

<b>CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM</b>		<b>DATE: DRAFT – STILL NEEDS WORK</b>  <b>December 22, 2021</b>
<b>TO:</b> Land Development Services Department of Building & Safety		<b>FROM:</b> Oh-Sang Kwon, P.E. Flood Control - Project Manager Department of Public Works
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Drainage Study for:	<b>COPIES TO:</b>
<b>Parcel 3 at Sunstone Phase 3</b>		Westwood
<b>Cross Streets:</b>	Sky Point Drive and Log Cabin Way	Northland, LLC
<b>File Number:</b>	F:\Depot\DSMemos\DS5530A.doc	Bart Anderson, P.E., DevCo
<b>Parcel Number:</b>	125-06-211-016	
<b>Zoning Action:</b>	21-0524-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	12/15/2021	12/21/2021	See Comments Below	\$400	\$400
<b>TOTAL FEES (LDDRS):</b>				<b>\$400</b>	<b>----</b>

**REMARKS: This Drainage Study does not meet the Minimum Standards and is Rejected.**

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.

**This Drainage Study requires an overall Quality Control Review prior to resubmittal. Flood Control requires a meeting for this project prior to the resubmittal.**

1. This study requires an overall quality control review prior to resubmitting. A meeting with Flood Control is required before resubmitting. The following comments are provided to assist in the review of the project and do not represent everything that needs to be addressed in this Study prior to resubmittal. A complete detailed review of this Study will be provided at the next submittal, as the condition of this Study did not allow for a full detailed review.

The following comments are provided to assist in the review of the project. Additional comments will be provided with the resubmittal of the Study and grading plans:

2. Provide a copy of the zoning/planning conditions associated with this site with the next submittal to verify compliance with conditions. *Flood Control* will not issue conditional approval of the drainage study without the associated zoning/planning conditions (issued by the *City Council*). Any associated conditions of approval that revise the site drainage parameters will require that the drainage study be revised and resubmitted.
3. .

4. **Exhibit E:** The basin delineation is not clear.
5. **Exhibit E:** It is unclear what is proposed with this study (phase 3) and what is existing. Provide clarification.
6. **Exhibit E:** ESKV1 and ESKV2 not shown on exhibit, however, are presented in flow summary table.
7. **Exhibit E:** The summary flow and prorated flow tables have the Q and 100 year switched. Clarify which values are the Q100 and which are the basin areas.
8. **Exhibit E:** Prorated flows for EAA1 add up to 75 cfs. The flow for EAA1 is 114 cfs. Prorated Flows for EAA3 add up to 92 cfs, should be 102 cfs. Prorated flows EAA4 add up to 18, should be 45 cfs.
9. **Exhibit E:** The flows for the hydraulic sections do not make sense. For example, hydraulic section 3-2 lists contributing basin EAA1(2b) and the section is calculated for 21 cfs. However, basin EAA1(2b) is nowhere near section 3-2 on the map and is only 11 cfs. Provide clarification of flows and overall quality control for hydraulic sections.
10. **Exhibit E:** The 2 interior street cross sections provided do not appear to be enough information to adequately check all finished floors. These are not a representation of the entire parcel flow or even a representation of the worst case scenario. Provide more hydraulic sections or clarify why the sections provided are representative of the entire parcel.
11. **Exhibit E:** E01 cross section on the map is not in the location that an emergency overflow would be. This location should be downstream of the inlet in the event the inlet is clogged.
12. It appears that all hydrologic information is referenced, the reference material provided has only some of the basin flows called out and indicated as referenced. Clarify where all the basin flows came from. No HEC-1 was provided even though that is discussed in the report.
13. The end of Venetian Brick Place on sheet G-8, the street just ends at a low point, there is no curb depression or conveyance to the swale that takes the flow offsite. Provide a curb opening or means to convey this flow out of the street. Additionally, the swale that conveys the street flow needs a hydraulic section to confirm depth and velocity for erosion requirements. Exhibit shows a cross section d4 but provides no information that this was actually analyzed.
14. WSPG's require a QC of inputs. For example, the WSPG for the SDDI#2 includes a 12.5' x 6.3' RCB when this system is 24" RCP and 18" RCP.

**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/PBJ

T/R/S: T19S/R60E/S06  
AREA G-06