

# CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT – Development Review Services



June 1, 2015

Diane Hoelzer, P.E.  
**Mark Goodwin & Associates, P.A.**  
P.O. Box 90606  
Albuquerque, NM 87199

Richard J. Berry, Mayor

**RE: Los Diamantes Subdivision  
Drainage Report, and Grading and Drainage Plan  
Engineer's Stamp Date 3-24-2015 (File: N09D013)**

Dear Ms. Hoelzer:

Based upon the information provided in your submittal received 3-27-15, the above referenced plan cannot be approved for Preliminary Plat and Grading Permit until the following comments are addressed:

Conclusions from the meeting 3-11-15 were as follows:

- Per the meeting notes dated 3-11-15, the allowable discharge into the 30" stub at SDMH 16 (CPN 736782) is the difference between the upstream and downstream Q, or  $505\text{cfs} - 472\text{cfs} = 33\text{ cfs}$ . This value matches that shown on Exhibit 4, Master SD Basin Map, for basin DB16.
- Per the same meeting notes, the Q at 98<sup>th</sup> St. is noted as 569cfs. The difference between the upstream and downstream Q at MH 17 is  $569\text{cfs} - 505\text{cfs} = 64\text{cfs}$ . Exhibit 4 shows that DB20 (the roadway) discharges 19cfs, so 45 cfs is the allowable from DB9 (Exhibit 4).
- Per meeting notes, a storm drain in 98<sup>th</sup> was required.
- During the meeting we agreed that the street flows in Blake could be ignored due to the timing of the hydrograph.

Based on the above notes, revise the report to reflect the following:

- The total allowable developed discharge from this site, including Tract A is  $45\text{cfs (MH17)} + 33\text{cfs (MH16)} = \mathbf{78\text{ cfs}}$ .
- Based on a proration of area, Tract A is allowed  $78\text{cfs} * (5.67\text{ Ac} / 19.86\text{ Ac}) = \mathbf{23\text{ cfs}}$ . Areas were taken from the preliminary plat.
- The allowable discharge for this subdivision is  $78\text{cfs} - 23\text{cfs} = \mathbf{55\text{cfs}}$ . Per Exhibit 4, if 33cfs was intended to the existing stub, then the remaining 22cfs was intended to discharge to a storm drain in 98<sup>th</sup> St.

Comments:

1. Provide a plan to collect flows from developed Tract A and 98<sup>th</sup> St. roadway. CPN 736782 shows a stub at MH 17 that was intended to collect flows from DB9 and DB20. It is noted that there are inlets on 98<sup>th</sup> street near Blake at present.

2. It is acceptable to discharge more than the intended 33 cfs into the 30" stub. How is the discharge part of the rating curb calculated in AHYMO? Also show that the 72" SD between MH 16 and 17 has capacity.
3. The grated inlet in Gold dust way Cul-de-sac is not a COA standard. Provide standard inlets.
4. Show Pond Volume on the Plan.
5. If Tract A is intended to discharge into 98<sup>th</sup> St. in the undeveloped condition, a desilting pond should be shown on the grading plan. Contours show that the SE corner of Tract A is at same elevation as T.O. Curb but view from google earth shows it to be lower than T.O. Curb in that area. Please confirm survey is accurate.

If you have any questions, you can contact me at 924-3695.

Sincerely,



Rita Harmon, P.E.  
Senior Engineer, Planning Dept.  
Development Review Services

Orig: Drainage file  
c.pdf Addressee via Email