From:	Abiel X. Carrillo
To:	"Scott Steffen"
Cc:	Kevin Patton (Kevin.Patton@PulteGroup.com); Cherne, Curtis
Subject:	Montecito West Units 1-4 - D09D005 - Stamp Date 5-20-2016
Date:	Wednesday, July 06, 2016 4:50:00 PM

Scott,

This email is being sent in lieu of an attached comment letter in order to expedite intermediate reviews. A reply to these comments via email will not be considered a resubmittal. Thanks for your patience, the review for the resubmittal/response will be significantly shorter.

Based upon information provided in your submittal received 5-20-2016, and the updated storm drain map received 6-21-2016, the above-mentioned Grading and Drainage Plan and Drainage Report cannot be approved for Preliminary Plat, Site Plan for Subdivision, or Grading Permit until the following items are addressed:

Clarify the numbering of the Development phases. The title of this report is Montecito Vistas Units 1-4, the Report for the previous Montecito Vistas development is Montecito Vistas Units 1 & 2, and the Plates within this report are titled Montecito Vistas Units 3-6. It appears that this report should be titled Montecito Vistas Units 3-6. The Plat calls them Units 1-4.

Show the phase limits on the Grading Plan; the sheet titles only approximate the quadrant limits. Add the phase/unit limits to the Storm Drain Network Map.

The Grading Plan should include a conceptual phasing plan to show interim facilities that will be needed. A detailed phasing plan can be produced prior to Grading Permit.

The AHYMO analysis routes Basin 9-D.1 completely through AP 9-D.1, but there appears to be a minor flowpath directing offsite flows from Basin 9-D.1 to the proposed de-siltation pond at the west end of Retablo Road. Is this a negligible contribution? If it is not, flows could be routed away from the stub.

Clarify in the report what the 4W Water Zone is.

It appears that the inlets that are in sump condition on Vista Luces will accept about half of their grate capacity which would account for the clogging factor required for

sump inlets. If that is not correct please address.

Rear lot ponding for first flush management is strongly discouraged. The report proposes to turn a wall bock 4-inches from the ground near the low point of the yard for the easternmost lots. It would be expected that several home owners would eventually fill in the 4 inches with landscaping or purposely to straight grade from the edge of the house pad to the invert of the block.

a. Considering the comment above, the spillway of the first flush pond should not drain to the adjacent development, the overflow would need to be routed to future right of way, or to an available storm drain (possibly surface flow between the two retaining walls to the inlet north of lot 19).

Clarify how the northeastern outfall channel ties to the Boca Negra Arroyo middle branch, it is described as a 455 long channel, but the alignment is not shown.

a. Does it get constructed with Unit 1/Unit 3?

b. The current FEMA FIRM shows that the Arroyo is a floodway, show the approximate limits of the floodway in relation to the construction of the channel. If grading for the channel will affect the floodway, a CLOMR could be triggered.

The Report needs to include an assessment of the Vista Vieja Roadway section's hydraulic capacity downstream. It appears that the first available inlets are at the Vista del Sol intersection.

a. It appears that the Vista Vieja roadway is intended to drain to the Boca Negra Dam, if that is the case, runoff from Vista Vieja from this project could be diverted through the subdivision.

). Page 8 of the report describes the capacity that is available in the Boca Negra Arroyo, and the benefit of having a time gap between the peak discharge of this subdivision and the farther reaches of the watershed. However, the flows eventually combine in the Boca Negra Dam. The report should address if the increase in

discharge proposed, although small (+3%) is consisted with the documentation for the Dam (does the benefit of the time gap extend to the Dam). Specifically, the 2014 Final Summary Report of the Boca Negra Dam, by Wilson & Co. should be included in the background materials that are researched for this report (I have a copy if you'd like to check it out).

.. The Open Space tracts are proposed to be graded to drain to the adjacent roadways. What will be proposed to control sediment, and to manage the concentrated flows across the pedestrian paths?

a. Are there opportunities to provide de-siltation areas, or to depress these tracts?

b. Are there significant impervious trails/areas within these tracts that need to be incorporated into the drainage model?

:. The design and layout of SDP5/IN13 should be planned to fully capture runoff from the open tract, as well as to control the inflow of sediment.

:. An approved ESC Plan will be required prior to approval for Grading Permit.

.. Minor Comments

a. Show matchlines on the grading plan

b. If available, please include the basin ID map for the developed condition AHYMO model, specifically, to assist in matching the channel numbering to the overall basin map. Alternatively, label the channel numbers on one of the exhibits.

c. Page 7 of the report and the storm drain map mentions a 108 cfs design flow rate for the outfall channel, but the Q in the table is 111.

Any question or if it helps to meet to clarify some of the comments that are actually questions just

let me know.

Abiel Carrillo, PE, CFM

Principal Engineer - Hydrology
Planning Department
Development Review Services Division
City of Albuquerque
505-924-3986
acarrillo@cabq.gov
600 2nd Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102