesSoil Map Unit Points		Other	Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause
			Special Line Features	line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of
Special	Point Features	Water Fea	tures	contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed
<u>ہ</u>	Biowoul	~	Streams and Canals	
×	Borrow Pit	Transport	ation	Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map
英	Clay Spot	++++	Rails	measurements.
\diamond	Closed Depression	~	Interstate Highways	Source of Man: Natural Resources Conservation Service
X	Gravel Pit	~	US Routes	Web Soil Survey URL:
0 0 0	Gravelly Spot	\sim	Major Roads	Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)
0	Landfill	~	Local Roads	Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator
٨.	Lava Flow	Backgrou	nd	projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts
علام	Marsh or swamp Aer		Aerial Photography	Albers equal-area conic projection that preserves area, such as the
衆	Mine or Quarry			accurate calculations of distance or area are required.
0	Miscellaneous Water			This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as
0	Perennial Water			of the version date(s) listed below.
\vee	Rock Outcrop			Soil Survey Area: El Paso County Area. Colorado
+	Saline Spot			Survey Area Data: Version 20, Sep 2, 2022
- 	Sandy Spot			Soil man units are labeled (as space allows) for man scales
-	Severely Eroded Spot			1:50,000 or larger.
۵	Sinkhole			Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Jun 0, 2021, Jun 12
à	Slide or Slip			2021
<u></u>	Sodic Spot			
Jø L				compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
38	Jarre-Tecolote complex, 8 to 65 percent slopes	109.5	50.8%
71	Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	31.1	14.5%
93	Tomah-Crowfoot complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes	74.8	34.7%
Totals for Area of Interest	•	215.4	100.0%

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or

landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An *association* is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

El Paso County Area, Colorado

38—Jarre-Tecolote complex, 8 to 65 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 368c Elevation: 6,700 to 7,500 feet Frost-free period: 90 to 125 days Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Jarre and similar soils: 40 percent Tecolote and similar soils: 30 percent Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Jarre

Setting

Landform: Alluvial fans Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Alluvium

Typical profile

A - 0 to 5 inches: gravelly sandy loam Bt - 5 to 22 inches: gravelly sandy clay loam 2C - 22 to 60 inches: very gravelly sandy loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 30 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Medium
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 5.3 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6e Hydrologic Soil Group: B Ecological site: R048AY222CO - Loamy Park Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Tecolote

Setting

Landform: Alluvial fans Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Alluvium

Typical profile

A - 0 to 3 inches: very stony loam

- E 3 to 12 inches: very gravelly loamy sand
- Bt 12 to 45 inches: extremely gravelly sandy clay loam
- C 45 to 60 inches: extremely gravelly loamy sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 65 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: High
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.20 to 2.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Very low (about 2.7 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 7e Hydrologic Soil Group: B Ecological site: R048AY255CO - Pine Grasslands Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Other soils

Percent of map unit: Hydric soil rating: No

71—Pring coarse sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 369k Elevation: 6,800 to 7,600 feet Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Pring and similar soils: 85 percent *Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.*

Description of Pring

Setting

Landform: Hills Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Arkosic alluvium derived from sedimentary rock

Typical profile

A - 0 to 14 inches: coarse sandy loam

C - 14 to 60 inches: gravelly sandy loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 3 to 8 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High (2.00 to 6.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 6.0 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 3e Hydrologic Soil Group: B Ecological site: R048AY222CO - Loamy Park Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Pleasant

Percent of map unit: Landform: Depressions Hydric soil rating: Yes

Other soils

Percent of map unit: Hydric soil rating: No

93—Tomah-Crowfoot complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 36bb Elevation: 7,300 to 7,600 feet Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Tomah and similar soils: 50 percent *Crowfoot and similar soils:* 30 percent *Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.*

Description of Tomah

Setting

Landform: Hills, alluvial fans

Custom Soil Resource Report

Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope, crest Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Alluvium derived from arkose and/or residuum weathered from arkose

Typical profile

A - 0 to 10 inches: loamy sand

E - 10 to 22 inches: coarse sand

Bt - 22 to 48 inches: stratified coarse sand to sandy clay loam

C - 48 to 60 inches: coarse sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Medium
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.60 to 2.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 4.6 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6e Hydrologic Soil Group: B Ecological site: R049XY216CO - Sandy Divide Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Crowfoot

Setting

Landform: Hills, alluvial fans Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope, crest Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Alluvium

Typical profile

A - 0 to 12 inches: loamy sand E - 12 to 23 inches: sand Bt - 23 to 36 inches: sandy clay loam C - 36 to 60 inches: coarse sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Medium
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.60 to 2.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 4.7 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6e Hydrologic Soil Group: B Ecological site: R049XY216CO - Sandy Divide Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Other soils

Percent of map unit: Hydric soil rating: No

Pleasant

Percent of map unit: Landform: Depressions Hydric soil rating: Yes

References

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.

Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.

Federal Register. September 18, 2002. Hydric soils of the United States.

Hurt, G.W., and L.M. Vasilas, editors. Version 6.0, 2006. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.

National Research Council. 1995. Wetlands: Characteristics and boundaries.

Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/ nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_054262

Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053577

Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053580

Tiner, R.W., Jr. 1985. Wetlands of Delaware. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Wetlands Section.

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Waterways Experiment Station Technical Report Y-87-1.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National forestry manual. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/ home/?cid=nrcs142p2 053374

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National range and pasture handbook. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/ detail/national/landuse/rangepasture/?cid=stelprdb1043084

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/ nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2_054242

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/? cid=nrcs142p2_053624

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. 1961. Land capability classification. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 210. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_052290.pdf

<u>Appendix D</u>

MAPS





VICINITY MAP HAY CREEK VALLEY (NTS)



LEGEND



BASIN BOUNDARY

EXISTING CONTOUR

——— 100-YEAR STORM EVENT PEAK FLOW (CFS) — SUB BASIN AREA (AC.)



	FI PASO COUNTY			LAY OREEK	FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT			OFFSITE DRAINAGE BASINS		DESIGNED BY: WCG SCALE DATE ISSUED: JANUARY 2023 DRAWING No.	CHECKED BY: JTS VERT. SHEET 1 OF 3 DR01
SEAL		DRFI IMINARY		THIS DRAWING HAS NOT	DOM TEL APPROVED BY	GUVERNING AGENCIES AND	IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE			FOR AND ON BEHALF OF MATRIX DESIGN GROUP INC	PROJECT No. 22.886.076
							PREPARED BY:			Evrellence hv Decian	Execution by Design
SHEET KEY											
5 ####		#####	####	#####		BY			eports\FDR\D\VG\DR01 - HAY CREEK.dwg		
						DESCRIPTION	REVISIONS		ary Properties\200 Design\220 Drainage-WR\222 R		HANGE.
####	##### ######	####	####	#####	####	DATE		ITER FILE MANAGEMENT	1E: S:\22.886.076 Hay Creek-Forest Manor-O'Le.	∵ тғ. Januarv 18. 2023 1:46:38 РМ	IG IS CURRENT AS OF PLOT DATE AND MAY BE SUBJECT TO CH
REFERENCE ####	DRAWINGS ####	####	####	#####		No.			FILE NAN		



LEGEND





EXISTING CONTOUR

DESIGN POINT

------ SUB BASIN DESIGNATION

— 5-YEAR STORM EVENT PEAK FLOW (CFS) ------ 100-YEAR STORM EVENT PEAK FLOW (CFS) SUB BASIN AREA (AC.)



Hay Creek								
Existing Conditions Sub-basin Summary								
Basin	Area	Q5	Q100					
	acres	cfs	cfs					
EX-OS1a	9.4	3.5	18.9					
EX-OS1b	59.2	12.3	74.6					
EX-OS2a	15.9	7.8	42.0					
EX-OS2b	2.8	1.3	6.7					
EX-OS2c	3.2	1.6	8.2					
EX-OS3	8.1	2.7	17.7					
EX-1	56.0	8.2	50.4					
EX-2	48.2	10.3	59.7					
EX-3	61.6	15.6	96.6					
EX-4	5.9	2.3	15.6					
EX-5	42.8	11.4	71.8					

Existing Design Point Summary									
Hay Creek									
Design Point	Sub-Basins	Total Area (ac.)	Q(5) (cfs)	Q(100) (cfs)					
1	EX-OS1a	9.35	3.47	18.95					
2	EX-OS1b	59.21	12.31	74.56					
3	EX-OS2a	15.90	7.84	42.05					
4	EX-OS2b	2.77	1.34	6.74					
5	EX-OS2c	3.17	1.62	8.21					
6	EX-OS3	8.15	2.66	17.71					
7	EX-4	5.88	2.32	15.59					
8	EX-OS1b, EX-OS2a, EX-2	123.33	26.12	153.08					
9	EX-OS2b, EX-OS2c, EX-3	67.57	17.56	106.51					
10	EX-OS3, EX-5	50.97	13.45	85.25					
11	DP-8, DP-9, DP-10, EX-OS1a, EX-1	307.27	35.04	210.91					

Y	Y			-
1	11/201	14 and ar	11 Mar 14	-
		5/2//	1111	-
11 Partier	「二日間にいたい	なられたいいい	「おいい」の「おい」	-
			うちちょうないので、「	-
c	「ころん」	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	「御田」と	-
から言語	「「「「「「「「」」」」	ここの一部である	「「「「「「「」」」」	
WARE NO.	ないのではない	「「「「「「「「」」」	And the second second	
	and the second second		「「「「「「」」」」	
	いたのであった	のないで、いいの	And the second second	
	「日本の日本		The second second	
	26	States and	Harrison and the second	
	のないというの	のないとうないの目的に	たいことに確認されたに	
	記録ないの	State States	「「「「「「「」」」	
	The second second		State of the second sec	
	「「「「「「「」」	のたいと見ていた	ALTER OF ALL ST	
	The second	and the second se	的していたのです。	
からいちの		いたのでは、「		
	-		「「「「「「「「」」」」	
	というで、	「「「「「「「」」」	「「「「「「「」」」	
1000	のないのであるの	たいたちである	「「「「「「「」」」	
ないであってい	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	ようないないです。	「「「「「「「「」」」」」」	
	「二日本のある」という	and the second sec	10000	
			に有力にに	
Contraction of the		an all and	No. of the local division of the local divis	
	「大学」の書き	The reason	「「「「」」	

REFERENCE	* #####	#### #### SHEET KEY			SEAL	
DRAWINGS	#####					FI PASO COUNTY
	#####					
	#####				THIS DRAWING HAS NOT	HAY OREEK
	#####				BEEN APPROVED BY	FINAL DRAINAGE REPORT
	No. L	ATE DESCRIPTION DESCRIPTION BY				
		REVISIONS		EPARED BY:	IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE	
	COMPUT	FER FILE MANAGEMENT				
	FILE NAME:	S:\22.886.076 Hay Creek-Forest Manor-O'Leary Properties\200 Design\220 Drainage-WR\222 Reports\FDR\DWG\DR01 - HAY CREEK.dwg				
	CTB FILE:				FOR AND ON BEHALF OF	DESIGNED BY: WCG SCALE DATE ISSUED: IANI IAPY 2023 DEAWING No.
	PLOT DATE:	January 18, 2023 1:43:40 PM		Excellence by Design	MATRIX DESIGN GROUP, INC.	DRAWN BY: WCG HORIZ.
	THIS DRAWING I.	S CURRENT AS OF PLOT DATE AND MAY BE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.			PROJECT No. 22.886.076	CHECKED BY: JTS VERT. SHEET 2 OF 3 URUZ



LEGEND



----- <------

<u>/BASIN</u>

AREA

 \longrightarrow

EXISTING CONTOUR PROPOSED CONTOUR PROPOSED STORM DRAIN PIPE ____ EXISTING EDGE OF ROAD ----- PROPOSED FLOW DIRECTION

DESIGN POINT

PROPOSED MAINTENANCE ACCESS ROAD PROPOSED RIP RAP

EMERGENCY FLOW PATHS

- SUB BASIN DESIGNATION

5-YEAR STORM EVENT PEAK FLOW (CFS) Q5 Q100 — SUB BASIN AREA (AC.)

We need to know how much disturbed area is untreated and if there are any exclusions that apply to those areas. So please create a basic overview map (or modify an existing drainage map) with color shading/hatching that shows areas tributary to each PBMP (pond, runoff reduction, etc) and those disturbed areas that are not treated by a PBMP, with the applicable exclusion labeled (ex: 20% up to 1ac of development can be excluded per ECM App I.7.1.C.1 and exclusions listed in ECM App I.7.1.B.#). An accompanying summary table on this map would also be very helpful (example provided):

			200				
Basin ID	Total Area (ac)	Total Proposed Disturbed Area (ac)	Area Trib to Pond A (ac)	Disturbed Area Treated via Runoff Reduction (ac)	Area Excluded from WQ per ECM App I.7.1.C.1 (ac)	Area Excluded from WQ per ECM App I.7.1.B.# (ac)	Applicable WQ Exclusions (App I.7.1.8.#)
А	4.50	4.50	4.50	-	-	-	
В	1.25	1.25	-	1.00	0.25	-	
С	6.00	4.00	-	-	-	4.00	ECM App 1.7.1.B.5
D	2.50	2.50	1.00	-	0.50	1.00	ECM App I.7.1.B.7
E	3.00	-	3.00	-	-	-	
F	8.25	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	25.50	12.25	8.50	1.00	0.75	5.00	
Comments		[For each row, the sum of the values in Columns 4-7 must be greater than or equal to the value in Column 3 obcue 1	[Values in this column can be more than Column 3 if over- treating non- disturbed areas.]	See RR calc spreadsheet.	[Total must be <20% of site and <1ac.]		



Hay Creek Proposed Conditions Sub-basin Summary								
Basin	Area	Q5	Q100					
	acres	cfs	cfs					
OS1a	9.4	3.5	18.9					
OS1b	59.2	12.3	74.6					
OS2a	5.0	2.2	12.4					
OS2b	8.6	4.0	21.6					
OS2c	2.3	1.3	6.5					
OS2d	2.8	1.3	6.7					
OS2e	3.2	1.6	8.0					
OS3a	4.9	1.5	10.1					
OS3b	3.3	1.1	7.6					
PR-1	70.9	11.7	64.2					
PR-2	16.1	6.2	34.1					
PR-3	9.8	3.6	19.4					
PR-4	28.4	7.2	39.3					
PR-5	5.9	3.1	17.0					
PR-6	58.2	17.0	93.0					
PR-7	1.2	0.4	2.5					
PR-8a	5.1	5.3	11.1					
PR-8b	0.4	1.8	3.3					
PR-9	2.4	0.6	4.0					
PR-10	16.4	4.1	27.3					

Proposed Design Point Summary - Central Basin

Hay Creek				
Design Point	Sub-Basins	Total Area (ac.)	Q(5) (cfs)	Q(100) (cfs)
1	OS1a	9.35	3.47	18.95
2	OS1b	59.21	12.31	74.56
3	OS2a	5.01	2.23	12.44
4	OS2b	8.57	4.04	21.65
5	OS2c	2.28	1.30	6.47
6	OS2d, OS2e	5.93	2.85	14.41
7	OS3a	4.88	1.50	10.11
8	OS3b	3.29	1.13	7.59
9	PR-5	5.86	3.11	17.01
10	OS2b, PR-2	24.65	9.00	48.83
11	OS2c, PR-3	12.06	4.48	23.99
12	OS2d, OS2e, PR-4	34.29	8.69	46.80
13	OS3a, PR-6	63.07	18.09	100.09
14	OS1a, OS1b, OS2a, PR-1, DP-10, DP-11, DP-12	215.41	27.39	153.04
15	PR-7	1.20	0.45	2.45
16	PR-7, PR-8a	6.32	5.41	12.33
EDB-IN	PR-7, PR-8a, PR-8b, PR-9	9.13	6.41	16.43
EDB-OUT	PR-7, PR-8a, PR-8b, PR-9	9.13	0.20	1.80
17	EDB-OUT, DP-13, DP-14	287.62	38.10	207.80
18	DP-8, DP-17, PR-10	307.28	37.60	211.90

