MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT

2480 W. 26th Ave Suite 156-B | Denver, CO 80211
TEL 303 455 6277 | FAX 303 455 7880

www.mhfd.org

MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)

MHFD Referral Review Comments

For Internal MHFD Use Only.	
MEP ID:	107610
Submittal ID:	10004662
MEP Phase:	Referral

Date: April 16, 2020 Ware Malcomb response to comments 6-1-2020

To: **Craig Perl**
Via email

RE: MHFD Referral Review Comments

Project Name:	**Stafford Logistics Center (RSN 1343186)**
Drainageway:	**Sand Creek Right Bank Tributary**

This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to maintenance eligibility of major drainage features, in this case:

- Detention Pond A and Tributary

We have the following comments to offer:

1. The Sand Creek Right Bank Tributary OSP (2016) identifies reach 14 (upstream of the master planned regional detention basin Pond) as having a 100-yr flow of 966 cfs. The Geomorphic Conceptual Design Report uses 100-yr flows that are similar, but inconsistent with this published flow. Please use the published flow for this reach when designing the channel.
   This has been Discussed and agreed upon with MHFD per converstion with CoA as well. Note added to drainage report stating the a flow of 966 cfs has been used for design rather than the flows shown in the Geomorphology report addendum.
2. The channel design appears to be based on regional curves. While useful for conceptual level design, a more detailed analysis would be required to refine the channel sections moving forward.
   Also discussed in the same meeting was the fact that WWE used regional curves only to develop the bankful condition/elevation. Master Drainage Report text revised accordingly.
   The comment response from Ware Malcomb for the Master Drainage Report addressed a question regarding the use of Rational Method for existing conditions modeling by stating “CUHP SWMM were used for existing conditions. Report text updated.” However, the updated report indicates that “StreamStats and Regional Curves” were used for analysis of existing conditions. This information was used in design of channel geometry and should not be misconstrued to be the analysis of existing conditions for the entire site. Please provide the CUHP and SWMM modeling of existing conditions.
   This was a language misunderstanding on WM’s part. The OSP was used for all aspects of channel and pond development with the exception of the regional curves mentioned above. MDR text has been revised.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Morgan Lynch, P.E., CFM
Project Manager, Watershed Services
Mile High Flood District