



## civilsolutionsgroup inc.

January 20, 2023

To: Albert Sung, P.E., Flood Control Project Engineer  
From: Civil Solutions Group

Subject: Review Responses to Technical Drainage Study for Stonebridge Stake Center

Albert,

The following responses are in regard to the initial Drainage Study comments. The date of review for these comments was December 28, 2022.

For clarity, the comment made in the Drainage Study Review are shown below in italics. Our response follows in the standard font.

*1 Provide a copy of the zoning/planning conditions associated with this site (22-0612-CRG1) 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.*

A copy of the 22-0612-CRG1 conditional approval memo is attached with this submittal.

*2. Standard Form 1: The subject study and the improvement plans all show the at the name of the project tis Stonebridge Stake Center, not Stonebridge Meetinghouse. Revise the "Name of Development" in Standard Form 1 to Stonebridge Stake Center.*

Standard Form 1 has been revised. Please note that the project engineer of record has changed to Mr. Dayton Law, PE. The form has been updated to include his contact information and approval.

*3. Standard Form 1: Revise the assessor parcel number (APN) to 164-03-115-001.*

Standard Form 1 has been revised.

*4. Technical Drainage Study Sections 4.2 to 4.5 refer to the Proosed Conditions map as Exhibit G when it appears to be Exhibit E. Provide a quality check on cross reference stated in the report.*

The proposed condition exhibit is labeled as Exhibit E. The references in the report have been updated.

*5. Exhibit D – Existing Condition Map: Provide proper drainage basin delineation.*

Exhibit D has been revised to delineate the existing condition on-site hydrologic sub-basins. The site existing condition hydrology has been updated to reflect this sub-basin delineation.



## civilsolutionsgroup inc.

6. *Exhibit D – Existing Conditions Map: Properly label existing flood control facilities. For example, identify and label the size of the existing storm drain exiting flow from the site to Crossbridge Drive and existing drop inlet on Crossbridge Drive.*

Existing storm drain facilities adjacent to the site have been labeled on Exhibit D and Exhibit E for reference.

7. *Exhibit D – Existing Conditions map: Clarify what are the two dashed lines going across the site from west to east as well as the box in the middle of site.*

The dashed lines crossing the site represent an existing communication easement. The lines have been removed from the exhibits. The box represented a proposed site feature that was on an errant layer. The box has been removed.

8. *Exhibits D & E: The texts are too small and illegible. The engineer should use full size sheets (24" x 36") in the next submittal.*

The exhibits have been plotted on full size sheets.

9. *Exhibits D & E: Provide a complete drainage basins summary table that includes basin acreage.*

Basin summary tables have been included on the updated exhibits.

10. *Exhibit E – Proposed Conditions Map: Provide an overall quality check on the drainage map. For example, there are two cross sections labeled 1.1 and area flow for Area 5 is labeled Area 3 when it should be Area 5.*

Exhibit E has been edited accordingly.

11. *Exhibit E – Proposed Conditions Map: Provide a summary table of hydraulic parameters for cross sections been analyzed.*

A table showing the Cross Section parameters has been added to the Exhibit.

12. *Exhibit E - Proposed Condition Map: Cross Sections 2 and 6.3 are analyzed on StormCAD but do not appear on the exhibit. Provide a thorough check on the quality of the maps.*

Exhibit E has been modified. The section analyses in the report reflect the location as indicated on the exhibit.

13. *Update No. 4 to the Conceptual Drainage Study for Summerlin Village 24 is listed in the study but not found in the appendices.*

Reference material from this Conceptual Drainage Study is included in Appendix H of the updated Technical Drainage Report for this site.

14. *Storm CAD model: Cross section SB4 is analyzed for 6.48 cfs, should be 0.43 cfs.*



## civilsolutionsgroup inc.

The section for SB4 has been updated in the attached report. The flow analyzed represents the flow from the proposed site that enters Stonebridge Drive (0.89 cfs).

*15. Sheet CG-01: Storm drain connecting to DI#2 to SDMH#2 has 20.42ft length however the StormCAD profile shows 24.12ft. Revise accordingly.*

The proposed hydraulic pipe analysis has been checked with the design profile and elevations for the site storm drain system.

*16. Sheet CG-02: Storm drain connection DI#3 to DI34 has 10.08ft length and 20.3% slope however the StormCAD profile shows 13.44ft an 19.90%. Revise accordingly.*

The proposed hydraulic pipe analysis has been checked with the design profile and elevations for the site storm drain system.

*17. Sheet CG-02: There is a callout for SDMH#4 however the StormCAD only lists three manholes. Address and resolve in the next submittal.*

SDMH #4 has been included in the hydraulic pipe model, analysis and profile exhibits.

*18. Sheet CG-02: DI#5 appears to be in a local sump condition. Address during a worst-case scenario when the inlet is totally clogged, is there any emergency overflow path for the drainage to discharge safely. Note that the maximum ponding depth cannot exceed 12".*

The grading around DI#5 has been adjusted to bring the grate elevation closer the existing elevations of the adjacent roadway and its improvements.

*19. In the next submittal, provide a description of all proposed drop inlets in sump condition (if there are any other than DI#5) on whether emergency overflow path and maximum ponding depth are provided.*

A table depicting the inlets in sump condition is provided in the updated report.

*20. Sheet CG-01 and Sheet CG-02: In the two driveway entrances, provide flow line elevation (FL xxxx.xx) at both sides of the cross valley gutter of the stie entrance to verify the jump is appropriately elevated 6 inches above the 100-YR water surface elevation.*

The driveway entrances continue to climb as the enter the site. No hump immediate adjacent to the entrance is required. Please refer to the updated grading plans.

*21. In the grading plans, a "SUMP" elevation is shown along with "RIM" and "INV" elevation at all the Dis and SDMHs. It is not understood what the "SUMP" elevation is about. Eliminate the "SUMP" callouts in the next submittal.*

The "SUMP" referenced refers to the floor elevation of the structure. We have removed this from the structure labels.

*22. In the grading plans, some detail sections referenced Sheet CD-09. However, Sheet CD-09 was not provided in the last submittal.*



## civilsolutionsgroup inc.

Detail Sections should reference CD-08. They have been revised accordingly.

*23. In Las Vegas Valley area, the conventional callout for Top of Curb elevation is TC. Change all the TBC callouts to TC in the next submittal.*

The top of curb callouts have been revised to use the TC abbreviation.

*24. On the grading plans, show and identify an existing storm drain system in Crossbridge Drive and label with pipe size and City of Las Vegas recorded plan number. Identify all pertinent existing drop inlets and with size information.*

The existing storm drain features are labeled on the grading plans.

*25. Provide a note on all grading plans: All onsite storm drain systems and the associated facilities are privately owned and to be privately maintained by the property owner.*

This general note has been added to the grading plans.

*26. Provide BMP design calculations and BMP facilities such as landscape swales or sand/oil interceptors for the proposed site parking lot and LIDs per Section 1500 from the Clark County Regional Flood Control District's Hydrologic Criteria and Drainage Design Manual.*

Oil/sediment "snouts" have been called for at all three of the inlets collecting the parking lot/drive features.

*27. Grading Plans: Provide BMP locations, types and sizes for parking lot and LIDs.*

Oil/sediment "snouts" have been called for at all three of the inlets collecting the parking lot/drive features.

*28. Provide a note on all grading plans: 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.*

The general note has been added to the sheets.

Please feel free to contact me with questions as needed.

Sincerely,

**DAYTON LAW, PE, MBA, COO**

MOBILE [435.890.4190](tel:435.890.4190)

OFFICE [801.874.1432](tel:801.874.1432) EXT 711 (UTAH VALLEY)

[dlaw@civilsolutionsgroup.net](mailto:dlaw@civilsolutionsgroup.net)

<b>CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM</b>		<b>DATE:</b> December 28, 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>COPIES TO:</b>
Stonebridge Stake Center		Civil Solutions Group, Inc.
<b>Cross Streets:</b>	NWQ of Sky Vista Drive & Crossbridge Drive	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints c/o Trio Design
<b>File Number:</b>	F:\Depot\DSMemos\DS5633A.doc	Bart Anderson, P.E., DevCo
<b>Parcel Number:</b>	164-03-115-001	
<b>Zoning Action:</b>	22-0612-CRG1	
<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	12/5/2022 (Paid on 12/14/2022)	12/28/2022	See Comments Below	\$400.00	5073984: \$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 (**22-0612-CRG1**) 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. **Standard Form 1:** The subject study and the improvement plans all show that the name of the project is **Stonebridge Stake Center**, not Stonebridge Meetinghouse. Revise the "*Name of Development*" in Standard Form 1 to **Stonebridge Stake Center**.
3. **Standard Form 1:** Revise the assessor parcel number (APN) to 164-03-115-001.
4. **Technical Drainage Study Sections 4.2 to 4.5** refer to the Proposed Conditions map as *Exhibit G* when it appears to be *Exhibit E*. Provide a quality check on cross reference stated in the report.
5. **Exhibit D – Existing Conditions Map:** Provide proper drainage basin delineation.
6. **Exhibit D – Existing Conditions Map:** Properly label existing flood control facilities. For example, identify and label the size of the existing storm drain exiting flow from the site to *Crossbridge Drive* and existing drop inlet on *Crossbridge Drive*.

7. **Exhibit D – Existing Conditions Map:** Clarify what are the two dashed lines going across the site from west to east as well as the box in the middle of site.
8. **Exhibits D & E:** The texts are too small and illegible. The engineer should use full size sheets (24"x36") in the next submittal.
9. **Exhibits D & E:** Provide a complete drainage basins summary table that includes basin acreage.
10. **Exhibit E – Proposed Conditions Map:** Provide an overall quality check on the drainage map. For example, there are two cross sections labeled **1.1** and area flow for Area 5 is labeled Area 3 when it should be Area 5.
11. **Exhibit E – Proposed Conditions Map:** Provide a summary table of hydraulic parameters for cross sections been analyzed.
12. **Exhibit E – Proposed Conditions Map:** *Cross Sections 2 and 6.3* are analyzed on StormCAD but do not appear on the exhibit. Provide a thorough check on the quality of the maps.
13. *Update No. 4 to the Conceptual Drainage Study for Summerlin Village 24* is listed in the study but not found in the appendices.
14. **Storm CAD model:** Cross section SB4 is analyzed for 6.48 cfs, should be 0.43 cfs.
15. **Sheet CG-01:** Storm drain connecting DI#2 to SDMH#2 has 20.42ft length however the StormCAD profile shows 24.12ft. Revise accordingly.
16. **Sheet CG-02:** Storm drain connecting DI#3 to DI#4 has 10.08ft length and 20.3% slope however the StormCAD profile shows 13.44 ft and 19.90%. Revise accordingly.
17. **Sheet CG-02:** There is a callout for SDMH#4 however the StormCAD only lists three manholes. Address and resolve in the next submittal.
18. **Sheet CG-02:** DI#5 appears to be in a local sump condition. Address during a worst case scenario when the inlet is totally clogged, is there any emergency overflow path for the drainage to discharge safely. Note that the maximum ponding depth cannot exceed 12".
19. In the next submittal, provide a description of all proposed drop inlets in sump condition (if there are any other than DI#5) on whether emergency overflow path and maximum ponding depth are provided.
20. **Sheet CG-01 and Sheet CG-02:** In the two driveway entrances, provide flow line elevation (FL xxxx.xx) at both sides of the cross valley gutter of the site entrance to verify the hump is appropriately elevated 6 inches above the 100-YR water surface elevation.
21. In the grading plans, a "SUMP" elevation is shown along with "RIM" and "INV" elevations at all the DIs and SDMHs. It is not understood what this "SUMP" elevation is about. Eliminate the "SUMP" callouts in the next submittal.
22. In the grading plans, some detail sections referenced Sheet CD-09. However, Sheet CD-09 was not provided in the last submittal.
23. In Las Vegas Valley area, the conventional callout for Top of Curb elevation is TC. Change all the TBC callouts to TC in the next submittal.
24. On the grading plans, show and identify an existing storm drain system in *Crossbridge Drive* and label with pipe size and *City of Las Vegas* recorded plan number. Identify all pertinent existing drop inlets and with size information.
25. Provide a note on all grading plans: All onsite storm drain systems and the associated facilities are privately owned and to be privately maintain by the property owner.

26. Provide BMP design calculations and BMP facilities such as landscape swales or sand/oil interceptors for the proposed site parking lot and LIDs per *Section 1500* from the *Clark County Regional Flood Control District's Hydrologic Criteria and Drainage Design Manual*.
27. Grading Plans: Provide BMP locations, types and sizes for parking lot and LIDs.
28. Provide a note on all grading plans: 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**  
HDR/AYS

T/R/S: T21S/R59E/03  
AREA P-03



**LAS VEGAS  
CITY COUNCIL**

CAROLYN G. GOODMAN  
Mayor

BRIAN KNUDSEN  
Mayor Pro Tem

VICTORIA SEAMAN  
OLIVIA DIAZ

FRANCIS ALLEN-PALENSKE  
CEDRIC CREAR  
NANCY E. BRUNE

JORGE CERVANTES  
City Manager

DEPARTMENT OF  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

**SETH T. FLOYD**  
DIRECTOR

**CITY HALL**  
495 S. MAIN ST.  
3RD FLOOR  
LAS VEGAS, NV 89101  
702.229.6301 | VOICE  
702.464.2545 | FAX  
711 | TTY



cityoflasvegas  
lasvegasnevada.gov

**December 28, 2022**

R. Scott Lystrup  
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints  
50 East North Temple Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Salt Lake City, UT 84150

**RE: 22-0612-CRG1 - CITY REFERRAL GROUP**

Dear Applicant:

The City Referral Group at a regular meeting held on **December 28, 2022** **APPROVED** your request FOR A PROPOSED RELIGIOUS FACILITY on 5.89 acres located on the north side of Crossbridge Drive, approximately 1,341 feet south of the intersection of Sky Vista Drive and Crossbridge Drive (APN 164-03-115-001), P-C (Planned Community) Zone, Ward 2 (Seaman).

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

**Planning**

1. This approval shall be void two years from the date of final approval, unless exercised pursuant to the provisions of LVMC Title 19.16. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
2. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan date stamped 12/20/22 and landscape plan and building elevations, date stamped 11/14/22, except as amended by conditions herein.
3. All necessary building permits shall be obtained and final inspections shall be completed in compliance with Title 19 and all codes as required by the Department of Building and Safety.
4. These Conditions of Approval shall be affixed to the cover sheet of any plan set submitted for building permit.
5. A technical landscape plan, signed and sealed by a Registered Architect, Landscape Architect, Residential Designer or Civil Engineer, must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit. A permanent underground sprinkler system is required, and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner; the landscape plan shall include irrigation specifications. Installed landscaping shall not impede visibility of any traffic control device.

6. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.
7. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City Departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.

**Public Works**

8. Dedicate the appropriate right-of-way for any new left turn lanes proposed with this site prior to the issuance of permits for this site.
9. The sidewalk adjacent and driveways to this site shall meet Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) in accordance with code requirements of Title 13.56.040 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer concurrent with development of this site. Grant any Pedestrian Access Easement needed to complete this requirement.
10. Prior to the approval of construction drawings for this site, the Master Developer shall submit a landscaping plan for Crossbridge Drive that removes or modifies landscaping such that the new driveways meet Site Visibility Restriction Zone requirements. This landscape plan must meet the approval of the City Traffic Engineer.
11. Landscape and maintain all unimproved right-of-way adjacent to this site. All landscaping and private improvements installed with this project shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections.
12. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or submittal of any construction drawings, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Drainage Studies and approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site.

**22-0612-CRG1 - Page Three**  
**December 28, 2022**

This administrative action by the City Referral Group on December 28, 2022 is final unless a written appeal is filed with the Director of the Department of Planning within ten (10) days of the date of the City Referral Group's decision.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nicole Eddowes". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Nicole" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Eddowes".

Nicole Eddowes  
Community Development Coordinator  
Case Planning Division

NE:nl

c.c.:

Tim Hurley  
Brittany White Johnson  
4040 W. Daybreak Parkway  
South Jordan, UT 84009