AMENDMENT NO. 4 PINE CREEK DRAINAGE BASIN PLANNING STUDY AND MASTER DEVELOPMENT DRAINAGE PLAN FOR PINE CREEK SUBDIVISION (Retrofit of Pine Creek Regional Detention Facility "C" Part of Briargate Parkway Plaza Filing No. 1 (Track A))

In conjunction with:

Powers Boulevard Bridges Project Briargate, Union, Pine Creek

February xx, 2012

Prepared for:

Colorado Department of Transportation Region 2, Colorado Springs Residency

Prepared by:



CONSULTING ENGINEERS

5690 DTC Blvd, Ste 345W Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111 303.771.6200 www.tshengineering.com

ENGINEERS 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 City for drainage reports and said report is in conformity with the master plan of the drainage basin. I accept responsibility for any liability on my part in preparing this report.

manning DO REG 19501

George K. Cottor, Colorado Colorado PE 19501 For and On Behalf of Tsiouvaras Simmons Holderness, Inc.

2/28/2012

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REGION 2, COLORADO SPRINGS RESIDENCY

Um

Resident Engineer

2/23/12

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS: Filed in accordance with Section 7-7-906 of the Code of the City of Colorado Springs, 2001, as amended

2/28/12

For the City Engineer

Preliminary Drainage Report Regional Detention Facility "C" Waler Quality Retrofit Powers Boulevard Bridges Project Page 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	GENERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	2
III.	DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS	3
IV.	DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA	4
V.	DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN	4
	A. General Concept	4
	B. Specific Details	7
	C. Grading and Erosion Control	8
	D. Other Government Agency Requirements	8
VI.	DRAINAGE FACILITY MAINTENANCE	8
VII.	REFERENCES	9
APPE	NDIX	10
	Vicinity Map	11
	Pine Creek RDF-C Site Photos	12
	Design Plans for Pine Creek RDF-C Water Quality Retrofit	14
	Storm Rax Overflow Trash Rack	18
	Water Quality Capture Volume (UDFCD EDB Worksheet)	22
	Comparison of Addendum No. 2 and No. 3 Hydrology	26
	Hydrologic Model Input Data	27
	Hydrologic Model Output	34
	Nationwide 404 Permit	35
	Letter on Briargate and Union Detention Pond (Robin Kidder to)
	Mark Andrew, February 11, 2011)	38
	Information from Other Reports and As-Built Plans	40

I. INTRODUCTION

CDOT is completing the segment of Powers Boulevard between Pine Creek and Briargate Parkway. The construction will complete the mainline bridges over Pine Creek, Union Boulevard and Briargate Parkway; and will pave the mainline. Within CDOT right-of-way limits, the stormwater runoff will be treated in accordance with CDOT and City of Colorado Springs MS4 permits. New permanent stormwater quality facilities (PSQF) will be constructed near Pine Creek and an existing PSQF will treat stormwater runoff for the segment of Powers Boulevard from Union Boulevard to Pine Creek.

Stormwater runoff from Powers Boulevard that is tributary to the Briargate Parkway drainage system currently has no PSQF. CDOTs project requirements allowed for retrofit of Regional Detention Facility "C" (RDF-C) in accordance with an agreement with the City of Colorado Springs. The other option permitted by CDOT design requirements was for construction of a PSQF within Powers Boulevard right-of-way. Because of the difficulty of siting a large volume PSQF within the project, the design-build team of Edward Kramer & Sons (build) and Tsiouvaras Simmons Holderness (design) chose the RDF-C retrofit approach.

This report presents the basis of the retrofit design of the primary outlet for RDF-C. The purpose of the retrofit is to provide regional treatment for all stormwater runoff that is tributary to the facility, which includes runoff from Powers Boulevard to the Briargate Parkway storm drainage system.

II. GENERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Regional Detention Facility "C" is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Union Boulevard and Briargate Parkway (see Exhibit 1). The primary outlet for the detention pond is located in the southwest corner. Geodetic coordinates for the outlet are approximately 38°57′59″N and 104°45′37″W.

RDF-C was constructed as a component of the Master Development Drainage Plan for the Pine Creek Subdivision. RDF-C is within the South Fork branch of Pine Creek and is one of four regional detention facilities constructed within that tributary. All of the inflows to RDF-C are conveyed to the basin via closed conduits. The largest inflows to the pond are from the Pine Creek South storm drainage system. This system has two large inlets to RDF-C: one from Briargate that enters at the southeast corner into the pond forebay, and one from Union along the east side of the pond. There are also two inlets to the pond for local drainage systems that drain areas that are the north of the pond.

While no natural drainageways enter RDF-C, there is a jurisdictional wetland within the pond. When the pond was constructed, a constructed wetland was located along the south side of the pond as mitigation for wetland loses due to development. The wetland is fed by discharges from the pond forebay. Since construction of the pond, additional wetlands have established beyond the limits of the original mitigation area. Other wetlands that now exist in the pond include the area around the pond outlet. These wetlands are below elevation 6870.0, which is the berm height for the constructed wetland. Several wetlands have also formed on the perimeter of the pond where pond excavation intercepted groundwater seeps. Seeps can be observed on the north and east sides of the ponds. Groundwater seeps are not found in the vicinity of the pond outlet. It has been assumed that the entire work area near the pond outlet that is below elevation 6870.0 is jurisdictional wetland. The project has applied for a nationwide permit for work within wetland areas for project (see Appendix for a copy of the permit application).

III. DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS

RDF-C is a component of the drainage system for Pine Creek South Fork. The fully developed hydrology of this drainage basin is described in detail in the "Pine Creek Drainage Basin Planning Study" (JR Engineering, 1998). The watershed has 13 subbasins of which 10 are tributary to RDF-C. The total drainage area to RDF-C is 1.04 square miles (664 acres) and has a weighted impervious area of 67.6%. The Powers Boulevard drainage basins that drain to Pine Creek South Fork have an area of 43.4 acres with an impervious percentage of 55%.

Sub-basin data is summarized in the appendix of this report (Hydrologic Input Calculations).

IV. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA

RDF-C is a non-jurisdictional detention dam that is currently privately owned by LP47, LLC and maintained and managed by the City of Colorado Springs. Design of the RDF-C water quality retrofit will conform to criteria of the City of Colorado Springs as stated in City of Colorado Springs "Drainage Criteria Manual" (DCM), Volumes 1, 2 and addenda. Specific sections of the DCM that are relevant to the detention facility retrofit design include Volume 1 Section 6.6 "Detention Storage Criteria" and Chapter 11 "Detention Storage". Criteria for starting water surface elevations for extended detention basins are given in Volume 2 on page 4-22.

V. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN

A. General Concept

The existing primary outlet for detention basin RDF-C will be modified to include a water quality outlet with a 40 hour drain time. The existing primary outlet consists of a 48-inch diameter reinforced concrete pipe that is supported by a standard headwall. To prevent debris from entering the pipe, the headwall has a sloping trash rack that is supported by the headwall and apron.

The new outlet design will raise the height of the headwall and wing-walls to a constant elevation. The elevation will be set to the stage in the RDF-C basin for the water quality capture volume (WQCV) plus 20% for accumulated sediment storage (i.e. design water quality volume).

The WQCV will be released though an orifice plate that is designed to drain that volume in 40 hours. The orifice plate will be placed on the front wall of the raised outlet headwall opposite the 48" outlet pipe. To prevent debris from clogging the orifice openings, a screen will be placed in front of the orifice plate. As a part of the screen design, a 2.5 foot deep micro-pool will be constructed to maintain a permanent pool of water in front of the screen, assuring that the lower portion of the screen will be free of floating debris. The micro-pool will be a square concrete sump that has side lengths equal to the existing headwall width of 8'-0". An additional fence-like screen will be placed along the perimeter of the micro-

pool for the purposed of collecting larger debris and limiting access to the micropool except by authorized maintenance personnel.

During regular rainfall conditions, stormwater will pool against the headwall up to the elevation of the design water quality volume and gradually release. A water quality volume of 12.46 ac-ft is calculated for the total watershed area of 658.4 acres (1.03 sq. mi.) and 57.2% imperviousness. The design height of the raised headwalls will be 6'-5". From the base of the micro-pool, the structure will be 8'-11" high.

During storm rainfall conditions, stormwater will pool to the height of the headwall and begin spilling to the 48" outlet pipe. Initially, the headwall will act as a weir and will control the rate that water is released from the pond. However, once the flow increases, the release from the pond will be controlled by the outlet pipe.

Our analysis found that the outlet pipe runs in "inlet" control and that there is extra capacity in the Pine Creek South storm drain. We looked at the option of improving the headwall efficiency by adding a bevel around the outlet pipe (i.e. changing from an HDS Chart 1 outlet to an HDS Chart 3 outlet). This improvement would increase the outlet release from RDF-C by 12 to 14 percent and could partially make up for the initial period, when stormwater fills the WQCV and releases from the retrofit outlet are low. Analysis of this option however showed only minor overall improvement. Pond stage for the 100-year storm only decreased 0.1 foot and peak outflow by about 5.1 cfs (see Appendix, Hydrologic Model Output). This is well within the modeling error and so was not deemed to be a valid option.

To prevent debris from entering the outlet pipe, a sloping trash rack will be installed on top of the headwall. A prefabricated, tented rack was selected with raised sides and 60% open area that will be bolted to the outlet structure.

A new maintenance access road will be constructed from the existing access road near the forebay spillway along the toe slope (above the elevation of the wetland) to the micro-pool. The access road will be 10 feet wide on a level grade The access road will be surfaced with a 6 inch depth of aggregate base course (CDOT Class 6 material) to stabilize the road.

It was found that even with improvements to the detention basin primary outlet that it will be necessary to increase the storage volume within the detention basin. The existing pond has a volume of 68.9 ac-ft at the spillway crest. Routing (using the HEC-HMS model) through the existing pond for the 100-year storm requires a volume of 72.8 ac-ft, which is equivalent to stage of 6882.1 (0.6 feet above the existing emergency spillway crest). [Note: The flood routing for Addendums No. 2 and No. 3 was accomplished using the older hydrologic analysis program, HEC-1 (USACE, 1990). In this computer program the routing time step is set manually. The hydrologic analysis for the current retrofit design used HEC-HMS, which has replaced HEC-1. In HEC-HMS, the computational time step is computed by the program to meet all tolerances. Addendum No. 2 used a 3.0 minute time step, while HEC-HMS finds this time step to be too long and computed a shorter time step of about 2.0 minutes. The shorter time step results in a more accurate routing computation and a larger volume of runoff stored in the pond. We estimate that continuity error in the original computation to be about 2.8% of the total inflow to the pond (209.3 ac-ft) based on the HEC-HMS analysis. This is a theoretical error and within the operational uncertainty of the detention pond.]

Routing of the 100-year storm with the primary outlet modified for water quality (with an initial stage corresponding to 0.5 WQCV) requires 81.3 ac-ft of flood storage. Raising the spillway approximately 1.5 feet provides 78.8 ac-ft of storage volume. The maximum 100-year stage is 6883.3 or 0.3 feet above the spillway elevation. In theory, this will result in a spill of 85 cfs over the spillway (similar to the estimated 84 cfs spill from the existing pond). The spill would be brief, lasting 36 minutes and releasing 3.3 ac-ft.

To accomplish the spillway raise, the existing concrete cutoff wall will be extended over a length of 190 feet by 1'-6". The existing riprap protection will be removed and approximately 380 cubic yards of embankment added to the spillway. The riprap protection will then be replaced to match the new elevation

of the cutoff wall. The raised spillway will be 3 feet below the elevation of the basin embankment. If the primary outlet were totally plugged, our analysis shows that the 100-year storm flow could pass over the spillway with 2 feet of freeboard.

B. Specific Details

Design exhibits for the RDF-C water quality retrofit are provided in the Appendix of this report. The design is presented on four plan sheets, which are part of the plan set for the Powers Boulevard Bridges Project. Sheet 181 shows the planned grading for the pond access road. The design shows regrading of the existing access road to the forebay with the new access road extending west along the south perimeter of the pond to the outlet. The detail for extending the existing emergency spillway cutoff wall is also shown on this sheet.

Sheet 182 shows the plan and elevation of the modified outlet. A work pad is provided at the outlet on the east side. To accommodate the embankment slope of the work pad at the micro-pool, the east wall of the micro-pool is extended and sloped to match the embankment slope of the pad. Other components of the outlet shown on this sheet include: the location of the orifice plate and water quality screen, the over flow trash rack, and a perimeter fence around the micro-pool. The perimeter of the micro-pool is fenced with a standard 6' high chain link fence. Access to the micro-poll is provided by a gate on the west side. A two foot concrete walkway around the perimeter of the micro-pool will provide a firm footing for removing debris from the perimeter fence.

Sheet 183 shows reinforcement and related structural details for the vault modifications and new micro-pool.

Sheet 184 shows fabrication details for the orifice plate and trash racks. The orifice place will be mounted on the exterior of the outlet vault and surrounded by bar-grate trash rack. In accordance with UDFCD recommendations for a trash rack of this size, Amico-Klempt grade model 19-W-4 with 4" cross bar spacing is specified. The grate is configured to provide a vertical orientation of the bars, which facilitates cleaning. Access to the orifice place is accomplished by

unbolting the bar grate from its vertical supports. A prefabricated overflow trash rack is specified. The Storm Rax structure is distributed by Contech and is manufactured with structural plastic (see product information in the Appendix).

C. Grading and Erosion Control

It is estimated that the retrofit construction will disturb 0.34 acres and require the placement of approximately 380 cubic yards of fill. Construction erosion control BMPs will be implemented at the site. A grading and erosion control permit will be obtained from the City of Colorado Springs for the retrofit.

D. Other Government Agency Requirements

The primary outlet for RDF-C is adjacent to a jurisdictional wetland. The area near the outlet will be disturbed in order to construct the retrofit. A Nationwide Permit No 43 Section 404 permit has been obtained for construction work in this wetland area from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (see Appendix: Letter from Van Truan to George Cotton, February 1, 2012).

VI. DRAINAGE FACILITY MAINTENANCE

CDOT and the City of Colorado Springs have agreed to jointly develop a maintenance plan for the outlet structure (see Appendix: Letter from Robin Kidder to Mark Andrew, February 11, 2011).

VII. REFERENCES

- 1. City of Colorado Springs / County of El Paso, 1991, "Drainage Criteria Manual"
- JR Engineering, 1998, "Amendment No. 2 to Pine Creek Drainage Basin Planning Study and Master Development Drainage Plan for Pine Creek Subdivision (portion contributing to Pine Creek)", prepared for LP47, LLC
- 3. JR Engineering, 2002, "Amendment No. 3 to Pine Creek Drainage Basin Planning Study and Master Development Drainage Plan for Pine Creek Subdivision (portion contributing to Pine Creek)", prepared for LP47, LLC
- Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, 2011, "Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual – Volume 3" Section T-5, Extended Detention Basin (EDB) and Section T-12, Outlet Structures
- Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, 2011, "UD-BMP Workbook" version
 3.01
- 6. USACE, Hydrologic Engineering Center, 2000, "Hydrologic Modeling System, HEC-HMS, Technical Reference Manual"
- 7. USACE, Hydrologic Engineering Center, 1990, "HEC-1, Flood Hydrographic Package User's Manual"

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vicinity Map 11
Pine Creek RDF-C Site Photos 12
Design Plans for Pine Creek RDF-C Water Quality Retrofit 14
Storm Rax Overflow Trash Rack 18
Water Quality Capture Volume (UDFCD EDB Worksheet)
Comparison of Addendum No. 2 and No. 3 Hydrology 26
Hydrologic Model Input Data27
Sub-basin Parameters / Fully Developed Conditions
Addendum No. 2 27
Addendum No. 3 28
Type 2A Storm Pattern
Tabulation
Graph 30
Outlet Rating Curve
Option #1 31
Option #2 32
Pine Creek HEC-HMS Schematic 33
Hydrologic Model Output
Nationwide 404 Permit 35
Letter on Briargate and Union Detention Pond (Robin Kidder to Mark Andrew, February
11, 2011)
Information from Other Reports and As-Built Plans





Photo 1. Looking west from main inlet culvert to RDF-C showing existing constructed wetland along south side of pond (left edge of pond bottom). Pond forebay is in foreground below culvert apron. Outlet is in the distance in the southwest corner (top left area of photo).



Photo2. Existing pond outlet with steel trash rack. Outlet consists of a 48" RCP with headwall and wingwalls. Constructed wetland is in the background and new wetland has established near the pond outlet.

	POWERS BOULEVARD	EXHIBIT
CONSULTING ENGINEERS	RDF-C SITE PHOTOS	2



Photo 3. Looking east from RDF-C pond embankment showing existing constructed wetland along south side of pond (right half of pond bottom). Additional wetlands have established at other culvert inlets and groundwater seep points along the pond perimeter.



Photo 4. Looking south to pond outlet and spillway (highlighted in yellow) from RDF-C pond embankment.





Preliminary Drainage Report

Regional Detention Facility "C" Water Quality Retrofit

Powers Bridge Project Page 14



Preliminary Drainage Report

Regional Detention Facility "C" Water Quality Retrofit

Powers Bridge Project Page 15

2012 90% REVIEW JANUARY



Preliminary Drainage Report

Regional Detention Facility "C" Water Quality Retrofit

		riejeet nei, eeue						
TER QUA	LITY OL	JTLET R	FSA 0212-003					
r :	RA	Structure					18095	
:	MW	Numbers						
Subset:	DRAIN	Subset Sh	eets:	19	of	20	Sheet Number	183
						P	owers Bridge Project	



Preliminary Drainage Report

Regional Detention Facility "C" Water Quality Retrofit

Powers Bridge Project Page 17



Structural HDPE Products for Water Screening







Key Advantages

Availability

CONTECH[®] Construction Products Inc. is pleased to introduce StormRax,[™] its line of structural plastic trash racks and debris cages for stormwater management basins and pond structures from Plastic Solutions Inc. In addition to the full line of standard sizes, we can also customize to fit your specific requirements.

StormRax trash racks are available in numerous sizes and shapes to accommodate nearly every type of application.

Strength & Durability

Structural plastic has a cellular core surrounded by integral skins forming a totally integrated structure. Structural molded parts made from HDPE and fiberglass have a high strength-to-weight ratio and have 3 to 4 times greater rigidity than solid parts of the same material of equal weight.

Racks are designed to withstand the conditions of pond structures - rough handling, high/low temperatures and long term weather exposure. Structural plastic has replaced wood, concrete, solid plastics and metals in a variety of applications.







Quality Alternative

Structural plastic racks are a great alternative to painted and galvanized steel racks for use in stormwater management ponds and general water screening. They also provide a structurally sound product with a long lasting quality appearance.





With structural plastic, you can take advantage of the many benefits such as:

- Lighter Weight
- Elimination of Corrosion
- Design Flexibility
- Greater Part Stiffness and Stability
- Chemical Resistance
- Installation Savings

Preliminary Drainage Report Regional Detention Facility "C" Water Quality Retrofit

Applications and Options



StormRax pyramid racks are available with an anti-vortex device and racks can be mounted on concrete structures, plastic and metal pipe.



New Modular Design - Improved 'Round Series'

Our newest trash rack evolution is constructed of Structural Foam Molded High Density Polyethylene, a strong and lightweight replacement for steel that has proven to be a durable and economical alternative.

CONTECH Construction Products Inc. provides site solutions for the civil engineering industry. CONTECH's portfolio includes bridges, drainage, retaining walls, sanitary sewer, stormwater, erosion control and soil stabilization products.

For more information about the products in this brochure, or to reach a sales representative in your region, call CONTECH's Corporate Office at 513-645-7000 or call toll free at 800-338-1122.

Visit our web site: www.contech-cpi.com

NOTHING IN THIS CATALOG SHOULD BE CONSTRUED AS AN EXPRESSED WARRANTY OR AN IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE. SEE CONTECH'S STANDARD QUOTATION OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FOR APPLICABLE WARRANTIES AND OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SALE.

CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTS INC.

StormRax[™] is a trademark of Plastic Solutions Inc.



©2009 CONTECH CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTS, INC. All rights reserved. Printed in USA. Powers Bridge Project Page 21 Design Procedure Form: Extended Detention Basin (EDB)

Design rocedure romin.	
Designer: George Cotton Company: TSH Engineering Date: February 6, 2012 Project: Powers Blvd (SH 21) Bridges Location: RDF "C" Pine Creek South Fork	Sheet 1 of 4
 Basin Storage Volume A) Effective Imperviousness of Tributary Area, I_a B) Tributary Area's Imperviousness Ratio (i = I_a/ 100) C) Contributing Watershed Area D) For Watersheds Outside of the Denver Region, Depth of Average Runoff Producing Storm E) Design Concept 	$l_{a} = \underbrace{57.2}_{\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
 (Select EURV when also designing for flood control) F) Design Volume (1.2 WQCV) Based on 40-hour Drain Time (V_{DESIGN} = (1.0 * (0.91 * i³ - 1.19 * i² + 0.78 * i) / 12 * Area * 1.2) G) For Watersheds Outside of the Denver Region, Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV) Design Volume 	Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV) Excess Urban Runoff Volume (EURV) VDESIGN= 14.953 ac-ft VDESIGN OTHER= 14.953 ac-ft
 (VWQCV OTHER = (d₆ (VDESIGN/0.4.3)) H) User Input of Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV) Design Volume (Only if a different WQCV Design Volume is desired) I) Predominant Watershed NRCS Soil Group J) Excess Urban Runoff Volume (EURV) Design Volume For HSG A: EURVA = (0.1878i - 0.0104)*Area For HSG B: EURV_B = (0.1178i - 0.0042)*Area For HSG C/D: EURV_{CD} = (0.1043i - 0.0031)*Area 	$V_{\text{DESIGN USER}} = \underline{\qquad} \text{ac-ft}$ $Choose One \underline{\qquad}$ $\bigcirc A \\ \bigcirc B \\ \bigcirc C / D \\ EURV = \underline{\qquad} \text{ac-ft}$
 Basin Shape: Length to Width Ratio (A basin length to width ratio of at least 2:1 will improve TSS reduction.) 	L : W = <u>2.0</u> : 1
 3. Basin Side Slopes A) Basin Maximum Side Slopes (Horizontal distance per unit vertical, 4:1 or flatter preferred) 	Z = ft / ft
 4. Inlet A) Describe means of providing energy dissipation at concentrated inflow locations: 	One main inlet with SAF energy dissipator Two other storm drain inlets with riprap aprons



Design Procedure Form: I	Extended Detention Basin (EDB)
Designer: George Cotton Company: TSH Engineering Date: February 6, 2012 Project: Powers Blvd (SH 21) Bridges Location: RDF "C" Pine Creek South Fork	Sheet 3 of 4
8. Initial Surcharge Volume	
 A) Depth of Initial Surcharge Volume (Minimum recommended depth is 4 inches) 	D _{IS} = in
B) Minimum Initial Surcharge Volume (Minimum volume of 0.3% of the WQCV)	$V_{IS} = $ 1,628.4 cu ft
C) Initial Surcharge Provided Above Micropool	V _s = <u>64.0</u> cu ft INCREASE DEPTH OF INITIAL SURCHARGE OR SURFACE AREA OF MICROPOOL
9. Trash Rack A) Type of Water Quality Orifice Used	Choose Une Circular (up to 2" diameter) Rectangular (2" high)
B) Water Quality Screen Open Area: $A_t = 38.5^{+}(e^{-0.095D})^*A_{ot}$	A _t =
C) For 2", or Smaller, Circular Opening (See Fact Sheet T-12):	
i) Width of Water Quality Screen and Concrete Opening $(W_{\mbox{\scriptsize opening}})$	W _{opening} =inches
ii) Height of Water Quality Screen (H_{TR})	H _{TR} =inches Choose One
iii) Type of Screen, Describe if "Other"	O S.S. Well Screen with 60% Open Area* O Other (Describe):
D) For 2" High Rectangular Opening:	
i) Width of Rectangular Opening (W_{orifice})	W = 4.78 inches
ii) Width of Water Quality Screen Opening ($W_{opening}$)	$W_{opening} = 6.0$ ft
iii) Height of Water Quality Screen (H_{TR})	$H_{TR} = $ 8.6 ft
iv) Type of Screen, Describe if "Other"	Choose One Aluminum Amico-Klemp SR Series (or equal) Other (Describe):
v) Cross-bar Spacing	4.0 inches
vi) Minimum Bearing Bar Size	2-1/4 inch x 3/16 inch

Design Procedure For	m: Extended Detention Basin (EDB)
Designer:George CottonCompany:TSH EngineeringDate:February 6, 2012Project:Powers Blvd (SH 21) BridgesLocation:RDF "C" Pine Creek South Fork	Sheet 4 of 4
 10. Overflow Embankment A) Describe embankment protection for 100-year and greater overtopping: B) Slope of Overflow Embankment (Horizontal distance per unit vertical, 4:1 or flatter preferred) 11. Vegetation 	$Z_{\rm E} = \underbrace{10.00}_{\text{ft / ft}} \text{ft}$
12. Access A) Describe Sediment Removal Procedures Notes:	10' wide access road to micropool Access road to forebay currently exists.

Comparison of Addendum No. 2 and No. 3 Hydrology

The planning for the Pine Creek Drainage has progressed through three phases. The original planning study was completed by Obering, Worth and Associates in 1988. This plan was updated in 1998 by JR Engineering and again in 2002. The design of Pine Creek Regional Detention Facility "C" was completed in 1998 and constructed in the same year. In 2003, the pond was retrofit to include a constructed wetland.

Addendum No. 2 identified ten (10) sub-basins that where tributary to Pond "C" with a total drainage area of 664.4 acres (1.038 sq. mi.). The weighted SCS curve number for the basin was 87.2 and the impervious fraction of the basin was 67.2%.

Addendum No. 3 refined the watershed and has 20 sub-basins that are tributary to Pond "C" with a total drainage area of 658.4 acres (1.029 sq. mi.). The weighted SCS curve number for the basin decreases slightly to 84.6 and the impervious fraction of the basin to 57.2%.

Despite the additional detail in hydrologic modeling, the inflow to Pond "C" is similar for the two Addendums. The Addendum No. 2 inflow peak was 1840 cfs, which is nearly identical to the Addendum No. 3 inflow peak of 1825 cfs. Peak outflows are essentially the same with Addendum No. 2 releasing at a peak rate of 227 cfs and Addendum No. 3 at 228 cfs. Peak stage and maximum storage volume are 77.4 feet and 69 ac-ft, respectively for Addendum No. 2, and 77.6 feet and 72 ac-ft, respectively for Addendum No. 3.

Given the similarity in hydrology of both models, it was decided that it was acceptable and slightly conservative to base the pond routing on the simpler Addendum No. 2 model. The design water quality volume, however was based on updated impervious data for the watershed provided in Addendum No. 3.

Sub-Basin Parameters / Fully Developed Conditions

	-	_				
) A / a : a la tra al		
				weighted		
Sub-Basin	Total Area	Total Area	Weighted	Percent	Adjusted	Total Lag
Label	acres	s.m.	CN	Impervious	CN (1)	(min)
PS1	96.2	0.150	78.1	44.9	78.4	12.30
PS2	98.3	0.154	87.4	68.4	85.2	11.29
PS3	103.6	0.162	85.9	68.9	84.8	12.30
PS4	34.8	0.054	92.3	83.6	93.2	8.06
PS5	42.0	0.066	95.6	93.7	98.0	8.11
PS6	48.0	0.075	82.8	59.0	86.5	7.36
PS7	57.0	0.089	93.3	86.8	96.3	7.16
PS8	78.3	0.122	81.6	58.4	86.0	7.63
PS9	81.8	0.128	92.9	85.7	94.5	7.81
PS10	24.4	0.038	72.9	20.5	72.9	9.59
PS11	35.7	0.056	79.1	48.6	80.3	10.35
PS12	98.0	0.153	70.1	10.0	68.5	14.00
PS13	41.9	0.065	73.9	25.0	76.1	8.93
At RDF-C	664.4	1.038		67.6%		

from JR Engineering, 1998, "Amendment No. 2" Appendix - Hydrologic Model Input Calculation

Notes: (1) CNs were adjusted by JRE to match rational method calculations

Sub-Basin Parameters / Fully Developed Conditions

from JR Engineering, 2002, "Amendment No. 3"

Map 1. Fully Developed Conditions

				Weighted		
Sub-Basin	Total Area	Total Area	Weighted	Percent	Adjusted	Total Lag
Label	acres	s.m.	CN	Impervious	CN (1)	(min)
PSE01	21.6	0.034	70.5	30.6	74.5	0.197
PSE02	18.3	0.029	74.9	36.3	77.0	0.169
PSE03	49.9	0.078	79.3	45.7	79.6	0.171
PSE04	47.7	0.075	71.9	32.2	75.6	0.192
PSE05	30.2	0.047	74.2	35.0	76.5	0.181
PSE06	34.6	0.054	78.4	42.1	78.4	0.189
PSE07	37.0	0.058	96.0	90.0	96.5	0.125
PSE08	37.3	0.058	78.8	46.5	80.0	0.165
PSE09	26.5	0.041	90.7	78.1	97.5	0.107
PSE10	22.8	0.036	83.7	60.1	83.2	0.175
PSE11	20.6	0.032	80.0	50.0	80.0	0.210
PS02	15.2	0.024	88.4	73.5	88.4	0.150
PS03	45.1	0.070	92.6	85.1	97.5	0.117
PS04	38.2	0.060	78.7	42.9	78.5	0.178
PS05	19.5	0.030	92.8	85.4	96.0	0.130
PS06	34.0	0.053	93.8	89.4	97.5	0.126
PS07	20.1	0.031	92.8	85.2	97.5	0.118
PS08	71.4	0.112	84.1	58.8	83.0	0.174
PS09	34.8	0.054	87.6	70.9	90.0	0.125
PS10	33.6	0.053	73.2	23.9	73.4	0.177
PS11	34.7	0.054	78.5	47.1	80.3	0.172
PS12	98.0	0.153	70.0	9.9	69.0	0.233
PS13	41.9	0.065	73.9	25.0	74.3	0.149
At RDF-C	658.4	1.029		57.2%		•

Type IIA Storm Pattern (15 m interval)

Pine Creek Drainage Basin Colorado Springs, CO

	Sto	rm Distributi	on		Storm Distribution (cont.)			
Time	Type IIA		005-yr	Time	Type IIA		005-yr	
(h)	Distri.	100-yr (in)	(in)	(h)	Distri.	100-yr (in)	(in)	
0.00	0.0000	0.000	0.000	12.00	0.89	3.92	2.31	
0.25	0.0005	0.002	0.001	12.25	0.89	3.93	2.32	
0.50	0.0015	0.007	0.004	12.50	0.90	3.95	2.33	
0.75	0.0030	0.013	0.008	12.75	0.90	3.97	2.34	
1.00	0.0045	0.020	0.012	13.00	0.91	3.98	2.35	
1.25	0.0060	0.026	0.016	13.25	0.91	4.00	2.36	
1.50	0.0080	0.035	0.021	13.50	0.91	4.01	2.37	
1.75	0.0100	0.044	0.026	13.75	0.91	4.03	2.38	
2.00	0.0120	0.053	0.031	14.00	0.92	4.04	2.39	
2.25	0.0143	0.063	0.037	14.25	0.92	4.05	2.39	
2.50	0.0165	0.073	0.043	14.50	0.92	4.07	2.40	
2.75	0.0188	0.083	0.049	14.75	0.93	4.08	2.41	
3.00	0.0210	0.092	0.055	15.00	0.93	4.09	2.42	
3.25	0.0233	0.103	0.061	15.25	0.93	4.10	2.42	
3.50	0.0255	0.112	0.066	15.50	0.94	4.11	2.43	
3.75	0.0278	0.122	0.072	15.75	0.94	4.13	2.44	
4.00	0.0320	0.141	0.083	16.00	0.94	4.14	2.44	
4.25	0.0390	0.172	0.101	16.25	0.94	4.15	2.45	
4.50	0.0460	0.202	0.120	16.50	0.95	4.16	2.46	
4.75	0.0530	0.233	0.138	16.75	0.95	4.17	2.46	
5.00	0.0600	0.264	0.156	17.00	0.95	4.18	2.47	
5.25	0.0750	0.330	0.195	17.25	0.95	4.19	2.48	
5.50	0.1000	0.440	0.260	17.50	0.96	4.20	2.48	
5.75	0.4000	1.760	1.040	17.75	0.96	4.21	2.49	
6.00	0.7000	3.080	1.820	18.00	0.96	4.22	2.50	
6.25	0.7250	3.190	1.885	18.25	0.96	4.24	2.50	
6.50	0.7500	3.300	1.950	18.50	0.97	4.25	2.51	
6.75	0.7650	3.366	1.989	18.75	0.97	4.26	2.52	
7.00	0.7800	3.432	2.028	19.00	0.97	4.27	2.52	
7.25	0.7900	3.476	2.054	19.25	0.97	4.28	2.53	
7.50	0.8000	3.520	2.080	19.50	0.98	4.29	2.54	
7.75	0.8100	3.564	2.106	19.75	0.98	4.30	2.54	
8.00	0.8200	3.608	2.132	20.00	0.98	4.31	2.55	
8.25	0.8250	3.630	2.145	20.25	0.98	4.32	2.55	
8.50	0.8300	3.652	2.158	20.50	0.98	4.32	2.55	
8.75	0.8350	3.674	2.171	20.75	0.98	4.33	2.56	
9.00	0.8400	3.696	2.184	21.00	0.99	4.33	2.56	
9.25	0.8450	3.718	2.197	21.25	0.99	4.34	2.56	
9.50	0.8500	3.740	2.210	21.50	0.99	4.35	2.57	
9.75	0.8550	3.762	2.223	21.75	0.99	4.35	2.57	
10.00	0.8600	3.784	2.236	22.00	0.99	4.36	2.57	
10.25	0.8638	3.801	2.246	22.25	0.99	4.36	2.58	
10.50	0.8675	3.817	2.256	22.50	0.99	4.37	2.58	
10.75	0.8713	3.834	2.265	22.75	0.99	4.37	2.58	
11.00	0.8750	3.850	2.275	23.00	1.00	4.38	2.59	
11.25	0.8788	3.867	2.285	23.25	1.00	4.38	2.59	
11.50	0.8825	3.883	2.295	23.50	1.00	4.39	2.59	
11.75	0.8863	3.900	2.304	23.75	1.00	4.39	2.60	
12.00	0.8900	3.916	2.314	24.00	1.00	4.40	2.60	



Project Su	urvey (5)]	Outlet Pipe	Rating (cfs)	WQ Ou	tlet (cfs)	Emergency S	pillway (cfs)	Outlet Rat	ing (cfs)	
Elev	Storage		HDS-5 Ch-1	HDS-5 Ch-3	Weir (3)	Orifice Plate	Evicting	Retrofit			
(ft)	(ac-ft)	Depth (ft)	Exst (1)	Bevel (2)	Retrofit	(4)	Existing	(6)	Existing	Retrofit	Comment
6865.82	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	
6867.0	0.0043	1.2	3.7	1.4	0.0	0.80	0.0	0.0	3.70	0.8	
6868.0	0.47	2.2	31.5	32.5	0.0	1.83	0.0	0.0	31.50	1.83	
6869.0	2.27	3.2	56.7	60.9	0.0	3.12	0.0	0.0	56.70	3.12	
6870.0	5.51	4.2	79.5	86.6	0.0	4.62	0.0	0.0	79.50	4.62	
6870.17	6.23	4.35	83.3	91.6	0.0	4.84	0.0	0.0	83.30	4.84	Stage at 1/2 WQCV
6871.0	9.71	5.2	100.1	110.0	0.0	6.29	0.0	0.0	100.10	6.29	
6871.59	12.46	5.77	119.4	132.2	0.0	7.36	0.0	0.0	119.40	7.36	Stage at WQCV
6872.0	14.40	6.2	118.5	131.2	0.0	8.02	0.0	0.0	118.50	8.02	
6872.11	14.95	6.29	129.4	143.8	0.0	8.18	0.0	0.0	129.40	8.18	Stage at WQCV*1.2
6873.0	19.34	7.2	135.1	150.4	41.8	9.33	0.0	0.0	135.10	51.13	
6874.0	24.46	8.2	150.1	167.7	129.6	10.43	0.0	0.0	150.10	140.02	
6875.0	29.76	9.2	163.5	183.5	245.2	11.41	0.0	0.0	163.50	163.50	
6876.0	35.24	10.2	175.6	197.8	382.9	12.31	0.0	0.0	175.60	175.60	
6877.0	40.89	11.2	186.7	210.8	539.8	13.14	0.0	0.0	186.70	186.70	
6878.0	46.73	12.2	196.7	222.8	713.7	13.92	0.0	0.0	196.70	196.70	
6879.0	52.73	13.2	206.1	233.9	903.0	14.66	0.0	0.0	206.10	206.10	
6880.0	58.92	14.2	214.9	244.3	1106.6	15.36	0.0	0.0	214.90	214.90	
6881.0	65.30	15.2	223.3	254.3	1323.6	16.03	0.0	0.0	223.30	223.30	
6881.55	68.90	15.7	227.8	259.6	1448.3	16.39	0.0	0.0	227.80	227.80	Existing Spillway Crest
6882.0	71.92	16.2	231.5	263.9	1553.1	16.67	121.5	0.0	353.00	231.50	
6883.0	78.80	17.2	239.7	273.4	1794.6	17.30	702.8	0.0	942.48	239.70	Raised Spillway (6)
6883.5	82.34	17.7	244.9	279.5	1919.6	17.59	1096.0	142.3	1340.95	387.24	
6884.0	85.87	18.2	248.2	283.0	2047.4	17.89	1543.5	402.5	1791.73	650.70	
6885.0	93.12	19.2	257.0	292.9	2311.1	18.47	2579.3	1138.4	2836.26	1395.44	
6886.0	100.56	20.2	266.3	303.2	2585.2	19.02	3778.4	2091.5	4044.68	2357.75	Top of Dam Embankment

Outlet Rating Curves - Retrofit Configuration #1 (Exst Outlet Pipe)

Notes: (1) 4' RCP (Chart 1 / square edge with headwall) S = 0.050 '/'

(2) 4' RCP (Chart 3 / beveled-ring edge with headwall) S = 0.050 '/'

- (3) Sharp crested weir, L = 15 ft (effective length)
- (4) 15 rows 6.33"x2.0" orifices
- (5) Assumes that Csprings datum is NGVD29 and project is NAVD88 (Project = CSprgs + 3.824')
- (6) Raised spillway crest 1.5'

Project Su	urvey (5)		Outlet Pipe	Rating (cfs)	WQ Ou	tlet (cfs)	Emergency S	pillway (cfs)	Outlet Rating (cfs)		
Elev	Storage		HDS-5 Ch-1	HDS-5 Ch-3	Weir (3)	Orifice Plate	Evicting	Retrofit			
(ft)	(ac-ft)	Depth (ft)	Exst (1)	Bevel (2)	Retrofit	(4)	Existing	(6)	Existing	Retrofit	Comment
6865.82	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	
6867.0	0.0043	1.2	3.7	1.4	0.0	0.80	0.0	0.0	3.70	0.8	
6868.0	0.47	2.2	31.5	32.5	0.0	1.83	0.0	0.0	31.50	1.83	
6869.0	2.27	3.2	56.7	60.9	0.0	3.12	0.0	0.0	56.70	3.12	
6870.0	5.51	4.2	79.5	86.6	0.0	4.62	0.0	0.0	79.50	4.62	
6870.17	6.23	4.35	83.3	91.6	0.0	4.84	0.0	0.0	83.30	4.84	Stage at 1/2 WQCV
6871.0	9.71	5.2	100.1	110.0	0.0	6.29	0.0	0.0	100.10	6.29	
6871.59	12.46	5.77	119.4	132.2	0.0	7.36	0.0	0.0	119.40	7.36	Stage at WQCV
6872.0	14.40	6.2	118.5	131.2	0.0	8.02	0.0	0.0	118.50	8.02	
6872.11	14.95	6.29	129.4	143.8	0.0	8.18	0.0	0.0	129.40	8.18	Stage at WQCV*1.2
6873.0	19.34	7.2	135.1	150.4	41.8	9.33	0.0	0.0	135.10	51.13	
6874.0	24.46	8.2	150.1	167.7	129.6	10.43	0.0	0.0	150.10	140.02	
6875.0	29.76	9.2	163.5	183.5	245.2	11.41	0.0	0.0	163.50	183.50	
6876.0	35.24	10.2	175.6	197.8	382.9	12.31	0.0	0.0	175.60	197.80	
6877.0	40.89	11.2	186.7	210.8	539.8	13.14	0.0	0.0	186.70	210.80	
6878.0	46.73	12.2	196.7	222.8	713.7	13.92	0.0	0.0	196.70	222.80	
6879.0	52.73	13.2	206.1	233.9	903.0	14.66	0.0	0.0	206.10	233.90	
6880.0	58.92	14.2	214.9	244.3	1106.6	15.36	0.0	0.0	214.90	244.30	
6881.0	65.30	15.2	223.3	254.3	1323.6	16.03	0.0	0.0	223.30	254.30	
6881.55	68.90	15.7	227.8	259.6	1448.3	16.39	0.0	0.0	227.80	259.60	Existing Spillway Crest
6882.0	71.92	16.2	231.5	263.9	1553.1	16.67	121.5	0.0	353.00	263.90	
6883.0	78.80	17.2	239.7	273.4	1794.6	17.30	702.8	0.0	942.48	273.40	Raised Spillway (6)
6883.5	82.34	17.7	244.9	279.5	1919.6	17.59	1096.0	142.3	1340.95	421.81	
6884.0	85.87	18.2	248.2	283.0	2047.4	17.89	1543.5	402.5	1791.73	685.50	
6885.0	93.12	19.2	257.0	292.9	2311.1	18.47	2579.3	1138.4	2836.26	1431.34	
6886.0	100.56	20.2	266.3	303.2	2585.2	19.02	3778.4	2091.5	4044.68	2394.65	Top of Dam Embankment

Outlet Rating Curves - Retrofit Configuration #2 (Beveled Headwall Outlet Pipe)

Notes: (1) 4' RCP (Chart 1 / square edge with headwall) S = 0.050 '/'

(2) 4' RCP (Chart 3 / beveled-ring edge with headwall) S = 0.050 '/'

- (3) Sharp crested weir, L = 15 ft (effective length)
- (4) 15 rows 6.33"x2.0" orifices
- (5) Assumes that Csprings datum is NGVD29 and project is NAVD88 (Project = CSprgs + 3.824')
- (6) Raised spillway crest 1.5'



Pine Creek HEC-HMS Schematic

Comparison of reservoir operations in Pine Creek South Fork

Description: Update survey of RDF-C reservoir area

Alternative 1: New water quality outlet w/ 1.45' raised spillway crest

Existing headwall conditions at pipe outlet

		JR Report				Revised HMS (no spillway)					
									Pond		
	Inflow	Outflow	Max		Inflow	Outflow	Max		Min Elev	Pond Max	Spilllway
RDF	(cfs)	(cfs)	Stored (af)	Max Stage	(cfs)	(cfs)	Stored (af)	Max Stage	(ft)	Elev (ft)	Elev (ft)
D	1073	99	44	110.7	1265	115	55.8	112.9	100.0	114.0	
С	1840	227	69	77.4	1865	233	72.8	82.1	65.8	86.0	81.55
В	506	247	14	82.9	509	250	14.3	83.2	71.2	88.0	

	Revis	ed HMS (w	ith exst spil	lway)	RDF-C WQ Retrofit Alt 1 w/ spillway					_
	Inflow	Outflow	Max		Inflow	Outflow	Max		Spilllway	
RDF	(cfs)	(cfs)	Stored (af)	Max Stage	(cfs)	(cfs)	Stored (af)	Max Stage	Elev (ft)	
D	1265	115	55.8	112.9	1265	115	55.8	112.9		
С	1865	315*	71.0	81.9	1865	344.5*	81.3	83.3	83.0	with initial 50% WQCV
В	509	266	16.9	84.5	558	282	19.5	85.7		

*51 min / 84 cfs / 3.4 af

*36 min / 85 cfs / 3.3 af

	RDF-C	Clogged (with exst spi	illway)	RDF-C	WQ Retrofit Alt 1 w/ Clogging				
	Inflow	Outflow	Max		Inflow	Outflow	Max		Spilllway	
RDF	(cfs)	(cfs)	Stored (af)	Max Stage	(cfs)	(cfs)	Stored (af)	Max Stage	Elev (ft)	
D	1265	115	55.8	112.9	1265	115	55.8	112.9		
С	1865	756	79.2	83.1	1865	439	86.2	84.0	83.0	with initial 50% WQCV
В	508	258	15.5	83.8	520	254	15.0	83.5		



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY ALBUQUERQUE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS Southern Colorado Regulatory Office 200 S. Santa Fe Avenue, Suite 301 Pueblo, Colorado 81003

February 1, 2012

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

Regulatory Division

SUBJECT: Action No. SPA-2012-00051, Retrofit of Regional Detention Facility "C", El Paso County, Colorado

George Cotton Tsiouvaras Simmons Holderness, Inc. 5690 DTC Blvd., Ste 345W Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111

Mr. Cotton:

We received of your e-mail dated January 31, 2012 concerning Retrofit of Regional Detention Facility "C", El Paso County, Colorado. We have assigned Action No. SPA-2012-00051 to this activity. To avoid delay, please include this number in all future correspondence concerning this project.

We have reviewed this project in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water. Under Section 404, the Corps regulates the discharge of dredged and fill material into waters of the United States (U.S.), including wetlands. Based on your description of the proposed work, and other information available to us, we have determined that the proposed project will involve activities subject to Section 404. Therefore, a Department of the Army permit is required.

We have determined that this project is authorized by Nationwide Permit No. 43 for Stormwater Management Facilities. A summary of this permit and the regional conditions for Colorado is e available on our website at <u>www.spa.usace.army.mil/reg/</u>. You are only authorized to conduct the work described in your submittal

Our review of this project also addressed its effects on threatened and endangered species and historic properties in accordance with general conditions 17 and 18. Based on the information provided, we have determined that this project will not affect any species listed as threatened or endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service within the permit area. We have also determined that this project will not affect historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places. However, please note that you are responsible for meeting the requirements of general condition 17 on endangered species and general condition 18 on historic properties.

This verification is valid until March 18, 2012, unless the nationwide permit is modified, suspended, revoked or reissued prior to that date. The Corps will issue a public notice when the nationwide permits are reissued. If you commence or are under contract to commence the authorized activity before the date that the relevant nationwide permit(s) is modified, reissued or revoked you will have twelve (12) months from the date of the modification, reissuance, or revocation of the nationwide permits to complete the activity under the present terms and conditions of the nationwide permits. Continued confirmation that an activity complies with the terms and conditions, and any changes to the nationwide permit, is the responsibility of the permittee.

You must allow representatives from this office to inspect the authorized activity at any time deemed necessary to ensure that it is being, or has been, accomplished in accordance with the terms and conditions of the nationwide permit.

You must sign and submit to us the enclosed certification that the work, including any required mitigation, was completed in compliance with the nationwide permit. You should submit your certification within 30 days of the completion of work.

This permit is not an approval of the project design features, nor does it imply that the construction is adequate for its intended purpose. This permit does not authorize any injury to property or invasion of rights or any infringement of Federal, state or local laws or regulations. You must possess the authority, including property rights, to undertake the proposed work.

If you have any questions concerning our regulatory program, please contact Joshua Carpenter at 719-543-6914 or by e-mail at joshua.g.carpenter@usace.army.mil. At your

convenience, please complete a Customer Service Survey on-line available at http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html.

Sincerely.

Van Truan Chief, Southern Colorado Regulatory Office

Certification of Compliance with Department of the Army Nationwide Permit

Action Number: SPA-2012-00051

Name of Permittee: Colorado Department of Transportation

Nationwide Permit: No. 43 for Stormwater Management Facilities

Upon completion of the activity authorized by this permit and any mitigation required by the permit, sign this certification and return it to the following address:

Van Truan U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Albuquerque District Southern Colorado Regulatory Office 200 S. Santa Fe Avenue, Suite 301 Pueblo, Colorado 81003

Please note that your permitted activity is subject to a compliance inspection by an U.S. Army Corps of Engineers representative. If you fail to comply with this permit, you are subject to permit suspension, modification, or revocation.

Please enclose photographs showing the completed project (if available).

I hereby certify that the work authorized by the above referenced permit has been completed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the said permit, and required mitigation was completed in accordance with the permit conditions.

Date Work Started

Date Work Completed

Date

Signature of Permittee

ENGINEERING



February 11, 2011

Mark S. Andrew CDOT Resident Engineer 1480 Quail Lake Loop Suite A Colorado Springs, CO 80906

Re: Briargate and Union Detention Pond Colorado Springs, CO



Dear Mark,

This is a follow up letter to the meeting on February 9, 2011, with City Engineering, City Streets Division and CDOT regarding CDOT's request to modify the outlet structure at the large detention pond at Union and Briargate. The City concurs with this request, which will allow CDOT to modify the outlet structure with the following commitments from CDOT:

- During the design process, the City will be involved in the decision making to ensure the design meets current City specifications, as well as accepted industry practices for BMP design. The design will be reviewed and accepted by both the City and CDOT prior to construction.
- The outlet structure will require maintenance at recommended intervals. CDOT will commit to maintaining the outlet structure for every other maintenance cycle. The maintenance cycle will be determined based on the features of the final design of the outlet structure. CDOT will use best design practices to minimize maintenance for both the City and CDOT.
- CDOT will provide better access to the outlet structure to ensure that maintenance equipment can access the site.



30 S. Nevada Avenue, Ste 401, M/C 410, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903 Tel 719-385-5907 Fax 719-385-5497

1

- CDOT will also honor all requirements to other regulatory parties such as US Fish and Wildlife Service, which may limit access to seasonal periods.
- CDOT to follow up with an Intergovernmental Agreement that will specify further details including maintenance commitments from CDOT once the final design is completed.

Sincerely idder

City Engineer

C: Tim Mitros, City of Colorado Springs Bard Lower, City Streets Division Dave Poling, CDOT R2 Program Engineer Yun Han, CDOT Project Engineer

LEGEND

DF'X'

35%

/ xx ----

XX 🗲

/ PM7

88.0

OF CURRENT STUDY XISTING STORM DRAIN EXISTING STORM DRAIN INLET EXISTING STORM DRAIN MANHOLE PROPOSED STORM DRAIN

RENT SUB-BASIN BOUNDARY

PROPOSED DETENTION FACILITY DETENTION FACILITY IDENTIFICATION

SIGNIFIES ON SITE DETENTION REQUIREMENT OF 35% OF Q100 DEVELOPED - Q100 UNDEVELOPED FOR ALL NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY EXCLUSIVE OF STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY WITHIN THE SUB-BASIN ANALYSIS POINT (AP XX)

DRAINAGE BASIN BOUNDARY

REVIOUS MAJOR DRAINAGE BASIN BOUNDARY (1988 DBPS)

BASIN IDENTIFICATION BASIN ACRES

EXISTING 10 FOOT CONTOUR EXISTING 2 FOOT CONTOUR PC 1 PINE CREEK STUDY REACH IDENTIFICATION KEYED NOTE REFERENCE

GENERAL PROPOSED DIRECTION OF DRAINAGE FLOW



Regional Detention Facility "C" Water Quality Retrofit

- 1. FUTURE STORM DRAINS SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE ONLY INTENDED TO INDICATE GENERAL LOCATIONS AND APPROXIMATE SIZES OF FUTURE FACILITIES. ACTUAL STORM DRAIN SIZES AND LOCATIONS SHALL BE DETERMINED WITH MORE DETAILED ANALYSIS AT THE TIME OF DETAILED DESIGN OF THE FACILITIES, IT IS LIKELY THAT ADDITIONAL FACILITIES NOT SHOWN ON THIS PLAN WILL BE REQUIRED.
- 2. PROPOSED DETENTION FACILITIES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE ONLY INTENDED TO INDICATE GENERAL LOCATIONS AND LAND AREA REQUIRED FOR THESE FACILITIES. ACTUAL LOCATION AND LAND AREA REQUIRED SHALL BE DETERMINED AT THE TIME OF DETAILED DESIGN OF THE FACILITIES.
- 3. EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE NOTEO, THIS PLAN SHALL NOT MODIFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF PREVIOUSLY APPROVED MASTER DEVELOPMENT DRAINAGE PLANS AND FINAL DRAINAGE REPORTS.
- 4. THE AREA ABOVE POWERS BOULEVARD SHOULD BE RE-EXAMINED AS MORE DETAIL ABOUT LAND PLANNING IS KNOWN. ADDITIONAL DETENTION FACILITIES LOCATED HIGHER IN THE WATERSHED SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.

KEYED NOTES:

/18\

F7

33.5

ESEARC

Cotton wood creek

DRAINAGE BASIN

2) SECTION OF PINE CREEK TO BE ELIMINATED.

CS3 34 0



(PC 5) LEAVE NATURAL WITH BED AND BANK STABILIZATION.

PC 6 LEAVE NATURAL WITH BED AND BANK STABILIZATION. PC 7 LEAVE NATURAL WITH BED AND BANK STABILIZATION.

** ACTUAL TREATMENT REQUIREMENT TO BE DETERMINED WITH FUTURE DETAILED HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS. - NATURAL CHANNEL WILL REQUIRE MONITORING TO VERIFY PERFORMANCE AFTER DEVELOPMENT OCCURS.

EXCEPT FOR THE REACHES NOTED ABOVE, PINE CREEK CHANNEL WILL BE BY-PASSED WITH STORM DRAIN CONVEYANCES AND ELIMINATED WITHIN THE STUDY AREA.

	୕ ଜୁଇମା ଅଲ୍ଲ W		
ONDITION TER PLAN	SIUDY		
	KETTLE CREESSI DRAWNAGE BASI	PN4 73.0 PN5 5	
		2 PN3 52 9 (PN3 52 9	PS2
PN7 49.7 C C IO'Rx10'S C	BC PN6		
PINE PN8 72.5 DF'F'		PS5 42.0	
PS10 24.4	(PS9) 81.8		PS4
PARKWAY	57.0 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	COTTON WO	OD CREEK
(FS8) 78.3		DRAINAGE	BASIN
	PARKWAY	ANALYSIS POINT DATA FULLY DEVELOPED CC ANALYSIS WATERSHED AREA Q5 Q1 POINT △ (acres) (sq-miles) (cfs) (c AP1 198 AP2 256 AP3 371 APDFG 467 APDFF 589 AP4 640 AP4 640 AP5 864	SUMMARY BASIN I.D. I.D. ONDITION CN1 00 POINT DESCRIPTION 03 CS1 04 TOTAL FLOW 10 CS1 10 CS1 10 CS1 10 CS1 10 CS1 10 CS1 10 CS2 10 TOTAL FLOW 10 CS4 11 TOTAL POND INFLOW 12 TOTAL FLOW 13 TOTAL FLOW 14 TOTAL POND INFLOW 15 TOTAL FLOW 16 TOTAL FLOW
		AP5A 1702 2.66 342 65 APDFD 301 0.47 464 10 AP6 378 0.59 247 4 AP7 422 0.66 349 6 AP7A 480 0.75 532 93 AP8 557 0.87 692 13 AP9 640 1.00 935 17 AP0FC 666 1.04 956 18 AP10 698 1.09 181 37	64 TOTAL FLOW F6 73 TOTAL FLOW F7 70 TOTAL FLOW PM1 31 TOTAL FLOW PM2 98 TOTAL FLOW PM3 32 TOTAL FLOW PM4 78 TOTAL FLOW PM5 40 TOTAL FLOW PM6 7 TOTAL FLOW PM7

IRFACE FLOW ~ ~ ~ ~ <u>AP24</u> NA 159 SURFACE FLOW NA 350 1 NA 350 1 NA 461 586 TOTAL FLOW NA 461 PIPE FLOW NA 125 SURFACE FLOW 4.43 1297 2809 TOTAL POND FLOW 488 1147 TOTAL FLOW TOTAL FLOW 120 TOTAL FLOW

REGIONAL DETENTION FACILITY DATA SUMMARY FULLY DEVELOPED CONDITION

FACILITY	PEAK (c	INFLOW (fs)	PEAK C	OUTFLOW	ESTIMAT STORAGE	ED PEAK E (ac-ft)
1.D.	Q5	Q100	Q5	Q100	V5	V100
A	102	275	5	9	4	11
B	233	506	159	247	5	14
C	956	1840	153	227	33	69
D	464	1073	57	99	16	41
E	307	724	177	265	7	19
F	269	578	170	239	4	18
G	770	1747	165	250	23	60
No. 1	1297	2809	488	1147	47	96

ANALYSIS POINTS NOTE: ANALYSIS POINTS CONTAINED IN THE HEC--1 MODEL AND IN THE ABOVE TABLE ARE SHOWN ON THE MAP WITHOUT THE PREFIX "AP."



Powers Bridge Project Page 40



GENERAL NOTES:

- 1. FUTURE STORM SEWERS SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE ONLY INTENDED TO INDICATE GENERAL LOCATIONS AND APPROXIMATE SIZES OF FUTURE FACILITIES. ACTUAL STORM SEWERS SIZES AND LOCATIONS SHALL BE DETERMINED WITH MORE DETAILED ANALYSIS AT THE TIME OF DETAILED DESIGN OF THE FACILITIES. IT IS LIKELY THAT ADDITIONAL FACILITIES NOT SHOWN ON THIS PLAN WILL BE REQUIRED.
- 2. PROPOSED DETENTION FACILITIES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE ONLY INTENDED TO INDICATE GENERAL LOCATIONS AND LAND AREA REQUIRED FOR THESE FACILITIES. ACTUAL LOCATION AND LAND AREA REQUIRED SHALL BE DETERMINED AT THE TIME OF DETAILED DESIGN OF THE FACILITIES.
- 3. EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE NOTED, THIS PLAN SHALL NOT MODIFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF PREVIOUSLY APPROVED MASTER DEVELOPMENT DRAINAGE PLANS AND FINAL DRAINAGE REPORTS.

KEYED NOTES:

- () SECTION OF PINE CREEK TO BE ELIMINATED.
- ② FLOW IS TO BE DIVERTED TO A STORM SEWER IN FREQUENT EVENTS AND IS TO BE DIVIDED BETWEEN THE STORM SEWER AND NATURAL CHANNEL IN LARGER EVENTS. 3 an emergency overflow/relief route should be planned across this site
- FROM THE LOW POINT OF TELSTAR DRIVE TO PINE CREEK.

REACH ID		DETENTION	WATERS	HED AREA	PEAK	NFLOW	PEAK C	UTFLOW	ESTIMATE	D PEAK	ADDITION	AL DATA
		FACILITY			(c	fs)	(c	fs)	STORAGE	(oc-ft)	PROPOSED	
(PC 1)	LEAVE NATURAL WITH ONE DROP/CONTROL STRUCTURE, (COMPLETE)	I.D.	(acres)	(sq. miles)	Q5	Q100	Q5 `	Q100	V5	V100	OWNERSHIP	STATUS
		A	70.4	0.11	86	222	5	9	3	9	PUBLIC	EXISTING
PC 2	LEAVE NATURAL WITH MINOR BED STABILIZATION AND MODIFICATIONS TO DF No. 1 RUNDOWN CHANNEL.	B	793.6	1.24	227	493	153	219	7	21	PUBLIC	EXISTING
		<u> </u>	659.2	1.03	929	1825	156	228	33	72	PUBLIC	PART. EXISTING
	LEAVE NATURAL WITH GRADE CONTROL STRUCTURES.	D1	204.8	0.32	229	611	64	89	5	19	PUBLIC	PROPOSED
		D2	64.0	0.10	131	269	45	61	3	8	PUBLIC	PROPOSED
	REGRADE TO PROVIDE MDE DEPRESSED AREA TO SERVE AS EMERGENCY RELIEF CHANNEL. CONSTRUCT 54"	ΕΕ	774.4	1.21	254	593	157	224	7	17	PUBLIC	EXISTING
	STORM DRAIN TO CONVEY 10D YEAR DESIGN FLOW. (COMPLETE)	<u> </u>	588.8	0.92	553	1401	152	220	18	56	PUBLIC	PROPOSED
		NE1	89.6	0.14	104	271	59	103	1	6	UNKNOWN	PROPOSED
PC 5	LEAVE NATURAL WITH GRADE CONTROL STRUCTURES.	NE2	108.8	0.17	120	324	67	127	2	7	UNKNOWN	PROPOSED
6000		NE6	12.8	0.02		45	8	15	0.3	1	PRIVATE	PROPOSED
400	LEAVE NATURAL WITH GRADE CONTROL STRUCTURES.	No. 1	2816.0	4.40	1153	2671	463	1156	40	86	PUBLIC	EXISTING
(DO T)		SF	102.4	0.16	110	296	92	130	0.1	4	PRIVATE	EXISTING
	LEAVE NATURAL WITH FREQUENT FLOWS CONVETED IN BY-PASS STORM SEWER.		44.8	0.07	88	188	21	28	2	5.7	PRIVATE	EXISTING
PC 8	LEAVE NATURAL. FREQUENT FLOWS CONVEYED IN BY-PASS STORM SEWER.											
PC 9	LEAVE NATURAL WITH SOME RESHAPING. FREQUENT FLOWS CONVEYED IN BY-PASS STORM SEWER.											
** ACTU/	AL TREATMENT REQUIREMENT TO BE DETERMINED WITH FUTURE DETAILED HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS.											
- NATURAL CHANNEL WILL REQUIRE MONITORING TO VERIFY PERFORMANCE AFTER DEVELOPMENT OCCURS.												
EXCEF	T FOR THE REACHES NOTED ABOVE, PINE CREEK CHANNEL WILL BE BY-PASSED WITH STORM DRAIN TYANCES AND ELIMINATED WITHIN THE STUDY AREA.											

PROPOSED TREATMENT FOR PINE CREEK CHANNEL:

REGIONAL DETENTION FACILITY DATA SUMMARY FULLY DEVELOPED CONDITION

ANIAL VOIC				0100	f
DOINT A	(apren)	LO ARCA	00		POINT DESCRIPTION
	204 8		171	270	
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	0.52	1 121	239	ELOW TO CHANNEL
E16	NA		4 74	160	FLOW TO STOPH SEVER
<u> </u>	256.0		101	100	TOTAL FLOW
	200.0	U.40	104	1 310	
E.J				95	TOTAL FLOW FROM CHANNEL
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	U.34	230	270	
<u> </u>	NA NA		80	3/0	FLOW TO CHANNEL
<u> </u>	NA NA		148	1/3	FLOW TO STURM SEWER
<u> </u>	NA NA		185	209	TOTAL FLOW
	NA 70 (194	<u>Zaa</u>	TOTAL FLOW
	38.4	0.06	41	314	TOTAL FLOW
<u>E8</u>	89.0	0.14	107	281	I IDIAL FLOW
<u> </u>	/6.8	0.12	81	224	I TOTAL FLOW
EIU	83.2	0.13	80	144	I TOTAL FLOW
ļ	84.0	0.10	198	345	TOTAL FLOW FROM PNETT & PNET2
<u> </u>	108.8	0.17	255	493	TOTAL FLOW
	518.4	0.81	4/0	1178	TOTAL FLOW TO RUNDOWN
	NA	NA	110	437	TOTAL FLOW FROM CHANNEL
4	659.2	1.03	166	309	TOTAL FLOW
<u></u>	819.2	1.28	159	276	TOTAL FLOW
<u>5A</u>	1651.2	2.58	313	531	TOTAL FLOW
6	326.4	0.51	236	413	TOTAL FLOW
<u>6A</u>	345.6	0.54	260	478	TOTAL FLOW
68	364.8	0.57	293	547	TOTAL FLOW
/	448.0	0.70	476	908	TOTAL FLOW
7A	499.2	0.78	637	1190	TUTAL FLOW
8	588.8	0.92	815	1569	TOTAL FLOW
9	627.2	0.98	900	1735	TOTAL FLOW
10	691.2	1.08	175	304	TOTAL FLOW
11	832.0	1.30	155	263	TOTAL FLOW
12	1875.2	2,93	372	899	TOTAL FLOW
13	1945.6	3.04	399	1017	TOTAL FLOW
14	/6.8	0.12	167	285	TOTAL FLOW
15	108.8	0.17	224	407	TOTAL FLOW
16	153.6	0.24	242	433	TOTAL FLOW
17	121.6	0.19	51	141	TOTAL FLOW
18	147.2	0.23	88	231	TOTAL FLOW
19	2246.4	3.51	609	1655	TOTAL FLOW
<u>19A</u>	2272.0	3.55	641	1721	TOTAL FLOW
20	2400.0	3.75	712	1943	TOTAL FLOW
21	2419.2	3.78	735	2007	TOTAL FLOW
22	172.8	0.27	161	337	TOTAL FLOW
225	NA	NA	0	77	SURFACE FLOW
<u>22P</u>	NA	NA	161	260	PIPE FLOW
23	198.4	0.31	<u>194</u>	331	TOTAL FLOW
235	NA	NA	0	33	SURFACE FLOW
23P	NA	NA	194	298	PIPE FLOW
24	236.8	0.37	274	490	TOTAL FLOW
245	NA	NA	0	140	SURFACE FLOW
24P	NA	NA	274	350	PIPE FLOW
25	294.4	0.46	421	581	TOTAL FLOW
25S	NA	NA	0	120	SURFACE FLOW
25P	NA	NA	421	461	PIPE FLOW
26	2816.0	4.40	463	1156	TOTAL FLOW
27	2860.8	4.47	466	1170	TOTAL FLOW
28	2918.4	4.56	563	1199	TOTAL FLOW

J·R ENGINEERING A Subsidiary of Westrian

4310 ArrowsWest Drive Colorado Springs, CO 80907 719--593-2593 • Fax: 719--528-6613 • www.jrengineering.com

<u>j</u>	(ocres)	(sg~miles)	(minutes)	(nours)		Q5	Q100
<u>CN1</u>	70.7	0.110	19.0	0.190	78.4	86	222
CN2	50.0	0.078	21.4	0.214	75.5	47	136
CN3	27.5	0.043	15.7	0.157	80.0	40	QR
CS1	33.9	0.053	181	0.181	73.6	31	
<u> </u>	45.0	0.000		0.101	/3.0	110	<u> </u>
	75.0	0.070		0.101	90.0	149	254
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	0.051	1/./	0.177	85.5	61	134
CS4	42.3	0.066	12.8	0.128	86.0	88	188
F1	76.0	0.119	20.8	0.208	78.3	89	233
F2	25.0	0.039	17.1	0 171	74.0	24	69
F.3	730	0 114	21.5	0.215	770	76	210
	70.0	0,114		0.215	77.0	10	210
<u> </u>	24.0	0.038	19.7	0,197	83.0	38	89
<u>F5</u>	41.0	0.064	12.1	0.121	89.0	99	199
F6	24.5	0.038	10.6	0.106	93.5	72	131
F7	33.5	0.052	13.7	0.137	90.5	83	164
PM1	34.5	0.054	20 3	0.203	78 5	<u>A1</u>	107
DH2	110.5	<u> </u>	71 0	0 710	20.0	40	107
<u> </u>	119.0	<u>V.10/</u>	<u></u>	0.310	00,0	49	192
PM3	3/.2	0.058	24.8	0.248	/1.0	23	77.
PM4	70.9	0.111	17.0	0.170	71.9	57	180
PM5	123.3	0.193	18.5	0.185	70.5	.86	286
PM6A	27.0	0.042	13.1	0.1.31	90.0	87	132
PMAR	22.2	0.036	11.5	0 115	080	76	170
017	60 0	0,000	75 7	<u> </u>	30.0	70	130
FM/	<u>00.0</u>	0:130	10.0	<u> </u>	10.3	66	191
rma	<u>8./</u>	0.014	10.0	0.100	98.0	30	51
PM9	43.5	0.068	14.6	0.146	83.5	78	176
PM10	31.0	0.048	11.8	0.118	.98.0	101	17.3
PM11	27.0	0.042	121	0 121	98 ñ	88	160
PN7	45.6			0 200	77.0	40	110
		<u> </u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u> </u>	<u></u>	40	113
PNO	23.1	0.036	12.5	0.125	88.5	54	110
PN9		0.110	21.9	0.219	70.5	44	152
PN11	53.4	0.083	19.4	0.194	79.0	67	170
PN12	64.6	0.101	22.2	0 222	71.0	47	142
PN13	20.1	0.045	24.1	0.241	64.0	<u></u>	40
DAH		0.040	49.6	0.196		<u> </u>	44
CIVIT-	44.0	0.069	10.0	0.100			112
PNE1	86.1	0.135	18.0	0.186	/8.0	104	271
PNE2	109.3	0.171	21.0	0.210	77.5	120	324
PNE3	8.1	0.013	14.3	0.143	87.0	18	-37
PNE4	48.9	0.076	15.8	0.158	77.5	60	159
PNE5	11.6	0.018	10.8	0108	66.5		22
DNICE	12.6	0.010	15.4	0.150	70 5		din din di Et
	12.0	0.020	12.4	0.134	/9.5		40
PINE /	00.8	0.103	17.5	0.1/5	/6.0	. /1	196
PNE8	26.5	0.041	15.7	0.157	81.0	40	97
PNE9	8,5	0.013	9.7	0.097	80.0	14	33
PNE10	36.7	0.057	22.8	0.228	69.3	20	7.3
PNF11	45.4	0.071	130	0130	06.5	144	251
DNICTO	16 7	0.07	47.6	- 0.100	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	E A	~~~~
	24 2	<u></u>		<u></u>			94
PNCIO DUCA	31.3	0.049	14.5	0.140	81.0	49	118
PINE14	13.]	0.020	13.4	0.134	/6.5	16	42
PS2	15.2	0.024	15.0	0.150	88.4		71
PS3	45.1	0.070	11.7	0.117	97.5	146	252
PS4	38.2	0.060	17.8	0.178	78.5	48	125
PS5	19.5	0.030	13.0	0.1.30	96.0	60	105
	34 0	0.053	17 6	<u> </u>	07 8		100
			11 0	-0.140			190
<u> </u>	<u>2V.1</u>	0.031	11.8	0.118	97.5	60	112
P58	71.4	0.112	17.4	0.174	83.0	118	274
PS9	34.8	0.054	12.5	0.125	90.0	87	171
PS10	33.6	0.053	17.7	0.177	73.4	30	90
PS11	34.7	0.054	17.2	0,172	80.3	49	121
PS12	98.0	0151	23 7	0 222	- <u>66</u> - +	52	180
Dei z		0.000					103
T-31J		<u> </u>		<u></u>	<u></u>	<u> </u>	123
<u> "351</u>	21.0	0.034	19.7	0.197	/4.5	20	59
PSE2	18.3	0.029	16.9	0.169	77.0	21	58
PSE3	49.9	0.078	17.1	0.171	79.6	68	171
PSE4	47.7	0.075	19.2	0.192	75.6	48	136
PSF5	30.2		191			77	00
	34 6	0.04/					100
	<u>4.0</u>	<u> </u>	18.9	0.189	/8.4	42	109
rSt/	<u>3/.0</u>	0.058	12.5	0.125	96.5	118	206
- PSE8	37.3	0.058	16.5	0.165	80.0	52	131
PSE9	26.5	0.041	10.7	0.107	97.5	86	148
PSE10	22.8	0.036	17.5	0.175	83.2	38	28
PSF11	20 6	- 0 0 20	21 0 1	7 216 1	80.0		
TOTAL			<u> </u>		<u> </u>	20	00
IVIAL	2317.0	4.000		L		I	
		-					

PINE CREEK DBPS AMENDMENT 3 BASIN MAP & MASTER PLAN JOB NO. 28716.11 DATE: 10/01/02 SHEET 1 OF 5

PINE CREEK DETENTION FACILITY "C"

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, COUNTY OF EL PASO, STATE OF COLORADO

GRADING AND EROSION CONTROL PLANS

JULY 1998

GENERAL NOTES:

- If shall be the responsibility of the contractor to verify the existence and location of all underground utilities on and adjacent to the site. The omission from or the inclusion of utility locations on the plans shall not to be construed as the non-existence of or a definite location of existing underground utilities.
- 2. THE CONTRACTOR WILL TAKE THE NECESSARY PRECAUTIONS TO PROTECT EXISTING UTILITIES. THE CONTINUE OF THE TAKE THE EXCESSION THEOROTIONS TO PROTECT EXPLANATION OF THE TABLE THEORY AND THE THEORY AND THE ADDRESS AND DEALERS AND DEALERS AND ANY SERVICE TO THIS OPERATION. ANY SERVICE DISKUPICK MILL BE REFAILED BY THE CONTRACTOR'S EXPENSE, AND ANY SERVICE DISKUPICK MILL BE SERVED BY THE CONTRACTOR'S EXPENSE, AND ANY SERVICE
- 3. OVERLOT GRADING SHALL BE COMPLETED TO A SUBGRADE TOLERANCE OF PLUS OR MINUS 0.2
- 4. CONTRACTOR SHALL OBTAIN COPIES OF THE SOLS REPORT FROM THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER AND KEPT ONSITE DURING ALL EARTHWORK OPERATIONS.
- 5. THE SHE SHALL BE STRIPPED A MINIMUM OF 0.5' BELOW EXISTING GRADE AND THE TOPSOIL STOCKPILED ON OR OFFSITE FOR REUSE.
- 6. MAXIMUM CUT/FILL SLOPES SHALL NOT EXCEED 3:1. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- 7. THE PRIMARY FUNCTION OF THIS FACILITY IS STORMWATER DETENTION. AS SUCH IT WILL BE EXPECTED TO ACT AS A DAM FOR PERIOD DURING AND FOLLOWING ANY MAJOR STORM. ANY USE OR ACTIVITY THAT WOULD COMPROMISE THIS FUNCTION SHOULD BE CAREFULLY CONTROLLED, I.E. USES THAT ENTAIL OBJECTS THAT COULD CLOG THE SPILLWAY OR COMPROMISE THE BERM OR OUTLET SPILLWAY AREA.
- 8. BENCHMARKS:
- 1. ²³ CUT SQUARE ON TOP OF CURB ON BRIARGATE PARKWAY APPROXIMATELY 300.²⁴ ENST OF THE INTERSECTION OF BRIARGATE PARKWAY AND LEXINGTON DRIVE. EL = 4794.71
- 2. THE SOUTH 1/4 CORNER OF SECTION 27 BEING A $3-1/4^{*}$ ALUMINUM CAP STAMPED L.S. 10956 APPROXIMATELY 2540' EAST OF THE EXISTING END OF CURB ON BRARGATE PARKWAY AND APPROXIMATELY 660' NORTH OF THE SAME. EL = 6025.58

EROSION CONTROL CRITERIA;

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED IN A MANNER THAT WILL PROTECT PROPERTIES AND PUBLIC FACILITIES FROM ADVERSE EFFECTS OF EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION AS A RESULT OF CONSTRUCTION AND EARTH ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE.

- 1. INSTALL ALL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES INDICATED ON THE EROSION CONTROL EROSION PLAN PRIOR TO ANY EARTHWORK DISTURBANCE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ADDITIONAL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES INCIDENTAL TO THE WORK.
- 2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CHECK ALL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES AFTER EVERY RAINFALL. ALL NECESSARY REPAIRS OR REPLACEMENT SHALL BE DONE IMMEDIATELY.
- 3. SEDIMENT TRAPPED BY CHECKDAMS, SEDIMENT BASINS AND SILT FENCES SHALL BE PERIODICALLY REMOVED AS NECESSARY TO ENSURE PROPER FUNCTION PROPER FUNCTION OF THESE MEASURES.
- 4. ALL NECESSARY EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES SHALL REMAIN IN PLACE AND MAINTAINED UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION POTENTIAL IS MITIGATED AND THE SITE DEEMED STABLE BY REVIEW AUTHORITIES. AT SUCH TIME THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE ALL EROSION CONTROL DEVICES, COLLECTED DEBRIS AND SEDIMENT FROM THE SITE AND AND DISPOSE OF ALL SUCH MATERIALS IN AN ACCEPTABLE MANNER.

1. 9 EACH - STRAW BALE FOR CHECK DAMS O \$4.00/BALE		\$ 108
3. 1440 LF SILT FENCE 0 \$1.00/LF		\$ 1440
4. 25% MAINTENANCE AND REPLACEMENT		\$ 387
5. 22.0 AC. OF RESEEDING O \$500.00/AC.		\$ 11000
	TOTAL	\$ 12935

AR ENCINEERING, LID. CANNOT AND DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT THE CONSTRUCTION COSTS WILL NOT VARY FROM THESE OPINIONS OR PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS. THESE OPINIONS REPRESENT OUR DEST JUDGEMENT AS A DESIGN PROFESSIONAL FAMILIAR WITH THE CONSTRUCTION Preliminary Drainage Report

Regional Detention Facility "C" Water Quality Retrofit



VICINITY MAP



ENGINEERING I

CIVIL ENGINEE

DEVELOPER:

WATER RESOU

GAS DEPT:

ELECTRIC DEP

TELEPHONE C

APPROVALS:

IF SUCH WORK IS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GRADING AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN, THE WORK WILL NOT BECOME A HAZARD TO UFE AND LIMB, ENDANGER ROPORTRY, OR ADVERSELY AFFECT THE SAFETY, USE, OR STABILITY OF A PUBLIC WAY, DRAINAGE CHANNEL, OR OTHER PROPERTY

PREPARED UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION FOR AND ON BEHALF OF JR ENGINEERING, LTD.

SHEET

TITLE SHEET DROP STRUCTURE



	L.P.47, LLC dba
	LA PLATA INVESTMENTS
	7150 CAMPUS DRIVE, SUITE 365
	COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80920
	MR. BOB INGELS (719) 260-7477
Ŀ	JR ENGINEERING, LTD.
	4935 NORTH 30TH STREET
	COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80918
	MR. FRANK TRIPI (719) 593-2593
INSION:	CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS
	101 W. COSTILLA STREET
	COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903
	MR. TIM MITROS (719) 385-5061
RCES:	
	WASTEWATER:
	CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS
	111 S. CASCADE AVENUE, SUITE 201
	COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903
	MR. JERRY VALLE (719) 448-8252
	WATED.
	CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS
	111 S. CASCADE AVENUE, SUITE 201
	COLORADO SPRINGS COLORADO 80903
	MRS. JANET KOSCIELSKI (719) 448-8253
	CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS
	101 5. CONEJOS STREET
	COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903
	MR. DAVE DEUTSCH (719) 668-3520
6	CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS
	7710 DURANT DRIVE
	COLGRADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80920
	MR. DAN GIECK (719) 668-4962
MPANY:	U.S. WEST COMMUNICATIONS
	(LOCATORS) (800) 922-1987

A.T.& T. (LOCATORS) (719) 635-3674

KYLE R. CAMPBELL, COLORADO P.E. 29794

THE OWNER WILL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS GRADING AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN.

OWNER OM

THIS GRADING PLAN IS FILED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 15-3-1503 (ENACIED AS 0HD. 82-56) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, 1980, AS AMENED. EROSION CONTROL IS REVEMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 4.8 OF THE DRAIMAGE CRITERIA MANUAL, OCTOBER 1991, LATEST REVISION.

CITY ENGINEER, CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS

12/4/98

11.10-98 DATE

11/12/98

IINULX	r	IN	D	ΕX
--------	---	----	---	----

GRADING PLAN & EROSION CONTROL PLAN

SHEET 1 OF 4 SHEET 2 & 3 OF 4 SHEET 4 OF 4

R PINE CREK DETENTION FACULITY C* Scale None REVISION BY DATE R PINE CREK DETENTION FACULITY C* Scale None REVISION BY DATE R PINE CREK DETENTION FACULITY C* Scale None REVISION BY None	t		the second se					
Image: Second and Second an	SH	PINE CREEK DETENTION FACILITY "C"	SCALE	NONE	NO. REVISION BY DATE		48 HOURS BEFORE YOU DIG,	
- CRADING AND EROSION CONTROL PLANS DES. BY TDS DES. BY TDS DES. BY TDS DES. BY <	R N		DATE	7/9/58		Tto	CALL UTILITY LOCATORS	UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THESE DRAWINGS ARE APPROVED BY
Q E B Ditty of coloredo Ditty of coloredo <thd< td=""><th>1</th><td>GRADING AND EROSION CONTROL PLANS</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>ווגוווכנו וווגי דיתי</td><td></td><td>THE APPROPRIATE REVIEWING</td></thd<>	1	GRADING AND EROSION CONTROL PLANS				ווגוווכנו וווגי דיתי		THE APPROPRIATE REVIEWING
The second secon			DES. BY	SOL		335 North 30th Street		APPROVES THEIR USE ONLY FOR
TITE SHEET	UF		CHK RV	RB		101 503-2503 • FAY (710) 528-6613		WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION.
DMN. BY JAC		TITLE SHEET					CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS DEPT OF UTHITIES	
	•		DWN. BY	JAC			GAS, ELECTRIC, WATER AND WASTEWATER	

Powers Bridge Project Page 42

8716.20





6.g.P ATED A UNTIL SUCH DRAMINGS THE APPRO AGENCIES, APPROVES THE PURPO OF UTU STEWATER 1-800-122-LOCA AN AN 面合 SCALE: CITY OF GAS, ço ·····) Engineering, Ltd. 455 North 30th Street Colorado Springs, Colorado 60919 (719) 533-2533 • P.XX (719) 528-6613 R LEGEND .0 85 - 6600 - EXISTING GROUND CONTOUR 7/5/ VF/ JRB ---- 6600 --- PROPOSED FINISHED CONTOUR SCALE DATE DES. BY CHK. BY DWN. BY 3503 × 6803.50 FG FINISHED GRADE SPOT ELEVATION -S-- APPROX. SILT FENCE LOCATION STRAW BALE CHECK DAM PLANS DIVERSION SWALE THE LOCATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES WHICH MIGHT BE CAUSED BY HIS FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. CON S PREPARED UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION FOR AND ON BEHALF OF JR ENGINEERING, LTD. AND 02 Z SHEET 3 OF 4 KYLE R. CAMPBELL, COLORADO POWERS Bridge Project 3 NO. 8716.20 Page 44 9812-8





Page 46



