

Thomas O. Isaacson, PE(RET.) & LS(RET.) . Fred C. Arfman, PE . Asa Nilsson-Weber, PE

February 5, 2014

Amy L. D. Niese, P.E. Senior Engineer, Hydrology Planning Department City of Albuquerque 600 2nd St NW

RE: Winrock Town Center Drainage Master Plan (J19/D058) Response to Comments

Dear Ms. Niese

Thank you for your comments from 11/07/14. I have responded to them in the following manner:

- 1. There seem to be some discrepancies in the Basin Summary Table.
 - A. For Basin 300, the flow in the Table is 120.3 cfs. The maximum flow for Basin 300 in Appendix C, Storm Drain Calculations is 81.40 cfs. Which is correct? Revise accordingly.

The correct flow is 120.2 cfs. The discharge from the H-Z Amendment is 120.4 cfs. It is slightly lower in this revision than in the reviewed DMP because the basin lines shifted some to allow the existing sotm drains to handle all of the flows. The storm drain calculations now have matching total flows.

B. For Basin 150, the flow in the Table labeled "Total 36" Discharge (Basin 150)" is 69.6 cfs. The maximum flow for Basin 150 in Appendix A is 43.60 cfs. Which is correct? Revise accordingly.

There was no corresponding basin in the previous studies. But Basin 150 and the associated storm drain were removed in this revision.

C. In the Table (in three locations) and on the Basin Map, the Basin 100 discharge size is labeled as 24 inch. Previous reports describe this as 36 inch. Please revise.

Done.

D. For Basin 600 in the Table, the flow is 18.4 cfs. The Comparison Flow in the Table is 135.6. The Comparison Flow is closer to yours. Revise accordingly.

The 135.6 cfs number was wrong. It is actually 18.4 cfs. This was corrected in the table.

- 2. On the Basin map additional information is needed.
 - A. Provide contours on the Basin Map.

Done.

B. Show all existing storm drains, manholes, and inlets. Label the size of all lines. Storm drains are missing near the theater, BJ's, the demolished hotel, and Toys R Us. Show the extents of what will be removed in the future.

I now have the current survey data. The existing storm drains that were identified are shown on the basin map. I have labeled storm drain sizes, and identified the lines that will be abandoned and/or removed.

C. If any existing storm drain will be below proposed development, the storm drain will be required to be removed ore relocated. Include a narrative regarding this.

I added a statement under the "Overall Requirements" catagory.

D. The Site Development Plan by Modulus Architects and a conceptual drainage plan by Huitt Zollars was submitted to the Uptown Review Team. Their site plan does not match Isaacson and Arfman's. Although the proposed development may be changing regularly, please include the most current layout in the report.

The area along the south side should now match the Huitt-Zollars and Modulus Architects plans.

- 3. For the Report Section, address the following:
 - A. What is happening with the flows in the southwest corner of the site that is the Department of Transportation Park and Ride? Is any of that flow coming onto the Winrock site from that site? Is any flow coming onto the site from surrounding roads?

There are existing inlets in the northeast corner of the DOT Park and Ride that captures the storm water from that parking area. It is slightly highr than the Winrock loop road, so no onsite flows enter the Park and Ride area.

B. Not all flows by Toys R us is sheet flowing to Indian School. There is a 60 inch storm drain/underground detention that discharges through a smaller storm drain. Investigate further.

That was shown on the new topo. I've labeled it on the Basin Map. It appears to capture flows from the Toys 'R' Us. I couldn't find any other info in the Hydrology library.

C. What will be repaved which will allow for more control of the drainage?

I added a paragraph in the Proposed Conditions section.

D. The existing flow in the report is for the site without any development. Provide a flow for the existing site with its current development. The flow from the Huitt Zollar report form September of 2011 that is 441.12 cfs is acceptable to reference or provide any analysis of your own. Include the entire site's total discharge and demonstrate that it is less than the current existing discharge.

The combined flow in this report is 440.1. I added this number to the Basin Summary table.

Sincerely,

Isaacson & Arfman, P.A.

Generière L. De

Genevieve L Donart, P.E.

GD/gld

| | | • |
|--|--|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |