From: Carrillo, Abiel X.
To: "Giahi, Maryam D."
Subject: La Cuentista Tract B-2 - D10D002B
Date: Thursday, December 29, 2016 4:35:00 PM

Maryam,

This email is being sent in lieu of a letter attached. A reply to this email will not replace a resubmittal.

Based on the information provided in your submittal with stamp date 12-16-16, the above-referenced Drainage Report cannot be approved for Preliminary Plat until the following items are addressed:

1. A maintenance agreement and covenants will be required to be a part of the SIA. For now, the Infrastructure List just needs to include the requirement in the Notes section.

2. The 18" Diameter pipe on Page 3 on Line 9 of the infrastructure List should be 24" (the short segment from the inlet to the manhole) around the bend.

3. Show the intended crown to no crown transitions on the Grading Plan 9this can be deferred to Grading Permit).

4. The corner of Smoketree and Redroot is proposed to drain by setting the outer corner high. Will this fit with the future extension to the west? It should not be planned for the interim condition only, or the Developer would be responsible for reconstructing the corner to produce a standard, smooth transition to the west.

5. Show the proposed manhole information (at least proposed depths/inverts) on the Grading Plan.

6. The inlets just North of Cornsilk are Double Type "C". Since they are the most upstream inlets, they need to be Type "A", or a combination of a single Type "A" + Type "C". The downstream inlets can be Type "C", per the DPM.

7. Provide invert information for the existing inlets along Rosa Parks Rd, and the invert of the inlet pipes within Pond 1 on the Grading Plan.

8. Clarify on the Grading Plan how the Open Space area between blocks 1 and 4 will drain. Will it utilize the existing stub?

9. Provide elevation information for the interim Pill Box off of Redroot St. on the Grading Plan.

10. On Page 3 of the Report there is a minor discrepancy between the text and the table for the Pond MSWEL for the Ultimate Condition (when the pond is operating as a detention pond).

11. Show on the Grading Plan where the existing temporary storm drain cap is located.

12. What is the Max Surface Elevation of the Pond in the Interim Condition (under retention conditions).

13. The Grading Plan describes the interim conditions as described in Section 5.3 (Page 4) of the Report, where Pond 1 is a 10-day Retention Pond. A such, it is confusing to include elements of the Ultimate Conditions such as the Outflow Discharge rate of Pond 1, and the detention volume instead of the retention volume needed (which means that the pond needs to be larger?). When the interim condition is transformed into the Ultimate Condition, a new, separate Grading Plan should be completed. Alternatively, the Grading Plan should be developed for the Interim Plan AND a Final Plan since you are trying to get approval for both scenarios depending on the Construction schedule of offsite improvements.

14. Clarify the Ultimate, Developed and Interim Conditions in the exhibits.

    a. In the Ultimate Condition, Basin 201 is built out. So show the conceptual layout that is known so far on Plate 1.

    b. Are these statements correct (just to make sure I understand the sections of the report):

        i. In the "Developed Condition", Tract B-2 is developed and the Outfall through La Cuentista Phase II is available. The Pond then needs to be a detention pond with the smaller footprint.

        ii. In the "Interim Condition", Tract B-2 is developed and the Outfall through La Cuentista Phase II is NOT available. The Pond then needs to be a retention Pond with the footprint shown on Plate 1.

        iii. In the "Ultimate Condition", Tract B in its entirety is developed and the Outfall through La Cuentista II is available. The Pond then needs to be a detention Pond with the footprint shown on Plate 1.

15. Also, just to clarify, these comments are specific to Preliminary Plat, although some of these comments would apply to the review for Grading Permit, no grading is allowed on this site until approval for Grading is secured.

16. As previously agreed, the wall heights are higher than the Sector Plan guidelines because it does appear that it is necessary to improve tie ins. The interior walls were designed higher, and the outer walls are held closer to the Sector Plan guidelines. As noted in the Sector Plan, these are variances that can be approved by Hydrology (no need to respond to this comment).

Thanks,

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