



Supplement to the Response to Comments to the Master Conceptual Drainage Study Update for

Summerlin West Village 28 and 32

62028-300

March 2025

Prepared for:
The Howard Hughes Company, Inc.
1700 S. Pavilion Center Dr. Suite 250
Las Vegas, NV 89135

Prepared by GCW, Inc.

1555 South Rainbow Blvd
Las Vegas, NV 89146

P: 702.804.2000
F: 702.804.2298

info@gcwengineering.com
www.gcwengineering.com

HYDROLOGIC CRITERIA AND DRAINAGE MANUAL
DRAINAGE STUDY INFORMATION FORM

Name of Development: Summerlin West Village 28 and 32 Date: March 2025

Location of Development: a) Descriptive (Cross Streets) North/South: Meadow Run Street

East/West: Alta Drive

b) Section: 21, 28, 29, 32, 33 Township: 20S Range: 59E

c) APN : 137-21-101-011, 137-28-101-008, 137-29-000-003, 137-33-101-008, 137-33-301-001

137-32-000-011, & 137-32-000-012

Name of Owner: The Howard Hughes Company, Inc.

Telephone No.: 702.791.4518 Fax No.: _____ E-Mail Address: April.Chapman@howardhughes.com

Address: 1700 S Pavilion Center Dr. Suite #250 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

Contact Person-Name: Mohammad Masih Edalat, PhD, PE Telephone No.: 702.804.2000

* E-Mail Address: MEdalat@gcwengineering.com Fax No.: _____

Firm: GCW Inc.

Address: 1555 South Rainbow Boulevard Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Type of Land Development/Land Disturbance Process:

☐	Rezoning	☐	Subdivision Map	☐	Clearing and Grading Only
☐	Parcel Map	☐	Planned Unit Development	☒	Other (Please specify below)
☐	Large Parcel Map	☐	Building Permit	☐	Master Study Update

1. Total Owned Land Area: At Site: +/- 2317 ac Being Developed/Disturbed: +/- 2317 ac

2. Is a portion or all of the subject property located in a designated FEMA Flood Hazard Area? ☐ Yes** ☒ No

3. Is the property bordered or crossed by an existing or proposed Clark County Regional Flood

Control District Master Planned Facility? ☒ Yes** ☐ No

4. Proposed type of development (Residential, Commercial, Etc.): Mixed Use (Commercial, Residential, Public Facility, Roadway)

5. Approximate upstream land area which drains to the subject site: +/- 640 ac

6. Has the site drainage been evaluated in the past? ☐ YES ☐ NO If yes, please identify documentation: Master Conceptual

Study for the Tributary Area to Detention Basin 4/5 and Village 24

7. If known, please briefly identify the proposed discharge point(s) of runoff from the site: Detention Basin 4/5, Village 24 COS-4 Wash,

Village 24 COS-2 Wash, Crossbridge Drive Storm Drain

8. Briefly describe your proposed schedule for the subject project: ASAP



Engineer's Seal

3/17/2025

Submit this form as part of the required drainage study to the local entity which has jurisdiction over the subject property. This form may provide sufficient information to serve as the Conceptual Drainage Study.

***New Required Field**

****Review and concurrence of the Clark County Regional Flood Control District is required.**

	Revision	Date

Local Entity File No. _____

REFERENCE:

STANDARD FORM 1

62028-300

March 17, 2025

Albert Sung, P.E.
City of Las Vegas, Public Works
495 S. Main Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101

**Re: Supplement to the Response to Comments to the Master Conceptual Drainage Study
for Summerlin West Village 28 and 32 (DS5834)**

Dear Mr. Sung,

This letter is to certify that all documents provided on electronic submittal (CD) match the hardcopy version of the study.

Respectfully submitted,



Masih Edalat, PhD, P.E.
Senior Engineer



62028-300

Subject: Supplement to the Response to the City of Las Vegas Comments on the Master Conceptual Drainage Study Update for Summerlin West Village 28 and 32 (DS5834)

This report addresses City of Las Vegas (CLV) review comments dated March 10, 2025 regarding the project in its entirety.

Comment 1:

The final approval of the subject study is in concept only. No permit for any construction will be issued. Technical drainage studies for the storm drain facility infrastructures will be required upon further site development.

Response:

Noted. Technical drainage studies will be submitted with future site developments.

Comment 2:

The subject study proposed for an additional inlet (CP Inlet 4) at the south end of the existing *Detention Basin #5* (DB #5). A **Master Plan Amendment (MPA)** to the “*2023 Las Vegas Valley Flood Control Master Plan Update*” must be submitted to address the proposed modifications. After the subject *Master Conceptual Study* is approved.

Response:

Noted. A Master Plan Amendment to the “*2023 Las Vegas Valley Flood Control Master Plan Update*” will be submitted after approval.

Comment 3:

The subject study proposed for an additional inlet (CP Inlet 4) to the existing *Detention Basin #5* (DB #5). A drainage study update to the approved DB #5 (DS5225) study will be required to address the modification to the detention basin after the subject *Master Conceptual Study* is approved.

Response:

A drainage study update to the *DB5 Study* was submitted on February 27, 2025.

Comment 4:

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 the 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>

Response:

Acknowledged. Upon conditional approval by CLV, the study will be submitted to CCRFCD for concurrence.

Comment 5:

Following the reasoning of previous Comment #4, please also provide comparison for discharges under Ultimate Condition HMS vs Ultimate Condition HEC-1 in the next submittal.

Response:

An Ultimate Condition HEC-1 model has not been provided per email discussion with the City and CCRFCD on March 17, 2025. A copy of the email correspondence has been provided in the Appendix. A HEC-1 model was not deemed necessary due to the following reasons:

- **Updated Hydrology in HMS:** The entire hydrology for Village 28 and 32 has been revised and modeled in HMS. The previous hydrology was done in HEC-1, but it does not reflect the current land plan. Since there is no existing HEC-1 model for the revised conditions, creating one would require significant effort.
- **Enhanced Transparency with HMS 4.10 (and 4.12):** The version of HMS used for this study (4.10) provides a detailed report that includes parameters, inputs, and outputs, making the review process more transparent and straightforward. The full HMS report is included in the study for reference.
- **Use of 'Specified Hyetograph' Method:** Unlike the Outlying Areas MPU HMS model that used the "Hypothetical Storm" approach (which does not directly report DARF values), our study employs the "Specified Hyetograph" method. This allows direct control of DARF values within the Simulation Runs, ensuring transparency and eliminating the concern regarding missing data in output tables.
- **Minimal Difference Between Models:** A comparison between HEC-1 and HMS for the **existing condition** was conducted, and the difference was found to be **less than 0.3%**. This demonstrates that HMS provides equivalent and reliable results. Given this minimal variation, the time and budget required to manually convert more than 100 subbasins and reaches into HEC-1 for the ultimate condition would be difficult to justify to our Client.
- **Electronic Model Provided to the City:** The electronic version of the HMS model was provided to the City on the submitted CD, ensuring that reviewers have full access to inputs and outputs for verification.

- **HEC-1 No Longer Supported:** As you know, the USACE is no longer supporting the HEC-1 software. Therefore, all agencies including FEMA and CCRFCD are moving towards the latest USACE HEC-HMS software. Since the USACE produced both software, the HEC-HMS software is using the same hydrograph and routing methods, and the USACE has done its own significant sensitivity analyses in its development prior to its release; therefore, it seems reasonable to move forward with the federally approved software at this point.
- **DB5 Modification Dam Safety Submittal:** One final important point to make regarding the HEC-HMS model and the proposed DB5 modification is that the stage-storage-discharge relationships will be completely updated and revised using the HEC-HMS software. Therefore, all of the supporting technical data will be provided to the Nevada Department of Water Resources, Dam Safety Branch for review and approval.

In conclusion, the proposed changes do not have any negative impacts on downstream facilities or development and are in compliance with the CCRFCD Hydrologic Criteria and Drainage Design Manual.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact GCW at (702) 804-2130.

Respectfully,

GCW, Inc.



Masih Edalat, PhD, PE
Senior Engineer



Elizabeth Martinez, EI

APPENDIX LAYOUT

Appendix

Pertinent Documents

1. CLV Comment Letter
2. CLV & CCRFCD Email Correspondence
3. CLV Email Correspondence

CLV Comment Letter

CITY OF LAS VEGAS			DATE:
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM			March 10, 2025
TO: Land Development Services Department of Building & Safety			FROM: Albert Sung, P.E. Flood Control Project Engineer Department of Public Works
SUBJECT:	Drainage Study for:		COPIES TO:
Master Conceptual Drainage Study Update For Summerlin West Village 28 and 32			GCW Inc.
Cross Streets:	West of Meadow Run Street & Alta Drive		Howard Hughes Company, Inc.
File Number:	F:\Depot\DSMemos\DS5834B.doc		Lucien Paet, P.E., DevCo.
Parcel Number:	137-21-101-001, 137-28-101-008, 137-29-000-003, 137-33-101-008, 137-33-301-001, 137-32-000-011, 137-32-000-012		CCRFC
Zoning Action:	N/A		
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	1/16/2025	2/5/2025	Not Approved	\$400.00	6080902: \$400
2 nd Submittal	2/13/2025	3/10/2025	See Comments Below	\$400.00	6116850: \$400
			TOTAL FEES (LDDRS):	\$800.00	----

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. The final approval of the subject study is in concept only. No permit for any construction will be issued. Technical drainage studies for the storm drain facility infrastructures will be required upon future site development.
2. The subject study proposed for an additional inlet (CP Inlet 4) at the south end of the existing *Detention Basin #5* (DB #5). A **Master Plan Amendment (MPA)** to the "2023 Las Vegas Valley Flood Control Master Plan Update" must be submitted to address the proposed modifications. After the subject *Master Conceptual Study* is approved.
3. The subject study proposed for an additional inlet (CP Inlet 4) to the existing *Detention Basin #5* (DB #5). A drainage study update to the approved DB #5 (DS5225) study will be required to address the modification to the detention basin after the subject *Master Conceptual Study* is approved.
4. The site is adjacent to or crosses an existing or proposed *Clark County Regional Flood Control District* (CCRFC) master planned facility. Therefore, CCRFC 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>

5. Following the reasoning of previous Comment #4, please also provide comparison for discharges under Ultimate Condition HMS vs Ultimate Condition HEC-1 in the next submittal.

***** 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/AYS

T/R/S: T20S/R59E/21
AREA K-21

CLV & CCRFCD Email Correspondence

Elizabeth Martinez

From: Oh-Sang Kwon <okwon@LasVegasNevada.GOV>
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 7:45 AM
To: Masih Edalat
Cc: Ching Wang; Jerry Pruitt; Elizabeth Martinez; Albert Sung
Subject: RE: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

Good morning,

Ok thanks for the response. HEC-1 is not require. Please submit this response when resubmitting drainage study.

Thank you,

Oh-Sang Kwon

Engineering Project Manager
Public Works | City Engineering
702-229-1815 | 702-379-9491
495 S. Main Street, 5th Floor | Las Vegas, NV 89101



lasvegasnevada.gov



Your opinion is important! Click [here](#) to take a short survey.

From: Masih Edalat <medalat@gcwengineering.com>
Sent: Friday, March 14, 2025 10:27 AM
To: Oh-Sang Kwon <okwon@LasVegasNevada.GOV>
Cc: Ching Wang <CWang@regionalflood.org>; Jerry Pruitt <JPruitt@gcwengineering.com>; Elizabeth Martinez <EMartinez@gcwengineering.com>; Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>
Subject: RE: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your City of Las Vegas account credentials.**

Hi Oh-Sang,

I understand the concern regarding the comparison between HEC-1 and HMS, especially given that the study area drains into DB5. However, I'd like to reiterate why a HEC-1 model for the ultimate condition should not be necessary in this case:

- **Updated Hydrology in HMS:** The entire hydrology for Village 28 and 32 has been revised and modeled in HMS. The previous hydrology was done in HEC-1, but it does not reflect the current land plan. Since there is no existing HEC-1 model for the revised conditions, creating one would require significant effort.

- **Enhanced Transparency with HMS 4.10 (and 4.12):** The version of HMS used for this study (4.10) provides a detailed report that includes parameters, inputs, and outputs, making the review process more transparent and straightforward. The full HMS report is included in the study for reference.
- **Use of 'Specified Hyetograph' Method:** Unlike the Outlying Areas MPU HMS model that used the "Hypothetical Storm" approach (which does not directly report DARF values), our study employs the "Specified Hyetograph" method. This allows direct control of DARF values within the Simulation Runs, ensuring transparency and eliminating the concern regarding missing data in output tables.
- **Minimal Difference Between Models:** A comparison between HEC-1 and HMS for the **existing condition** was conducted, and the difference was found to be **less than 0.3%**. This demonstrates that HMS provides equivalent and reliable results. Given this minimal variation, the time and budget required to manually convert more than 100 subbasins and reaches into HEC-1 for the ultimate condition would be difficult to justify to our Client.
- **Electronic Model Provided to the City:** The electronic version of the HMS model was provided to the City on the submitted CD, ensuring that reviewers have full access to inputs and outputs for verification.
- **HEC-1 No Longer Supported:** As you know, the USACE is no longer supporting the HEC-1 software. Therefore, all agencies including FEMA and CCRFCD are moving towards the latest USACE HEC-HMS software. Since the USACE produced both software, the HEC-HMS software is using the same hydrograph and routing methods, and the USACE has done its own significant sensitivity analyses in its development prior to its release; therefore, it seems reasonable to move forward with the federally approved software at this point.
- **DB5 Modification Dam Safety Submittal:** One final important point to make regarding the HEC-HMS model and the proposed DB5 modification is that the stage-storage-discharge relationships will be completely updated and revised using the HEC-HMS software. Therefore, all of the supporting technical data will be provided to the Nevada Department of Water Resources, Dam Safety Branch for review and approval.

Given these points, I request that we be allowed to proceed with the approval of the study as submitted. However, if there are remaining concerns regarding the HMS model, we would be happy to discuss further either in person or on a Teams call. Please let me know how you'd like to proceed.

Thank you,

Masih Edalat, PhD, PE,

GCW, Inc. | Direct: 702 804 2130

Sending us a large file? Use the [GCW File Transfer Site](#)

From: Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>

Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2025 4:35 PM

To: Masih Edalat <medalat@gcwengineering.com>

Cc: Oh-Sang Kwon <okwon@LasVegasNevada.GOV>; Ching Wang <CWang@regionalflood.org>

Subject: FW: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

Masih,

Please see the email chain below!

Albert Y. Sung, P.E.

Project Engineer

Public Works Dept. / Flood Control

(702) 229-2001

495 S. Main Street

Las Vegas, NV 89101



lasvegasnevada.gov



Your opinion is important! Click [here](#) to take a short survey.

From: Oh-Sang Kwon <okwon@LasVegasNevada.GOV>

Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2025 11:16 AM

To: Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>

Subject: FW: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

Please see Ching's email. We do need HEC-1 since it's draining into DB5 and it's critical infrastructure.

Thank you,

Oh-Sang Kwon

Engineering Project Manager

Public Works | City Engineering

702-229-1815 | 702-379-9491

495 S. Main Street, 5th Floor | Las Vegas, NV 89101



lasvegasnevada.gov



Your opinion is important! Click [here](#) to take a short survey.

From: Ching Wang <CWang@regionalflood.org>

Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2025 11:09 AM

To: Oh-Sang Kwon <okwon@LasVegasNevada.GOV>

Subject: RE: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your City of Las Vegas account credentials.**

We accept HMS but there are result differences so since the entire area has been done in HEC-1 it may be good to get that comparison. Biggest issue with HMS is the output reporting and not properly providing some data inputs that allows the reviewer to accurately check if the analysis is correct and not been manipulated to fit the narrative. For example if you enter a DARF in the paired data series in HMS with say a 100-yr 6 hr precip of 2.77 then it will treat the 2.77 as a hypothetical storm and only calculate the reduced precip value while out not outputting either of those values in tables by default. And if a curve table was added for DARF values, it would not provide the DARF ratio, only the reduced precip

value. Still some work to do and depending on entity reviewer may be more appropriate to use HEC-1 until they catch on.

I've been asking firms to submit the electronic version of the HMS so inputs can be checked by the entity reviewer(s).

Thanks,

Ching C. Wang, P.E.
Principal Civil Engineer
Clark County Regional Flood Control District
600 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 300
Las Vegas, NV 89106

Phone: 702-685-0000
Fax: 702-685-0001

www.regionalflood.org
www.befloodsafe.com

From: Oh-Sang Kwon <okwon@LasVegasNevada.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2025 11:01 AM
To: Ching Wang <CWang@regionalflood.org>
Subject: FW: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

Do we accept HEC-HMS? Please see email below. I'm thinking we should ask for future condition HEC-1 and HEC-HMS comparison for DB5 Detention basin.

Thank you,

Oh-Sang Kwon

Engineering Project Manager
Public Works | City Engineering
702-229-1815 | 702-379-9491
495 S. Main Street, 5th Floor | Las Vegas, NV 89101



lasvegasnevada.gov



Your opinion is important! Click [here](#) to take a short survey.

From: Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2025 10:49 AM

To: Oh-Sang Kwon <okwon@LasVegasNevada.GOV>

Subject: FW: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

Oh Sang,

Please see below!

Remember we'd discussed about the study and you wanted a comparison of HEC-1 vs HEC-HMS results for both existing and ultimate conditions.

They did provide a comparison between the two models for the existing condition and the difference is only about 0.3%. However, according to the email response below from Masih Edalat of GCW, it is very big deal for them to do a HEC-1 run for the ultimate condition.

Please take a read and let me know whether you'll waive the requirement for HEC-1 Ultimate Condition run.

Thanks!

Albert

From: Masih Edalat <medalat@gcwengineering.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2025 4:16 PM

To: Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>

Cc: Jerry Pruitt <JPruitt@gcwengineering.com>; Elizabeth Martinez <EMartinez@gcwengineering.com>

Subject: RE: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your City of Las Vegas account credentials.**

Hi Albert,

Following up on our phone conversation, I'd like to summarize the reasons why we used HMS instead of HEC-1 for the **Summerlin West Village 28 and 32 Master Drainage Study**:

- At GCW, we have been transitioning to HMS for major projects, especially since FEMA no longer accepts HEC-1.
- CCRFCD accepted HMS models for the 2024 Master Plan Update (MPU) for Outlying Areas, demonstrating its validity.
- Both HEC-1 and HMS are developed by the US Army Corps of Engineers and are widely accepted, but HMS provides significantly more features and capabilities.
- Converting from HMS to HEC-1 is a manual process. Given that this study includes over 100 subbasins and 100 reaches, the conversion would be cumbersome and inefficient.

Given these points, I kindly ask that you reconsider the comment and approve the Master Drainage Study. Please let me know if you have any questions or need further clarification.

Thank you,

Masih Edalat, PhD, PE,

GCW, Inc. | Direct: 702 804 2130

Sending us a large file? Use the [GCW File Transfer Site](#)

From: Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 5:14 PM
To: Masih Edalat <medalat@gcwengineering.com>
Subject: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

Here you go, Masih!

Albert Y. Sung, P.E.

Project Engineer
Public Works Dept. / Flood Control
(702) 229-2001
495 S. Main Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101



lasvegasnevada.gov



Your opinion is important! Click [here](#) to take a short survey.

CLV Email Correspondence

Elizabeth Martinez

From: Masih Edalat
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 9:29 AM
To: Elizabeth Martinez
Cc: Jerry Pruitt
Subject: FW: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

See below.

Masih Edalat, PhD, PE,
GCW, Inc. | Direct: 702 804 2130
Sending us a large file? **Use the** [GCW File Transfer Site](#)

From: Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 9:28 AM
To: Masih Edalat <medalat@gcwengineering.com>
Subject: RE: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

Masih,

Since we've already sent out a review comment, please submit a response just repeating the content in your previous email.

You may title that as a Supplement. I'll not charge you for that.

Albert Y. Sung, P.E.

Project Engineer
Public Works Dept. / Flood Control
(702) 229-2001
495 S. Main Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101



lasvegasnevada.gov



Your opinion is important! Click [here](#) to take a short survey.

From: Masih Edalat <medalat@gcwengineering.com>
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 9:16 AM
To: Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>
Subject: RE: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your City of Las Vegas account credentials.**

Hi Albert,

Since that was the only comment on the Master Conceptual for V28 & V32, and the HEC-1 comparison is no longer required, can we proceed with the approval of the study as submitted?

Thank you,

Masih Edalat, PhD, PE,

GCW, Inc. | Direct: 702 804 2130

Sending us a large file? Use the [GCW File Transfer Site](#)

From: Albert Sung <YSung@LasVegasNevada.GOV>

Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 5:14 PM

To: Masih Edalat <medalat@gcwengineering.com>

Subject: Master Conceptual V28 & 32

Here you go, Masih!

Albert Y. Sung, P.E.

Project Engineer

Public Works Dept. / Flood Control

(702) 229-2001

495 S. Main Street

Las Vegas, NV 89101



lasvegasnevada.gov



Your opinion is important! Click [here](#) to take a short survey.