

<b>CITY OF LAS VEGAS</b>		<b>DATE:</b>
<b>INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM</b>		December 8, 2021
<b>TO:</b> Land Development Services Department of Building & Safety		<b>FROM:</b> Albert Sung, P.E. Flood Control Project Engineer Department of Public Works
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Drainage Study for:	<b>COPIES TO:</b>
Skye Canyon Parcel 2.11		Westwood
<b>Cross Streets:</b>	SEC Shaumber Rd. & Skye Canyon Park Dr.	Century Communities Nevada, LLC
<b>File Number:</b>	F:\Depot\DSMemos\DS5519A.doc	Bart Anderson, P.E., DevCo
<b>Parcel Number:</b>	126-12-716-001, 126-12-314-082 and 126-12-713-010	CCRFCD
<b>Zoning Action:</b>	21-0473-TMP1	
<b>FEMA Flood Zone</b>	YES NO <b>X</b>	
<b>Proposed Storm Drain</b>	YES <b>X</b> NO	

HISTORY	DATE RECEIVED	DATE REVIEWED	COMMENTS	REVIEW FEES	FEES PAID Payment Trn #
1 <sup>st</sup> Submittal	11/11/2021	12/2/2021 & 12/8/2021	See Comments Below	\$400.00	4532885: \$400
<b>TOTAL FEES (LDDRS):</b>				<b>\$400.00</b>	----

**REMARKS:**

The Drainage Study for the subject project has been reviewed and:

	is approved subject to conformance to all City standards and the following conditions:
<b>X</b>	must be resubmitted or supplemented including the following:
	is conditionally approved subject to Clark County Regional Flood Control District concurrence.
	is conditionally approved subject to Clark County Public Works Department concurrence.

1. The site is adjacent to or crosses an existing or proposed *Clark County Regional Flood Control District* (CCRFCD) master planned facility. Therefore, CCRFCD concurrence is required prior to final approval of the drainage study.

Please note that effective March 15, 2019, the CCRFCD adopted new requirements for drainage study concurrence submittal. Follow the link below for specific guidance.

<http://gustfront.ccrfcd.org/LandDev/LandDev.aspx>

2. *Exhibit C3* was missing in Appendix A in the *Study*. Provide as such in the next submittal.
3. *Basin ID 2.11* has different acreage on Existing and Developed Exhibits. For example, on existing it shows 18.4 ac and in developed it shows 14.8 ac. Check these values.
4. The flow used in the WSPG model of the *South Arroyo Mainline* does not match with the flows summarized on Exhibit G, Ultimate Basin Map. Clarify the flow values modeled in the WSPG.
5. **Exhibit G:** The *Mainline Storm Drain Facility Summary* table does not match the described flows. For example, WC21 flow is listed as 174 cfs, yet Facility E1 states it conveys flow from WC21 and is stated as 191 cfs. Address and clarify in the next submittal.

6. On all the pertinent grading plans, it appears that the perimeter streets such as *Shaumber Road*, *Skye Canyon Park Drive* and *Egan Crest Drive* do not have any L-curb & gutter. Revise the grading plans to show the line works for the curb & gutter properly in the next submittal.
7. **Sheet G-2:** The driveway entrance at *Skye Canyon Park Drive* at the upstream side simply will not work. An estimate for the curb return is at about 10% slope which will not meet the ADA requirement for handicap ramp. Another point is that no offsite flow from a public street is allowed to enter the onsite development. Review and revise the entrance driveway and the subsequent onsite grading design accordingly.
8. **Sheet G-4 and Sheet G-5:** A *Construction Note Hexagon R2* calls for the removal of an existing access path to the regional facility to the south. Explain without the access path, how the regional facility is to be maintained in the future? Show all new maintenance access paths to the 50'-public drainage easement in the next submittal.
9. **Sheet G-5:** The flow line of the proposed swale runs right over the existing manhole of the facility coming out of Parcel 2.17. Move swale flowline away from any manhole structures.
10. **Sheet D-2:** In all detail sections showing 3-course solid grouted wall, specify clearly that they are 8"-thickness CMU wall.
11. **Sheet D-2:** Detail Sections 19/D-2 to 22/D-2 and 25/D-2, 26/D-2 all showed riprap swale to be constructed with the subject project. However, shouldn't the swale be part of the *Skye Canyon South Arroyo Storm Drain* project? In other words, should the riprap swale be shown as existing?  
  
If the riprap swale is something new, then an update to the *South Arroyo Storm Drain Study* must be submitted and approved prior to the final approval of the subject drainage study.
12. All pertinent Grading Plans: Show and identify all existing storm drain facilities in all perimeter streets and label with *City of Las Vegas* recorded drawing numbers.
13. All drainage easements must be public drainage easements to be privately maintained by the HOA and common lots to be labeled on the grading plans and to be dedicated as such in the final map.
14. The engineer must provide a table on the grading plans that shows a quantity estimate of all drainage improvements within Public Drainage Easements. All drainage improvements within Public Drainage Easements must be bonded and inspected.
15. Add a note in all pertinent sheets for the construction of all storm drain drop inlets per a newly adopted USDCCA Drawing No. 421 (Stormwater Quality Management Stamp and Sign Detail).
16. All proposed wrought iron fence must utilize RTC Uniform Standard Drawing 425.S1. Revise all pertinent construction notes and details accordingly.

**NOTE:** Please be advised that all land surface area disturbances over 1 acre or any area adjacent to a water way must submit to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection a "Notice of Intent" to discharge that certifies a stormwater pollution prevention plan has been developed and is maintained on site; for inclusion in the Stormwater General Permit No. NVR100000. A phased construction unit in a contiguous subdivision is considered under construction until all stripped or disturbed surface areas have been covered by paving, building construction or planting. For more information, including forms and applications see <http://ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/storm01.htm> or call (775) 687-9429.

**END OF REMARKS**  
HDR/AYS

T/R/S: T19S/R59E/12  
AREA F-12