

<b>CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM</b>			<b>DATE:</b>  January 25, 2022
<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>Area 15 – Offsite Lots</b>		<b>COPIES TO:</b> Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
<b>Cross Streets:</b>	SWC of Rancho Drive & Meade Avenue		Fisher Brothers Las Vegas, LLC
<b>File Number:</b>	F:\Depot\DSMemos\DS5538A.doc		Bart Anderson, P.E., DevCo
<b>Parcel Number:</b>	Portion of 162-08-702-001; 162-08-303-015 to -018 & 162-08-303-033		CCRFCD
<b>Zoning Action:</b>	SDR		
<b>FEMA Flood Zone</b>	YES	NO	<b>X</b>
<b>Proposed Storm Drain</b>	YES	NO	<b>X</b>

HISTORY	DATE RECEIVED	DATE REVIEWED	COMMENTS	REVIEW FEES	FEES PAID Payment Trn #
1 <sup>st</sup> Submittal (Paid on 1/11/2022)	12/28/2021 & 1/11/2022	1/25/2022	See Comments Below	\$400.00	4603848: \$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. Provide a copy of the zoning/planning conditions associated with this site (**SDR & SUP etc**) 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.
2. 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>

3. On the General Notes Sheet of both improvement plans for *Meade Parking Lot* and *Area 15 Event Lot*, it appears that the Stormwater Management general notes are missing. Provide as such in the next submittal.

**Meade Parking Lot:**

4. Comparing **PRO-2** (Onsite Proposed Condition Drainage Map) and **Sheet C3.01** (Grading Plan): There is a flow arrow in **PRO-2** indicating the parking lot discharging at the mid-point in *Rigel Avenue*. However, the subject grading plan doesn't show the proposed parking lot draining out at this point. Address and revise accordingly in the next submittal.
5. Explain clearly how the 100-year flow of the proposed parking lot drain? It appears that the 100-year flow of the site drains through the BMP swale. It'll be a dilemma because we'll allow riprap if it is a BMP but we'll require concrete lined if it is a 100-year channel. Review and revise to separate the two functions in the next submittal.
6. Per **PRO-2**, *Basin OFF5* does not impact the subject site, explain why a concrete channel is proposed along the west boundary of the parking lot, it seems unnecessary?
7. If the concrete channel stays in the next submittal, provide FL at regular intervals in the channel.
8. At the northwest corner, how can riprap be proposed through concrete sidewalk? Provide sidewalk underdrain instead.
9. Is the riprap swale along the southern boundary of the parking lot part of the BMP? It doesn't appear that any part of the parking lot drains to this swale at all, therefore it is not clear what function this riprap swale serve? Address and resolve in the next submittal.

**Area 15 Event Lot Expansion:**

10. Comparing **PRO-2** (Onsite Proposed Condition Drainage Map) and **Sheet C3.01** (Grading Plan): There is a flow arrow in **PRO-2** indicating portion of the parking lot discharge at the northwest corner of the site. However, the subject grading plan doesn't show likewise. Address and revise accordingly.
11. Same comment as Comment #5 above. Review and resolve in the next submittal.
12. Address what is the 100-year flow depth in *Rancho Drive*. If it is beyond the sidewalk, the proposed wall along *Rancho Drive* must be 8"-CMU solid grouted to three courses minimum. Revise the pertinent construction note and sections and detail call out accordingly.
13. Provide a note on all grading plans of the two parking lots: Post-Construction BMPs (PCBMPs) / Control Measures noted on the Grading Plans are mandatory permanent regulatory stormwater pollution controls. These PCBMPs must be installed per the approved plans and must be permanently maintained.

**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**  
ays

T/R/S: T21S/R61E/08  
AREA R-08