

CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM		DATE: May 5, 2024	
TO: Land Development Services Department of Community Development - Building & Safety Division		FROM: Jefferson Torrecampo, P.E. Flood Control Engineering Associate Department of Public Works	
SUBJECT:	Drainage Study for:	COPIES TO: Kimley-Horn	
Durango and Grand Montecito		Greystone Nevada, LLC	
Cross Streets:	Grand Montecito Pkwy & Durango Dr	Bart Anderson, P.E., Devco	
File Number:	F:\Depot\DSMemos\DS05772.doc		
Parcel Number:	125-29-512-015		
Zoning Action:	24-0075-MOD1; 24-0075-SDR1; 24-0075-SUP1; 24-0075-VAR1		
FEMA Flood Zone	YES	NO	X
Proposed Storm Drain	YES X	NO	

HISTORY	DATE RECEIVED	DATE REVIEWED	COMMENTS	REVIEW FEES	FEES PAID Payment Trn #
1 st Submittal	05/16/2024	6/4/2024	See Comments Below	\$400.00	5763913:\$400
TOTAL FEES (LDDRS):				\$400.00	----

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:
X	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. A review of the grading plan shows an elevation difference of approximately 3-feet of cut/fill adjacent to (un)developed properties. Sites with a grade difference of 2 feet above or below existing grades are required to have approval from the *City of Las Vegas Planning and Development Department*. The engineer must submit copies of the grading plans and detail sheet with a letter justifying the grade difference to the *City Planning Department (229-6301)*. The engineer must provide *City Planning* approval with the next submittal
2. Standard Form 4 Ultimate Condition: Basin ON Tlag does not match HEC-1 data.
3. **HEC-1 Ultimate Condition:** CP3 and CP1 Q₁₀₀ and Q₁₀ do not match HEC-1 data.
4. **Hydraulic Calculations, SW-ON2** does not match table on Sheet PRO-2.
5. Label and provide record number for the existing inlets along Durango Drive in all the exhibits and grading plans provided in this study.
6. Provide Existing Condition and Ultimate Condition drainage map in the next submittal.
7. **Proposed Conditions:** In the report it refers to Figure PRO, however exhibit is labeled as PRO-2.

8. **Proposed Conditions:** Explain why CP3 and CP1 Q₁₀₀ and Q₁₀ in Condition Flow Summary has two sets of number.
9. **Proposed Conditions:** Provide existing contour elevations.
10. **Proposed Conditions:** Basin *DOF5 flows does not matches the flows from the reference study.
11. **Proposed Conditions:** Referenced offsite basins **ON1-U and **ST1-U and Combination Point **CP-7 not listed on the *Proposed Condition Flow Summary*.
12. **Proposed Conditions:** Referenced *DOF3 not shown on onsite basin map.
13. Drop Inlet Calculations: Inlets #3 and #6 total intercepted flows do not match the Drop Inlet Summary Table and WSPG map. For example, in the calculations Inlet #3 shows 18.4 cfs and the table shows 15.5 cfs. Revise accordingly.
14. The following garage finish floors do not meet the Regional Flood Control District minimum criteria of twice the Q100 depth of flow up to 18-inches above the water surface (CCRFCD Manual Section 304.4.E.1). The following garage finish floors should be revised or alternate flood protection provided.

LOT	GFF Shown	Min GFF
4	82.25	82.28
5	82.50	82.51
10	84.10	84.14
12	85.15	85.22
14	86.20	86.30
18	88.75	88.77
20	89.80	89.85
21	90.40	90.50
34	82.35	82.42
35	82.80	82.88
37	83.80	83.81
39	84.85	84.93
40	85.35	85.39
41	85.80	85.85
54	86.35	86.36
55	85.80	85.82
60	83.30	83.32
61	82.80	82.85
63	81.90	81.93
65	83.00	83.07
66	83.50	83.52
67	83.80	83.98
68	84.40	84.44
70	85.50	85.54

LOT	GFF Shown	Min GFF
71	85.90	86.00
73	86.80	86.91
82	86.00	86.02
84	85.00	85.09
102	85.45	85.53
103	85.30	85.35
104	85.20	85.24
105	85.10	85.12
106	84.90	84.98
107	84.80	84.82
108	84.60	84.67
109	84.45	84.51
111	84.10	84.14
115	83.20	83.53
116	83.10	83.37
117	83.10	83.22

15. SDDI #6 is at a low point, and it appears there is no emergency overflow being proposed in case the inlet gets clogged. Address in next submittal.
16. SDDI #3 flow depth appears to be too high. A min 1-foot flow depth is recommended for onsite inlet.
17. Address flow ponding at northwest and southwest corners of the Summit Serenity Ave and Montecito Cliff St intersection.
18. Provide a commercial subdivision map or drainage easement to show how flow from *DOF2 is conveyed through the site.
19. WSPG Exhibit vs Grading plans: Revise stationing and invert elevations in the grading plans to match WSPGs.
20. **Grading Plans:** Provide FF for the existing structure located on North and West of the site development.
21. **Grading Plans:** The location of the SDMH at the entrance driveway on Grand Montecito Pkwy will cause maintenance issues in the future. Consider relocating the proposed SD pipe connecting to existing SDDI away from the entrance driveway so that in the event of storm drain maintenance it will not block the entrance.
22. **Grading Plans:** Provide FF for the existing structure located on North and West of the site development.
23. **Grading Plans:** Add in the constructions notes "All private streets and drainage easements are to be privately owned and maintained by the homeowners association (HOA)."
24. **Grading Plans, GD3:** Revise Dedication Note E2 "Private Landscape & Public Drainage Easement to be Privately Maintained PER OR"

***** The City of Las Vegas Flood Control is standardizing the file naming of drainage studies and plans during the digitizing process. When saving the project files in the CD or thumb drive, please follow the system below:**

If drainage study only contains one combined file, use the following naming convention in Document Title:

1st Submittal DS and Plans (for first and original submittal);

2nd Submittal DS and Plans (for second submittal (addendum #1)) etc.

If drainage study contains multiple files, use the following naming convention in Document Title:

1st Submittal DS (for the report of the drainage study)

1st Submittal Plan 1 (could be the drainage condition maps)

1st Submittal Plan 2 (could be the improvement plans) etc.

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.

NOTE: Any future changes to the proposed design (or design assumptions) as outlined in the approved drainage study and attached preliminary grading plan which affect drainage must be addressed in a Drainage Study Update and accepted by the *City of Las Vegas Flood Control Section*. Additionally, final approval of a drainage study is valid for a period of one (1) year. If the proposed construction has not been completed in that time period, the *City of Las Vegas* reserves the right to require additional conditions and/or submission and acceptance of a complete drainage study update prior to further construction of a project.

END OF REMARKS
HDR/JRT

T/R/S: T19S/R60E/S29
AREA G-29