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### 1.0 INIRODUCTION

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) is planning a design build improvement project for Interstate Highway 25 (I-25) between Woodmen Road and State Highway 105 (Monument Interchange). The pupose of this conceptual design report is to provide the design build team with a starting point regarding the design of permanent stormwater quality facilities (PSQFs) for the project to meet the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit requirements.

### 2.0 GENERALPROJ ECTLOCATION AND DESCRIPIION

The I-25 North Design Build improvement project in El Paso County will provide increased capacity for 10.8 miles of $\mathrm{I}-25$ between the Woodmen Road interchange and the Monument Interchange. The majority of the project is in unincomorated El Paso County, CO within an easement on land owned by the U.S. Air Force Academy (USAFA). On the north end, 3 miles of l-25 between the Monument Interchange and the northem USAFA boundary (approximately 1.1 miles south of Baptist Road) is within CDOT right-of-way outside of USAFA land. On the south end, a small section of $1-25$ between the crossing of Pine Creek and Woodman Road is in CDOTright-of-way within the Colorado Springs, CO city limits. Figure 1, the Vicinity Map, illustrates the general location of the project.

The purpose of the project is to widen I-25 to accommodate additional lanes within the project limits. The project includes complete reconstruction of portions of the highway (including pemanent storm drainage facilities) and just widening of the pavement section in other locations.

In general, the terrain in the area slopes from east to west toward I-25. Numerous cross culverts and bridges convey offsite runoff across l-25 before discharging to Monument Creek.

The Ultimate Configuration includes 3 through lanes with an auxiliary lane, HOV lane, 8 -foot outside shoulder, and a 12 -foot inside shoulder from the Woodmen to InterQuest Interchange. From InterQuest to Monument the Ultimate Configuration includes 3 lanes with 12 -foot inside and outside shoulders. The calculations contained within this report are based on the Ultimate Configuration.

### 3.0 WATER QUALTY AND DEIENTION APPROACH

Typic ally runoff from CDOT roadways must be treated to meet minimum water quality requirements as set forth in CDOTs MS4 permit. To comply with the MS4 permit, $100 \%$ of the project pavement area must be treated to meet either two of these requirements: capture and treat $100 \%$ of the water quality capture volume (WQCV) or provide
another means of removing $80 \%$ of the total suspended solids (TSS). The WQCV is equivalent to 0.5 -inch of rainfall from the impervious contributing area and is typically treated in an extended detention basin (EDB), releasing this volume over 40 hours. Examples of TSS removal facilities includes water quality vaults that remove sediment through proprietary vortex systems and sand filters that utilize pore spaces and slow release rates to remove pollutants.

As stated in the introduction, much of the project is within the boundaries of the USAFA. Our understanding is that the USAFA is concemed with erosion from increased runoff resulting from increased development upstream of USAFA property. Consequently, they have requested that CDOT provide 100-year detention facilities to reduce peak flow disc harges from the additional pavement width.

In response to the USAFA concems about the effect the added pavement width would have on the receiving drainageways, the concept of Full-Spectrum Detention (FSD) shall be provided for water quality and detention within the limits of the USAFA. FSD has been adopted by the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District and is a recommended treatment method in their Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual. FSD is a method of reducing urbanized peak flows for smaller stom events that more closely approximates the runoff peaks before urbanization occurred. The concept captures a volume of runoff defined as the Excess Urban Runoff Volume (EURV) and then releases it over 72 hours.

The chart below is from "Peak Flow Control for Full Spectrum of Design Storms" by Wulliman and Urbonas written in 2005. The chart illustrates that FSD produces release rates that most closely mimic pre-developed conditions.


Additionally, the design of the outlet structure for FSD is simplified because a separate 5or 10-year orifice or weir is not necessary (UDFCD, T-5, EDB-6). UDFCD recommends a two-level control: EURV release control (over 72 hours) and 100-year release control.

To satisfy CDOT MS4 requirements, water quality treatment must be provided for the entire post-project pavement width. To satisfy USAFA detention requirements, 100-year detention volume is to be provided for the additional pavement width (post-project width minus the pre-project) for drainageways tributary to Monument Creek within the USAFA jurisdiction. The EURV is inclusive of the 100-year detention volume and is greater than the WQCV needed to treat the full pavement width.

Excerpts from the UDFCD Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual that discuss the concepts of EURV and Full Spectrum Detention have been included in the Appendix.

### 4.0 APPROACH

This section discusses the approach taken to develop conceptual locations of water quality treatment facilities to meet the MS4 pemit requirements and USAFA expectations for water quality and detention.

### 4.1. Assumptions and Design Objectives

Only the pavement of the main line of l-25 was considered in the analysis. At interchanges where additional impervious area will be present due to ramps and overpasses, the treated volume will be higher and should be taken into account during final design. In general, the following design objectives were targeted:

1. Capture stormwater in EDBs to control peak outflows and provide water quality treatment. Provide treatment in water quality vaults where EDBs are not feasible.
2. The minimum total impervious area tributary to each PSQF is 2 acres.
3. Utilize FSD to treat runoff to tributaries of the USAFA and $100 \%$ WQCV elsewhere when EDBs are feasible.
4. In sizing and calculating the basin volumes, an existing pavement width of 72 feet for both directions of I-25 was used. An Ultimate Configuration pavement width of 160 ft from Woodmen to InterQuest and 120 ft from InterQuest to Monument was used.
5. Calculated volumes did not take into account additional volume for sediment accumulation.

### 4.2. Preble's Meadow J umping Mouse Critical Habitat

Several of the drainageways within the project area have been identified in the 2003 programmatic biological assessment (PBA) as critic al mouse habitat by the U.S. Fish and

Wild life Senvice. Water quality treatment facilities cannot produce additional impacts to mouse habitat areas. All facilities must be constructed either beyond the identified mouse habitat areas, within one of the permanent impacts already identified asa result of the roadway construction, or in the 15 -foot buffer along the pavement shoulders that are mowed regularly. For drainageways with critical mouse habitats, roadway runoff within the mouse habitat will be collected along the pavement edge and treated in water quality vaults. More detailed information regarding the critic al habitat boundary from the USFWS is provided in the Appendix.

### 4.3. Treatment Facility Locations

The primary goal is to strategically place treatment facilities at locations where roadway runoff can be treated prior to mixing with offsite runoff. In some areas, the contributing area is too small or the terrain prohibits reasonable conveyance to an EDB. Water quality treatment for these areas is provided in an underground water quality vault.

Conceptual water quality locations were detemined using mapping, aerial photography and site visits. Design survey of the existing condition from the Woodmen to Northgate interchange was provided by the CDOT for use in the analysis. Also, supplemental 2002 LIDAR was obtained from El Paso County along I-25 from Baptist road to Monument.

Feasible locations were determined based on available right-of-way, maximizing the tributary area to each facility and utilization of existing drainage pattems and roadside ditches to convey roadway runoff to treatment locations. Also, to minimize maintenance efforts, by maximizing the tributary area to each facility, the total number of treatment facilities should be minimized. Per UDFCD, It is recommended that the total contributing a rea to an EDB is not less than 2 impervious acres.

Consideration of the multiple cross draina ge structures camying off site flows and critical mouse habitat helped define tributary areas to potential treatment locations. Storm sewer may be necessary in some locations to convey roadway runoff to treatment facilities. Conveying to existing water quality treatment facilities was desirable as well as utilizing open space at major interchanges along the comidor for treatment facility locations.

### 4.4. Extended Detention Basin Volumes

For areas being treated beyond the USAFA influence area, WQCV was calculated to treat the entire contributing impervious area along the main line of $1-25$ for the Ultimate Configuration. WQCV equations take into account post-project imperviousness, but not
soil infiltration losses. For areas within the USAFA influence area, EURV and 100-year detention volume requirements were calculated for the basins. The EURV and 100-year detention volume equations are dependent on the hydrologic soils types within the project area. Much of the project area has very porous native soils (Type A and B soils) that have high initial infiltration coefficients and produce less runoff than Type C/D soils. Consequently compensation for urban runoff is greater to produce similar peak flows to a pre-developed condition. Please refer to the RESPEC Hydrology Report I-25 North Design Build formore detailed soils information for the project area.

For a visual representation of the basins tributary to each facility and the recommended facility locations, refer to the I-25 Design Build Water Quality Facilities figures (Sheets 1 to 8 ). Table 1 summarizes each water quality facilities' total tributary area, the treatment area, and treatment volume. Detailed volume and conceptual footprint calculations are provided in the Appendix.

### 5.0 BMP DESIGN AND MAINIENANCE

### 5.1 Extended Detention Basins

EDBs are to be designed in accordance with CDOT and Urban Drainage criteria. The footprint of the EDBs conceptually sized assuming $4: 1$ side slopes, a 3 -foot wide berm around the perimeter, 1 foot of freeboard, and an additional 6 inches of ponding depth for overflow weir control.

These assumptions were required to determine the conceptual footprint of the EDBs shown in the conceptual plan. Other design considerations during final design that should be taken into account include accessible maintenance access (typically a $10 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ ) down to the pond bottom, a 6 -foot trickle channel ( $0.5 \%$ minimum slope), micropool, and forebay. All of which are discussed in the UDFCD criteria manuals. The outlet structures will be designed to meet water quality goal requirements and will require further analysis.

When the goal of $100 \%$ WQCV is being met, the EDB outfall structure should be retrofitted with an outlet structure to obtain a 40-hour drain time to formalize the MS4 requirements for water quality. When the goal of FSD is being met, the outfall of the pond should be designed to release the EURV over 72 hours and the orifice or weir to control the100-year should be designed to be in accordance with the allowable release rates as recommended by the UDFCD. A detail regarding the outlet structure for WQCV and FSD basinscan be found in the Appendix.

The anticipated maintenance work that will be required to ensure effectiveness of the EDB fac ilities inc ludes the following:

1. Mowing of the grass in the pond, and removal of vegetation that may clog the outlet structure.
2. Clearing of trash and debris from the trash rack and outlet structure grate.
3. Clearing of onifice holes on outlet structure for continued flow.
4. Removal of sediment from the EDB once levels have reached the lowest orifice hole or the forebay outlet pipe is blocked.
5. Disposal of all trash, debris and sediment offsite.
6. Reseeding as necessary to prevent erosion.
7. Continued maintenance of the outlet structure to keep structure in working order (i.e. tightening or replacing bolts, etc.)
8. Add ing a ny additional erosion control BMP's a s necessary.

Additional information regarding the design and maintenance of EDBs is included in the Appendix.

### 5.2 Water Quality Vaults

Water Quality Vaults such as hydrodynamic sand separators or proprietary manufac tured systems are planned where runoff from impervious areas cannot reach a proposed EDB. These products are available in a variety of types and sizes depending upon the level of treatment required.

The Stormceptor System is one particular type of water quality vault that provides this type of treatment. For the purposes of this report, the computer program PCSWMM for Stormceptor was used to conceptually size the Water Quality Vaults based on the tributary impenvious area. The results are shown in Table 1.

The following assumptions and input data were entered into PCSWMM to obtain the proper Stormceptor model to meet the MS4 permit water quality objective of $80 \%$ TSS Removal:

1. Impervious a rea tributary to basin
2. $100 \%$ imperviousness
3. No upstream attenuation was assumed
4. Colorado Springs rainfall
5. Fine particle size distribution

More Information on Water Quality Vaults including Stormceptor manufacturer recommendations formaintenance is included in the Appendix.

### 6.0 CONCLUSION

Pemmanent Water Quality Facilities have been conceptually sized for the Ultimate Configuration and potential locations sited within this report. Additional analysis will be required during final design. It is recommended that EDBs be implemented for the l-25

North Design Build Project whenever possible for I-25 tributary areas greater than 2.0 acres. In selected locations when construction and maintenance of an EDB is not feasible, treatment should be provided with a Water Quality Vault. The total number of Permanent Water Quality Facilities should be minimized by maximizing the tributary area to each facility to reduce future maintenance efforts.
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Figure 1 - Vicinity Map
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Table 1

| BASIN ID | MILE MARKER |  | TYPE OF PERMANENT BMP | TOTAL IMPERVIOUS AREA TRIBUTARY TO BASIN (AC) | TREATED IMPERVIOUS AREA (AC) | TREATED VOLME (AC-FI) |  | STORMCEPTOR ${ }^{3}$ |  | GOAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RROM | T0 |  |  |  | WQCV or EURV ${ }^{1}$ | 100-year Detention ${ }^{1}$ | MODEL\# | DIA (FI) |  |
| 1 | 149.3 | 149.4 | EDB | 3.12 | 1.72 | 0.13 | N/A |  |  | 100\%WQCV |
| 2 | 149.4 | 149.9 | WQ VAULT | 8.41 | 8.41 | See note 4 |  | STC $11000^{5}$ | 10.0 | 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| 3 | 149.9 | 150.1 | EDB | 3.52 | 1.94 | 0.22 | 0.33 |  |  | FSD |
| 4 | 150.1 | 150.4 | EDB | 5.69 | 3.13 | 0.36 | 0.54 |  |  | FSD |
| 5 | 150.4 | 150.6 | EDB | 4.60 | 2.53 | 0.29 | 0.43 |  |  | FSD |
| 6 | 150.6 | 150.9 | EDB | 4.98 | 2.74 | 0.31 | 0.47 |  |  | FSD |
| 7 | 150.9 | 151.3 | WQ VAULT | 8.14 | 8.14 | See note 4 |  | STC $11000^{5}$ | 10.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 8 | 151.3 | 151.6 | EDB | 5.37 | 2.95 | 0.52 | 0.62 |  |  | FSD |
| 9 | 151.5 | 152.1 | EDB | 11.06 | 6.08 | 0.98 | 1.20 |  |  | FSD |
| 10 | 152.1 | 152.5 | EDB | 7.06 | 3.88 | 0.69 | 0.76 |  |  | FSD |
| 11 | 152.5 | 153.2 | EDB | 9.47 | 5.21 | 0.73 | 1.29 |  |  | FSD |
| 12 | 152.8 | 153.2 | EDB | 7.36 | 4.05 | 0.23 | 0.70 |  |  | FSD |
| 13 | 153.2 | 153.4 | EDB | 2.91 | 1.45 | 0.19 | 0.26 |  |  | FSD |
| 14 | 153.3 | 153.5 | WQ VAULT | 1.23 | 1.23 | See note 4 |  | STC 900 | 6.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 15 | 153.4 | 153.6 | EDB | $1.58{ }^{2}$ | 0.63 | 0.09 | 0.11 |  |  | FSD |
| 16 | 153.5 | 153.6 | WQ VAULT | 1.07 | 1.07 | See note 4 |  | STC 900 | 6.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 17 | 153.6 | 153.8 | EDB | 2.76 | 1.11 | 0.14 | 0.20 |  |  | FSD |
| 18 | 153.8 | 154.0 | WQ VAULT | 1.35 | 1.35 | See note 4 |  | STC 900 | 6.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 19 | 153.8 | 154.0 | WQ VAULT | 1.33 | 1.33 |  |  | STC 900 | 6.0 | 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| 20 | 154.0 | 154.0 | WQ VAULT | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  | STC 4501 | 4.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 21 | 154.0 | 154.0 | WQ VAULT | 0.18 | 0.18 |  |  | STC 4501 | 4.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 22 | 154.0 | 154.3 | EDB | 4.38 | 1.75 | 0.20 | 0.30 |  |  | FSD |
| 23 | 154.3 | 154.5 | EDB | 2.51 | 1.00 | 0.11 | 0.17 |  |  | FSD |
| 24 | 154.5 | 154.8 | EDB | 3.92 | 1.57 | 0.18 | 0.27 |  |  | FSD |
| 25 | 154.8 | 155.0 | EDB | 2.25 | 0.90 | 0.10 | 0.15 |  |  | FSD |
| 26 | 155.0 | 155.2 | WQ VAULT | 1.36 | 1.36 | See note 4 |  | STC 900 | 6.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 27 | 154.9 | 155.3 | WQ VAULT | 3.13 | 3.13 |  |  | STC 3600 | 8.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 28 | 155.2 | 155.7 | EDB | 6.86 | 2.75 | 0.31 | 0.47 |  |  | FSD |
| 29 | 155.7 | 155.9 | EDB | 3.76 | 1.51 | 0.17 | 0.26 |  |  | FSD |
| 30 | 155.9 | 156.4 | EDB | 6.55 | 2.62 | 0.30 | 0.45 |  |  | FSD |
| 31 | 156.4 | 156.6 | EDB | 3.17 | 1.27 | 0.14 | 0.22 |  |  | FSD |
| 32 | 156.6 | 156.9 | EDB | 4.54 | 1.82 | 0.21 | 0.31 |  |  | FSD |
| 33 | 156.9 | 157.1 | WQ VAULT | 2.24 | 2.24 | See note 4 |  | STC 2400 | 8.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 34 | 157.1 | 157.3 | EDB | 2.53 | 1.01 | 0.11 | 0.17 |  |  | FSD |
| 35 | 157.3 | 157.6 | EDB | 5.25 | 2.10 | 0.24 | 0.36 |  |  | FSD |
| 36 | 157.6 | 158.1 | WQ VAULT | 6.95 | 6.95 | See note 4 |  | STC 7200 | 12.0 | 80\%TSS REMOVAL |
| 37 | 158.1 | 158.4 | EDB | 2.95 | 2.95 | 0.12 | N/A |  |  | 100\%WQCV |
| 38 | 158.2 | 158.6 | EDB | 4.09 | 4.09 | 0.17 |  |  |  | 100\%WQCV |
| 39 | 158.6 | 158.9 | EDB | 4.77 | 4.77 | 0.20 |  |  |  | 100\%WQCV |
| 40 | 158.9 | 159.3 | EDB | 5.63 | 5.63 | 0.23 |  |  |  | 100\%WQCV |
| 41 | 159.3 | 159.4 | EDB | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0.08 |  |  |  | 100\%WQCV |
| 42 | 159.4 | 160.1 | EDB | 9.81 | 9.81 | 0.41 |  |  |  | 100\%WQCV |

1. EURV and 100 -year detention volume based on additional impervioius area only. WQCV is based on total tributary impervious area.
2. Tributary impervious area is less than 2 AC , but it is being conveyed to an existing permaent water quality facility.
3. Stormceptor or an approved equivalent are recommended as WQ Vaults to meet the goal of $80 \%$ TSS. Volume should adhere to manufactuers specific ations.
4. Volume to comply with manufactuer's specific a itons.
5. Units are composed of two structures.
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## APPENDIX A REFERENCE MATERIALS

Federation and American Society of Civil Engineers (1998) that stormwater quality treatment facilities (i.e., post-construction BMPs) be based on the capture and treatment of runoff from storms ranging in size from "mean" to "maximized" storms. The "mean" and "maximized" storm events represent the 70th and 90 th percentile storms, respectively. As a result of these studies, water quality facilities for the Colorado Front Range are recommended to capture and treat the $80^{\text {th }}$ percentile runoff event. Capturing and properly treating this volume should remove between 80 and $90 \%$ of the annual TSS load, while doubling the capture volume was estimated to increase the removal rate by only 1 to $2 \%$.

### 2.3 Attenuation of the WQCV (BMP Drain Time)

The WQCV must be released over an extended period to provide effective pollutant removal for postconstruction BMPs that use sedimentation (i.e., extended detention basin, retention ponds and constructed wetland ponds). A field study of basins with extended detention in the Washington, D.C. area identified an average drain time of 24 hours to be effective for extended detention basins. This generally equates to a 40 -hour drain time for the brim-full basin. Retention ponds and constructed wetland basins have reduced drain times ( 12 hours and 24 hours, respectively) because the hydraulic residence time of the effluent is essentially increased due to the mixing of the inflow with the permanent pool.
When pollutant removal is achieved primarily through filtration such as in a sand filter or rain garden BMP, an extended drain time is still recommended to promote stability of downstream drainageways, but it can be reduced because it is not needed for effective pollutant removal. In addition to counteracting hydromodification, attenuation in filtering BMPs can also improve pollutant removal by increasing contact time, which can aid adsorption/absorption processes depending on the media. The minimum recommended drain time for a post-construction BMP is 12 hours; however, this minimum value should only be used for BMPs that do not rely fully or partially on sedimentation for pollutant removal.

### 2.4 Excess Urban Runoff Volume (EURV) and Full Spectrum Detention

The EURV represents the difference between the developed and pre-developed runoff volume for the range of storms that produce runoff from pervious land surfaces (generally greater than the 2 -year event). The EURV is relatively constant for a given imperviousness over a wide range of storm events. This is a companion concept to the WQCV. The EURV is a greater volume than the WQCV and is detained over a longer time. It typically allows for the recommended drain time of the WQCV and is used to better replicate peak discharge in receiving waters for runoff events exceeding the WQCV. The EURV is associated with Full Spectrum Detention, a simplified sizing method for both water quality and flood control detention. Designing a detention basin to capture the EURV and release it slowly (at a rate similar to WQCV release) results in storms smaller than the 2 -year event being reduced to flow rates much less than the threshold value for erosion in most drainageways. In addition, by incorporating an outlet structure designed per the criteria in this manual including an orifice or weir that limits 100 -year runoff to the allowable release rate, the storms greater than the 2 -year event will be reduced to discharge rates and hydrograph shapes that approximate pre-developed conditions. This reduces the likelihood that runoff hydrographs from multiple basins will combine to produce greater discharges than pre-developed
conditions. conditions.

For additional information on the EURV and Full Spectrum Detention, including calculation procedures, please refer to the Storage chapter of Volume 2.

[^0]

Figure OS-2. Typical Outlet Structure for Full Spectrum Detention


Figure OS-3. Typical Outlet Structure for WQCV Treatment and Attenuation
the calculated 100-year volume. Others require that the 100 -year volume be added to the WQCV. All jurisdictions require the WQCV be added to the 5- or 10-year volume. When clear written local criteria on this matter are absent, the District recommends that no less than $50 \%$ of the WQCV be added to the calculated 100-year volume for 100-year volumes obtained using empirical equations and the FAA Method. However, unless the local jurisdiction requires adding all or part of the WQCV to the 100 -year volume obtained using the simplified Full Spectrum Detention design; District does not recommend adding any part of the WQCV to the 100-year volume. When the analysis is done using hydrograph routing methods, each level of controls needs to be accounted for and the resultant 100-year control volume used in final design.

### 3.2 Sizing of On-Site Detention Facilities

### 3.2.1 Maximum Allowable Unit Release Rates for On-Site Facilities

The maximum allowable unit release rates in the Denver area per acre of tributary catchment for on-site detention facilities for various design return periods are listed in Table SO-1. These maximum releases rates will apply for all on-site detention facilities unless other rates are recommended in a Districtapproved master plan. For regional facilities see Section 3.2.5.

Allowable unit release rates in Table SO-1 for each a soil group in the tributary catchment shall be areaweighted to composite the allowable unit release rate for the total catchment. Multiply this rate by the total tributary catchment's area to obtain the design release rates in cubic feet per second (cfs).
Whenever Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil surveys are not available, approximate their equivalent types using results of detailed soil investigations at the site.

Table SO-1—Maximum Unit Flow Release Rates (cfs/acre) from On-Site Detention Facilities

| Design Return <br> Period <br> (Years) | $\mathbf{3}$ | A | B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.02 | 0.03 | C \& D |
| 2 | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.04 |
| 5 | 0.13 | 0.23 | 0.17 |
| 10 | 0.24 | 0.41 | 0.30 |
| 25 | 0.33 | 0.56 | 0.52 |
| 50 | 0.50 | 0.85 | 0.68 |
| 100 |  |  | 1.00 |

### 3.2.2 Empirical Equations for the Sizing of On-Site Detention Storage Volumes

Urbonas and Glidden (1983), as part of the District's ongoing hydrologic research, conducted studies that evaluated peak storm runoff flows along major drainageways. The following set of empirical equations provided preliminary estimates of on-site detention facility sizing for areas within the District. They are
intended for single return period control and not for use when off-site inflows are present or when multistage controls are to be used (e.g., 10- and 100-year peak control). In addition, these equations are not intended to replace detailed hydrologic and flood routing analysis, or even the analysis using the Rational Formula-based FAA method for the sizing of detention storage volumes. The District does not promote the use of these empirical equations. It does not object, however, to their use by local governments who have adopted them or want to adopt them as minimum requirements for the sizing of on-site detention for small catchments within their jurisdiction. If the District has a master plan that contains specific guidance for detention storage or sizing of on-site detention facilities, those guidelines should be followed instead. The empirical equations for NRCS Soil types B, C and D are as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{i}=K_{i} A \tag{SO-1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the 100-year:

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{100}=\frac{\left(1.78 I-0.002 I^{2}-3.56\right)}{900} \tag{SO-2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the 10-year:

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{10}=\frac{(0.95 I-1.90)}{1,000} \tag{SO-3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the 5-year:

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{5}=\frac{(0.77 I-2.65)}{1,000} \tag{SO-4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For Soil Type A, Equations SO-1 and SO-2 tend to underestimate the needed 100-year detention volume. Instead, Equation SO-5 needs to be used to estimate the 100-year detention volume for Type A Soils (i.e., $V_{100 A A}$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{100 A}=\left(-0.00005501 \cdot I^{2}+0.030148 \cdot I-0.12\right) \cdot \frac{A}{12} \tag{SO-5}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which:
$V_{i}=$ required volume where subscript $i=100$-, 10- or 5 -year storm, as appropriate (acre-feet)
$K_{i}=$ empirical volume coefficient where subscript $i=100-10$ - or 5 -year storm, as appropriate
$I=$ fully developed tributary catchment imperviousness (\%)
$A=$ tributary catchment area (acres)
6. The calculated outflow volume, $V_{0}$, (cubic feet), during the given duration and the adjustment factor at that duration calculated using the equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{o}=Q_{a v}(60 T) \tag{SO-9}
\end{equation*}
$$

7. The required storage volume, $V_{S}$ (cubic feet), calculated using the equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{s}=V_{i}-V_{o} \tag{SO-10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The value of $V_{s}$ increases with time, reaches a maximum value, and then starts to decrease. The maximum value of $V_{s}$ is the required storage volume for the detention facility. Sample calculations using this procedure are presented in Design Example 6.2. The modified FAA Worksheet of the UD-Detention Spreadsheet performs these calculations.

### 3.2.4 Simplified Full-Spectrum Detention Sizing (Excess Urban Runoff Flow Control)

With urbanization, the runoff volume increases. Percentage-wise, this increase is much more noticeable for the smaller storm events than for the very big ones, such as the 100-year storm. Wulliman and Urbonas (2005) suggested a concept they termed Full Spectrum Detention. This concept was studied using extensive modeling, including continuous simulations of a calibrated watershed. Based on this modeling the original set of equations was slightly modified to increase the EURV by $10 \%$. The protocol that resulted and that is described below reduced runoff peak flows from urbanized areas to more closely approximate the runoff peaks along major drainageways before urbanization occurred.

This concept captures a volume of runoff defined as the Excess Urban Runoff Volume" (EURV) and then releases it over approximately 72 -hours. EURV is larger than the Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV) defined in Volume 3 of this Manual and varies with the type of NRCS soil group upon which urbanization occurs. EURV includes within its volume the WQCV, which then makes it unnecessary to deal with it separately when the Full Spectrum Detention design is used. Full Spectrum Detention Equations SO-11, -12 and -13 may by used to find the EURV depths in watershed inches. They were developed using the hydrologic methods described in this Manual.

NRCS Soil Group A: $\quad E U R V_{A}=1.1 \cdot(2.0491 \cdot i-0.1113)$
NRCS Soil Group B: $\quad E U R V_{B}=1.1 \cdot(1.2846 \cdot i-0.0461)$
NRCS Soil Group C/D: $\quad E U R V_{C D}=1.1 \cdot(1.1381 \cdot i-0.0339)$
in which, $E U R V_{K}=$ Excess Urban Runoff Volume in watershed inches ( $K=A, B$ or $C D$ ),
$i=$ Imperviousness ratio (I/100)

By combining the capture and slow release of the EURV with the 100-year control volumes for Soil Types B, C and D recommended by Equations SO-1 and SO-2 or for Soil Type A recommended by Equation SO-5 with the 100-year release rates based on recommendations in Table SO-1, this concept was found to be more effective in controlling peak flow along major drainageways for almost all levels of storms than provided by the simplified equations or the FAA Method, even for relatively large urban catchments.

The EURV is found using volumes obtained for each soil type, which are then area weighted in proportion to the total catchment's area. The watershed inches of EURV are then converted to cubic feet or acrefeet. The total 100-year detention basin volume is found using Equations SO-1 and SO-2 for Type B, C and D soils or Equation SO-5 for Type A soils, which are also area-weighted by soil types and converted to cubic feet or acre feet. The outlet is designed to empty the EURV in approximately 72 hours. Volumes exceeding EURV are controlled by an outlet designed for a composite maximum 100-year release rate based on unit rates recommended in Table SO-1

Equation 13a was developed to assist in the sizing of the openings of the perforated plate outlet to drain the EURV in 72 hours, provided the outlet follows the standardized design developed originally with the WQCV outlet for an Extended Detention Basin (EDB) described in Volume 3, namely the perforations are spaced vertically on $4^{\prime \prime}$ centers. Figure SO-8 depicts the results of this equation in graphical form. The equation and the figure are only applicable for water depths in the basin between one and eight feet and designers should not extrapolate beyond this range. Outlets needing greater or lesser depths than these need to be designed individually using ether EPA SWMM, UD-Detention spreadsheet or other appropriate software. The Full-Spectrum Worksheet of the UD-Detention Spreadsheet performs all of these calculations for the standardized designs, including adjustments for imperviousness due to Level 1 and 2 of MDCIA, accounts for the effects of various soil type distributions in the tributary catchment and has a provision for selecting the local government's policy in how the WQCV is treated as part of the 100-year volume, although the District does not recommend adding any portion of the WQCV to the 100-year volume calculated using this spreadsheet.

$$
A=\left[\frac{E U R V}{0.00528 \cdot H^{2}+0.0655 \cdot H+0.0492}\right]^{\frac{1}{-0.0018 \cdot H^{2}-0.0068 \cdot H+1.0015}}
$$

In which, $A=$ open area per row of perforations, in square inches
$H$ = maximum water depth in basin above the bottom of lowest perforation, in feet $E U R V=$ excess urban runoff volume, in acre feet

Whenever possible, it is suggested that circular orifice openings be used, beveled on the downstream side. The goal is to find a commonly available drill-bit size that will match the needed area with as few columns of perforations as possible. To achieve this, the designer should seek a drill bit size that will deliver an area within $+5 \%$ and $-10 \%$ of the one calculated using Equation SO-13a or Figure SO-8.

### 3.2.5 Excess Urban Runoff Flow Control at Regional Facilities

The simplified full-spectrum detention concept described above is appropriate for volume and outlet sizing of detention facilities serving on-site watersheds of up to 160 acres. For full-spectrum basins serving larger watersheds, the EURV portion of the basin still needs to be sized using Equations SO-10 through SO-12 and the outlet designed to empty this volume in approximately 72 -hours. The 100-year peak flow control volume above the EURV has to be sized, and its outlet designed, using full hydrograph routing protocols. The hydrograph routing option is also available for smaller sub-watersheds as well. Regardless of which 100-year sizing and outlet design option is used for regional facilities, the maximum 100-year release rates cannot exceed the release rates based on unit discharges recommended in Table SO-1 or pre-developed peak 100-year flow rates for the tributary watershed, whichever are less, or those recommended in a District accepted master plan.

### 3.2.6 Multi-Level Control

The District recommends that no more than two levels of controls, in addition to the WQCV controls, be used for on-site detention facilities. These levels can be the $10-$ or 100 -year storm, in combination with the 2-, 5- or the 10-year storm, as appropriate. More levels of control may appear to provide increased protection, but the added complexity of design and the questionable accuracy of results rarely justifies it. As an alternative to this three-level control recommended above, one can chose the two-level control offered by Sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 above to achieve broader levels of peak runoff control and possibly less expensive outlet design.

### 3.2.7 On-Site Detention and UDFCD 100-year Floodplain Management Policy

While UDFCD has confidence in the ability of many on-site detention basins to control peak flow rates to predevelopment level for small urban catchments, this is not the case for larger watersheds. The complexities of predicting where each on-site detention basin is going to be installed as areas urbanize, how each is going to be designed and built, and then applying the detention routing technology on an evolving and diffuse system of control facilities is beyond anyone's ability to assess or predict. In addition, the UDFCD has no ability or power to insure that all on-site detention facilities will continue to be maintained and their function will not deteriorate over time. In fact, evidence suggests to the contrary (Prommersberger, 1984) that many on-site detention facilities do not receive needed maintenance and do not provide the original design function over time. Prommersberger (1984) found that many, in fact, have never been built as designed. In response to these complexities of implementation and future maintenance uncertaities, the UDFCD adheres to the following policies when developing hydrology for the delineation and regulation of the 100-year flood hazard zones within its boundaries:

1. Hydrology has to be based on fully developed watershed condition as estimated to occur, at a minimum, over the next 50 years.
2. No on-site detention basin will be recognized in the development of hydrology unless:

### 3.0 Calculation of the WQCV

The first step in estimating the magnitude of runoff from a site is to estimate the site's total imperviousness. The total imperviousness of a site is the weighted average of individual areas of like imperviousness. For instance, according to Table RO-3 in the Runoff chapter of Volume 1 of this manual, paved streets (and parking lots) have an imperviousness of $100 \%$; drives, walks and roofs have an imperviousness of $90 \%$; and lawn areas have an imperviousness of $0 \%$. The total imperviousness of a site can be determined taking an area-weighted average of all of the impervious and pervious areas. When measures are implemented minimize directly connected impervious area (MDCIA), the imperviousness used to calculate the WQCV is the "effective imperviousness." Sections 4 and 5 of this chapter provide guidance and examples for calculating effective imperviousness and adjusting the WQCV to reflect decreases in effective imperviousness.

The WQCV is calculated as a function of imperviousness and BMP drain time using Equation 3-1, and as shown in Figure 3-2:

$$
\mathrm{WQCV}=a\left(0.91 I^{3}-1.19 I^{2}+0.78 I\right)
$$

Equation 3-1
Where:
WQCV = Water Quality Capture Volume (watershed inches)
$a \quad=$ Coefficient corresponding to WQCV drain time (Table 3-2)
I = Imperviousness (\%/100) (see Figures 3-3 through 3-5 [single family land use] and /or the Runoff chapter of Volume 1[other typical land uses])

Table 3-2. Drain Time Coefficients for WQCV Calculations

| Drain Time (hrs) | Coefficient, a |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12 hours | 0.8 |
| 24 hours | 0.9 |
| 40 hours | 1.0 |

Figure 3-2, which illustrates the relationship between imperviousness and WQCV for various drain times, is appropriate for use in Colorado's high plains near the foothills. For other portions of Colorado or United States, the WQCV obtained from this figure can be adjusted using the following relationships:

$$
\mathrm{WQCV}_{\text {other }}=d_{6}\left(\frac{\mathrm{WQCV}}{0.43}\right)
$$

Equation 3-2

Where:
WQCV = WQCV calculated using Equation 3-1 or Figure 3-2 (watershed inches)
$\mathrm{WQCV}_{\text {other }}=\mathrm{WQCV}$ outside of Denver region (watershed inches)
$d_{6} \quad=$ depth of average runoff producing storm from Figure 3-1 (watershed inches)

Once the WQCV in watershed inches is found from Figure 3-2 or using Equation 3-1 and/or 3-2, the required BMP storage volume in acre-feet can be calculated as follows:

$$
V=\left(\frac{\mathrm{WQCV}}{12}\right) A
$$

Equation 3-3

Where:


Figure 3-2. Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV) Based on BMP Drain Time

## Description

An extended detention basin (EDB) is a sedimentation basin designed to detain stormwater for many hours after storm runoff ends. This BMP is similar to a detention basin used for flood control, however; the EDB uses a much smaller outlet that extends the emptying time of the more frequently occurring runoff events to facilitate pollutant removal. The EDB's 40 -hour drain time for the water quality capture volume (WQCV) is recommended to remove a significant portion of total suspended solids (TSS). Soluble pollutant removal is enhanced by providing a small wetland marsh or "micropool" at the outlet to promote biological uptake. The basins are sometimes called "dry ponds" because they are designed not to have a significant permanent pool of water remaining between storm runoff events.

An extended detention basin can also be designed to provide Full Spectrum Detention. In this case, the EDB is sized for 100 -year peak reduction and the excess urban runoff volume (EURV) is used instead of the WQCV. The EURV is designed with a drain time of approximately 72 hours. Widespread use of Full Spectrum Detention is anticipated to reduce impacts on major drainageways by reducing post-development peak discharges to better resemble pre-development peaks. Refer to the Storage chapter of Volume 2 for additional information on Full Spectrum Detention.

## Site Selection

EDBs are well suited for watersheds with at least five impervious acres up to approximately one square mile of watershed. Smaller watersheds can result in an orifice size prone to clogging. Larger watersheds and watersheds with baseflows can complicate the design and reduce the level of treatment provided. EBDs are also well suited where flood detention is incorporated into the same basin.

Use the WQCV (or the EURV) when designing an EDB only for water quality. Use the EURV when incorporating water quality into a flood control facility.


Photograph EDB-1: This EDB includes a concrete trickle channel and a micropool with a concrete bottom and grouted boulder sideslopes. The vegetation growing in the sediment of the micropool adds to the natural look of this facility and ties into the surrounding landscape.

| Extended Detention Basin |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Functions |  |
| LID/Volume Red. | Somewhat |
| WQCV Capture | Yes |
| WQCV+Flood Control | Yes |
| Fact Sheet Includes EURV Guidance | Yes |
| Typical Effectiveness for Targeted Pollutants ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| Sediment/Solids | Good |
| Nutrients | Moderate |
| Total Metals | Moderate |
| Bacteria | Poor |
| Other Considerations |  |
| Life-cycle Costs ${ }^{4}$ | Moderate |
| ${ }^{3}$ Based primarily on data from the International Stormwater BMP Database (www.bmpdatabase.org). <br> ${ }^{4}$ Based primarily on BMP-REALCOST available at www.udfcd.org. Analysis based on a single installation (not based on the maximum recommended watershed tributary to each BMP). |  |

The depth of groundwater should be investigated.
Groundwater depth should be 2 or more feet below the bottom of the basin in order to keep this area dry and maintainable.

## Designing for Maintenance

Recommended maintenance practices for all BMPs are provided in the BMP Maintenance chapter of this manual. During design the following should be considered to ensure ease of maintenance over the long-term:

- Always provide a micropool (see step 7).
- Provide a design slope of at least $3 \%$ in the vegetated bottom of the basin (either toward the trickle channel or toward the micropool). This will help maintain the appearance of the turf grass in the bottom of the basin and reduce the possibility of saturated areas that may produce unwanted species of vegetation and mosquito breeding conditions. Verify slopes during construction, prior to vegetation.
- Follow trash rack sizing recommendations to determine the minimum area for the trash rack (see design step 9 ).
- Provide adequate initial surcharge volume for frequent inundation (see design step 3 ).
- Provide stabilized access to the forebay, outlet, spillway, and micropool for maintenance purposes.
- Provide access to the well screen. The well screen requires maintenance more often than any other EDB component. Ensure that the screen can be reached from a point outside of the micropool. When the well screen is located inside the outlet structure, provide an access port within the trash rack or use a sloped trash rack that consists of bearing bars (not horizontal) that are 6 inches on center.
- Provide a hard-bottom forebay that allows for removal of sediment.
- Where baseflows are anticipated, consider providing a flow-measuring device (e.g. weir or flume with staff gage and rating curve) at the forebay to assist with future modifications of the water quality plate. Typically, the baseflow will increase as the watershed develops. It is important that the water quality plate continue to function, passing the baseflow while draining the WQCV over approximately 40 hours. Measuring the actual baseflow can be helpful in determining if and when the orifice place should be replaced.

EDBs providing combined water quality and flood control functions can serve multiple uses such as playing fields or picnic areas. These uses are best located at higher elevation within the basin, above the WQCV pool level.

## Design Procedure and Criteria

The following steps outline the design procedure and criteria for an EDB:

1. Basin Storage Volume: Provide a design volume equal to $120 \%$ of the WQCV or $100 \%$ of the EURV. This volume begins at the lowest orifice in the outlet structure. The additional $20 \%$ for the WQCV is for sediment accumulation and the resultant loss in storage volume. Additional volume for sediment storage is not necessary when designing for the EURV, as the water quality perforations extend above the depth of the WQCV.

- Determine the imperviousness of the watershed (or effective imperviousness where LID elements are used upstream).
- Find the required storage volume. Determine the required WQCV or EURV (watershed inches of runoff) using Figure 3-2 located in Chapter 3 of this manual (for WQCV) or equations provided in the Storage chapter of Volume 2 (for EURV).
- Calculate the design volume as follows:

For WQCV:

$$
V=\left[\frac{\mathrm{W} Q C V}{12}\right] 1.2 \mathrm{~A}
$$

Equation EDB-1

For EURV:

$$
V=\left[\frac{\mathrm{EURV}}{12}\right] A
$$

Equation EDB-2

Where:
$V \quad=$ design volume (acre ft$)$
A = watershed area tributary to the extended detention basin (acres)
1.2 factor $=$ multiplier to accommodate sediment accumulation
2. Basin Shape: Always maximize the distance between the inlet and the outlet. It is best to have a basin length (measured along the flow path from inlet to outlet) to width ratio of at least 2:1. A longer flow path from inlet to outlet will minimize short circuiting and improve reduction of TSS. To achieve this ratio, it may be necessary to modify the inlet and outlet points through the use of pipes or swales.
3. Basin Side Slopes: Basin side slopes should be stable and gentle to facilitate maintenance and access. Slopes that are $4: 1$ or flatter should be used to allow for conventional maintenance equipment and for improved safety, maintenance, and aesthetics. Side slopes should be no steeper than 3:1. The use of walls is highly discouraged due to maintenance constraints.
4. Inlet: Dissipate flow energy at concentrated points of inflow. This will limit erosion and promote particle sedimentation. Inlets should be designed in accordance with UDFCD drop structure criteria
for inlets above the invert of the forebay, impact basin outlet details for at grade inlets, or other types of energy dissipating structures.
5. Forebay Design: The forebay provides an opportunity for larger particles to settle out in an area that can be easily maintained. The length of the flow path through the forebay should be maximized, and the slope minimized to encourage settling. The appropriate size of the forebay may be as much a function of the level of development in the tributary area as it is a percentage of the WQCV. When portions of the watershed may remain disturbed for an extended period of time, the forebay size will need to be increased due to the potentially high sediment load. Refer to Table EDB-4 for a design criteria summary. When using this table, the designer should consider increasing the size of the forebay if the watershed is not fully developed.

The forebay outlet should be sized to release $2 \%$ of the undetained peak 100-year discharge. A soil riprap berm with $3: 1$ sideslopes (or flatter) and a pipe outlet or a concrete wall with a notch outlet should be constructed between the forebay and the main EDB. It is recommended that the berm/pipe configuration be reserved for watersheds in excess of 20 impervious acres to accommodate the minimum recommended pipe diameter of 8 inches. When using the berm/pipe configuration, round up to the nearest standard pipe size and use a minimum diameter of 8 inches. The floor of the forebay should be concrete or lined with grouted boulders to define sediment removal limits. With either configuration, soil riprap should also be provided on the downstream side of the forebay berm or wall if the downstream grade is lower than the top of the berm or wall. The forebay will overtop frequently so this protection is necessary for erosion control. All soil riprap in the area of the forebay should be seeded and erosion control fabric should be placed to retain the seed in this high flow area.
6. Trickle Channel: Convey low flows from the forebay to the micropool with a trickle channel. The trickle channel should have a minimum flow capacity equal to the maximum release from the forebay outlet.

- Concrete Trickle Channels: A concrete trickle channel will help to establish the bottom of the basin long-term and may also facilitate regular sediment removal. It can be a "V" shaped concrete drain pan or a concrete channel with curbs. A flat-bottom channel facilitates maintenance. A slope between $0.4 \%-1 \%$ is recommended to encourage settling while reducing the potential for low points within the pan.
- Soft-bottom Trickle Channels: When designed and maintained properly, soft-bottom trickle channels can allow for an attractive alternative to concrete. They can also improve water quality. However, they are not appropriate for all sites. Be aware, maintenance of soft bottom trickle channels requires mechanical removal of sediment and vegetation. Additionally, this option provides mosquito habitat. For this reason, UDFCD recommends that they be considered on a case-by-case basis and with the approval of the local jurisdiction. It is recommended that soft bottom trickle channels be designed with a consistent longitudinal slope from forebay to micropool and that they not meander. This geometry will allow for reconstruction of the original design when sediment removal in the trickle channel is necessary. The trickle channel may also be located along the toe of the slope if a straight channel is not desired. The recommended minimum depth of a soft bottom trickle channel is 1.5 feet. This depth will help limit potential wetland growth to the trickle channel, preserving the bottom of the basin.

Riprap and soil riprap lined trickle channels are not recommended due to past maintenance experiences, where the riprap was inadvertently removed along with the sediment during maintenance.
7. Micropool and Outlet Structure: Locate the outlet structure in the embankment of the EDB and provide a permanent micropool directly in front of the structure. Submerge the well screen to the bottom of the micropool. This will reduce clogging of the well screen because it allows water to flow though the well screen below the elevation of the lowest orifice even when the screen above the water surface is plugged. This will prevent shallow ponding in front of the structure, which provides a breeding ground for mosquitoes (large shallow puddles tend to produce more mosquitoes than a smaller, deeper permanent pond).

Micropool side slopes may be vertical walls or stabilized slopes of 3:1 (horizontal:vertical). For watersheds with less than 5 impervious acres, the micropool can be located inside the outlet structure (refer to Figures OS-7 and OS-8 provided in Fact Sheet T-12). The micropool should be at least 2.5 feet in depth with a minimum surface area of 10 square feet. The bottom should be concrete unless a baseflow is present or anticipated or if groundwater is anticipated. Riprap is not recommended because it is often inadvertently removed during maintenance operations.

Basins with micropools have fewer mosquitoes. Micropools reduce shallow wet areas where breeding is most favorable .

Where possible, place the outlet in an inconspicuous location as shown in Photo EDB-3. This urban EDB utilizes landscaped parking lot islands connected by a series of culverts (shown in Photo EDB-4) to provide the required water quality and flood control volumes.

The outlet should be designed to release the WQCV over a 40-hour period. This can be done through an orifice plate as detailed in BMP Fact Sheet T-12. Use reservoir routing calculations as discussed in the Storage Chapter of Volume 2 or use equation EDB-3, a simplified orifice sizing equation (see Technical Memorandum dated July 13, 2010 available at www.udfcd.org).

$$
A_{O}=\frac{88 V^{\left(0.95 / H^{0.085}\right)}}{T_{D} S^{0.09} H^{\left(2.6 S^{0.3}\right)}}
$$

Equation EDB-3

Where:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
A_{O} & =\text { area per row of orifices spaced on } 4 " \text { centers }\left(\mathrm{in}^{2}\right) \\
V & = \\
T_{D} & =\text { design volume }(\mathrm{WQCV} \text { or EURV, acre } \mathrm{ft}) \\
& \\
& \text { (i.e., } 40 \text { hours for WQCV or } 72 \text { hours for EURV) } \\
H & = \\
S & = \\
= & \text { depth of volume }(\mathrm{ft}) \\
\mathrm{St} / \mathrm{ft})
\end{array}
$$

Refer to BMP Fact Sheet T-12 for schematics pertaining to structure geometry, grates, trash racks, orifice plate, and all other necessary components.

## Additional Guidelines for Incorporating Flood Control:

When designing for flood control using Full Spectrum Detention, the outlet is typically designed to drain the EURV in 72 hours. However, the owner may want to modify the design (reduce the EURV drain time) for a number of reasons including wanting to provide larger orifices for maintenance purposes or, when designing BMPs in series, to ensure that the maximum detention time for the system does not exceed 72 hours. Modifications can be permitted as long as the outlet drains the WQCV (not the EURV) over a period of at least 40 hours. The UD-BMP workbook can be used to ensure this condition is met while adjusting the drain time for the EURV.

When using Full Spectrum Detention a separate 5- or 10-year orifice or weir is not necessary. In order to best replicate historic release rates, design the outlet structure to overtop at the EURV elevation. The velocity of flows into the structure at the 100-year peak discharge should not exceed a velocity of 2 feet per second. This criterion is a safety precaution, limiting the risk of pinning. Use the continuity equation to ensure this criterion:

$$
V=\frac{Q_{100}}{A} \leq 2
$$

Equation EDB-4
Where:
$V \quad=$ velocity of flow through the trash rack ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ )
$Q_{100} \quad=$ peak discharge through the outlet structure (cfs)
A $\quad=$ open area of the trash rack $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$
The outlet may have flared or parallel wing walls as shown in Figures EDB-1 and EDB-2, respectively. Either configuration should be recessed into the embankment to minimize its profile. Additionally, the trash rack should be sloped with the basin side-slopes.
8. Initial Surcharge Volume: Providing a surcharge volume above the micropool for frequently occurring runoff minimizes standing water and sediment deposition in the remainder of the basin. This is critical to turf maintenance and mosquito abatement in the basin bottom. The initial surcharge volume is not provided in the micropool nor does it include the micropool volume. It is the available storage volume that begins at the water surface elevation of the micropool and extends upward to a grade break within the basin (typically the invert of the trickle channel).


Photograph EDB-2. The initial surcharge volume of this EDB is contained within the boulders that surround the micropool.

The area of the initial surcharge volume, when full, is typically the same or slightly larger than that of the micropool. The initial surcharge volume should have a depth of at least 4 inches. For watersheds of at least 5 impervious acres, the initial surcharge volume should also be at least $0.3 \%$ of the WQCV. The initial surcharge volume is considered a part of the WQCV and does not need to be provided in addition to the WQCV. It is recommended that this area be shown on the grading plan or in a profile for the EDB. When baseflows are anticipated, it is recommended that the initial surcharge volume be increased. See the inset on page EDB-9 for additional guidelines for designing for baseflows.
9. Trash Rack: Provide a trash rack (or screen) of sufficient size at the outlet to provide hydraulic capacity while the rack is partially clogged. Openings should be small enough to limit clogging of the individual orifices. For this reason, it is recommended that a well screen be used when circular orifices are used. Size any overflow trash rack so it does not interfere with the hydraulic capacity of the outlet pipe. See BMP Fact Sheet T-12 for detailed trash rack design guidance.


Photograph EDB-3. Although walls may complicate maintenance access, this outlet structure is relatively hidden from public view. This photo was taken shortly following a storm event.


Photograph EDB-4. A series of landscape islands connected by culverts provide water quality and flood control for this site.


Figure EDB-1. Flared Wall Outlet Structure Configuration. Graphic by Adia Davis.


Figure EDB-2. Parallel Wall Outlet Structure Configuration. Graphic by Adia Davis.
10. Overflow Embankment: Design the embankment to withstand the 100-year storm at a minimum. If the embankment falls under the jurisdiction of the State Engineer's Office, it must be designed to meet the requirements of the State Engineer's Office. The overflow should be located at a point where waters can best be conveyed downstream. Slopes that are $4: 1$ or flatter should be used to allow for conventional maintenance equipment and for improved safety, maintenance, and aesthetics. Side slopes should be no steeper than 3:1 and should be planted with turf forming grasses. Poorly compacted native soils should be excavated and replaced. Embankment soils should be compacted to $95 \%$ of maximum dry density for ASTM D698 (Standard Proctor) or 90\% for ASTM D1557 (Modified Proctor). Spillway structures and overflows should be designed in accordance with the Storage Chapter of Volume 2 as well as any local drainage criteria. Buried soil riprap or reinforced turf mats installed per manufacturer's recommendations can provide an attractive and less expensive alternative to concrete.
11. Vegetation: Vegetation provides erosion control and sediment entrapment. Basin bottom, berms, and side slopes should be planted with turf grass, which is a general term for any grasses that will form a turf or mat, as opposed to bunch grass which will grow in clumplike fashion. Xeric grasses with temporary irrigation are recommended to reduce maintenance requirements, including maintenance of the irrigation system as well as frequency of mowing. Where possible, place irrigation heads outside the basin bottom because irrigation heads in an EDB can become buried with sediment over time.
12. Access: Provide appropriate maintenance access to the forebay and outlet works. For larger basins, this means stabilized access for maintenance vehicles. If stabilized access is not provided, the maintenance plan should provide detail, including recommended equipment, on how sediment and trash will be removed from the outlet structure and micropool. Some communities may require vehicle access to the bottom of the basin regardless of the size of the watershed. Grades

## Designing for Baseflows

Baseflows should be anticipated for large tributary areas and can be accommodated in a variety of ways. Consider the following:

- If water rights are available, consider alternate BMPs such as a constructed wetland pond or retention pond.
- Anticipate future modifications to the outlet structure. Following construction, baseflows should be monitored periodically. Intermittent flows can become perennial and perennial flows can increase over time. It may be determined that outlet modifications are necessary long after construction of the BMP is complete.
- Design foundation drains and other groundwater drains to bypass the water quality plate directing these drains to a conveyance element downstream of the EDB. This will reduce baseflows and help preserve storage for the WQCV.
- When the basin is fully developed and an existing baseflow can be approximated prior to design, the water quality orifices should be increased to drain the WQCV in 40 hours (or EURV in 72 hours) while also draining the baseflow. This requires reservoir routing using an inflow hydrograph that includes the baseflow. The UDDetention workbook available at www.udfcd.org may be used for this purpose.
- Increase the initial surcharge volume of the pond to provide some flexibility when baseflows are known or anticipated. Baseflows are difficult to approximate and will continue to increase as the watershed develops. Increasing the initial surcharge volume will accommodate a broader range of flows.
should not exceed $10 \%$ for haul road surfaces and $20 \%$ for skid-loader and backhoe access. Stabilized access includes gravel, concrete, articulated concrete block, concrete grid pavement, or reinforced grass pavement. The recommended cross slope is $2 \%$.


## Aesthetic Design

Since all land owners and managers wish to use land in the most efficient manner possible, it is important that EDBs become part of a multi-use system. This encourages the design of EDBs as an aesthetic part of a naturalized environment or to include passive and/or active open space. Within each scenario, the EDB can begin to define itself as more than just a drainage facility. When this happens, the basin becomes a public amenity. This combination of public amenity and drainage facility is of much greater value to a landowner. Softened and varied slopes, interspersed irrigated fields, planting areas and wetlands can all be part of an EDB.

The design should be aesthetic whether it is considered to be an architectural or naturalized basin. Architectural basins incorporate design borrowed or reflective of the surrounding architecture or urban forms. An architectural basin is intended to appear as part of the built environment, rather than hiding the cues that identify it as a stormwater structure. A naturalized basin is designed to appear as though it is a natural part of the landscape. This section provides suggestions for designing a naturalized basin. The built environment, in contrast to the natural environment, does not typically contain the randomness of form inherent in nature. Constructed slopes typically remain consistent, as do slope transitions. Even dissipation structures are usually a hard form and have edges seldom seen in nature. If the EDB is to appear as though it is a natural part of the landscape, it is important to minimize shapes that provide visual cues indicating the presence of a drainage structure. For example, the side sides should be shaped more naturally and with varying slopes for a naturalized basin.

## Suggested Methods for a Naturalized Basin

- Create a flowing form that looks like it was shaped by water.
- Extend one side of the basin higher than the other. This may require a berm.
- Shape the bottom of the basin differently than the top.
- Slope of one side of the basin more mildly than the opposing side.
- Vary slope transitions both at the top of the bank and at the toe.
- Use a soft-surface trickle channel if appropriate and approved.
- When using rock for energy dissipation, the rock should graduate away from the area of hard edge into the surrounding landscape. Other non-functional matching rock should occur in other areas of the basin to prevent the actual energy dissipation from appearing out of context.
- Design ground cover to reflect the type of water regime expected for their location within the basin.


Figure EDB-3. Extended Detention Basin (EDB) Plan and Profile

Additional Details are provided in BMP Fact Sheet T-12. This includes outlet structure details including orifice plates and trash racks.

Table EDB-4. EDB Component Criteria

|  | On-Site EDBs for Watersheds up to 1 Impervious Acre ${ }^{1}$ | EDBs with Watersheds up to 2 Impervious Acres ${ }^{1}$ | EDBs with Watersheds up to 5 Impervious Acres | EDBs with Watersheds over 5 Impervious Acres | EDBs with Watersheds over 20 Impervious Acres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forebay Release and Configuration | A forebay and trickle channel may not be necessary for this size site. Specific site operations should be considered to determine if a forebay will serve to reduce the maintenance requirements. | Release $2 \%$ of the undetained 100-year peak discharge by way of a wall/notch configuration | Release 2\% of the undetained 100-year peak discharge by way of a wall/notch configuration | Release 2\% of the undetained 100-year peak discharge by way of a wall/notch configuration | Release $2 \%$ of the undetained 100-year peak discharge by way of a wall/notch or berm/pipe ${ }^{2}$ configuration |
| Minimum <br> Forebay <br> Volume |  | $1 \%$ of the WQCV | $2 \%$ of the WQCV | $3 \%$ of the WQCV | $3 \%$ of the WQCV |
| Maximum Forebay Depth |  | 12 inches | 18 inches | 18 inches | 30 inches |
| Trickle Channel Capacity |  | $\geq$ the maximum possible forebay outlet capacity | $\geq$ the maximum possible forebay outlet capacity | $\geq$ the maximum possible forebay outlet capacity | $\geq$ the maximum possible forebay outlet capacity |
| Micropool | Area $\geq 10 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | Area $\geq 10 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | Area $\geq 10 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | Area $\geq 10 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | Area $\geq 10 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ |
| Initial <br> Surcharge <br> Volume | $\begin{gathered} \text { Depth } \geq 4 \\ \text { inches } \end{gathered}$ | Depth $\geq 4$ inches | Depth $\geq 4$ inches | Depth $\geq 4$ in. Volume $\geq$ 0.3\% WQCV | Depth $\geq 4$ in. Volume $\geq$ 0.3\% WQCV |

${ }^{1}$ EDBs are not recommended for sites with less than 2 impervious acres. Consider a sand filter or rain garden.
${ }^{2}$ Round up to the first standard pipe size (minimum 8 inches).

## Design Example

The UD-BMP workbook, designed as a tool for both designer and reviewing agency is available at www.udfcd.org. This section provides a completed design form from this workbook as an example.

Design Procedure Form: Extended Detention Basin (EDB)



## Design Procedure Form: Extended Detention Basin (EDB)

| Design Procedure Form: Extended Detention Basin (EDB) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sheet 3 of 4 |
| 8. Initial Surcharge Volume <br> A) Depth of Initial Surcharge Volume (Minimum recommended depth is 4 inches) <br> B) Minimum Initial Surcharge Volume (Minimum volume of $0.3 \%$ of the WQCV) <br> C) Initial Surcharge Provided Above Micropool | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D}_{1 \mathrm{~S}}=\frac{6.0}{} \text { in } \\ & \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{IS}}=\frac{55.5}{} \mathrm{cu} \mathrm{ft} \\ & \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{s}}=\frac{62.5}{}=-\mathrm{cuft} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 9. Trash Rack <br> A) Type of Water Quality Orifice Used <br> B) Water Quality Screen Open Area: $A_{t}=38.5^{*}\left(e^{-0.095 D}\right)^{*} A_{n t}$ <br> C) For 2", or Smaller, Circular Opening (See Fact Sheet T-12): i) Width of Water Quality Screen and Concrete Opening ( $\mathrm{W}_{\text {opening }}$ ) <br> ii) Height of Water Quality Screen $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{TR}}\right)$ <br> iii) Type of Screen, Describe if "Other" | Choose One $\qquad$ Rectangular (2" high) <br> $A_{t}=$ $\qquad$ 317 square inches <br> $\mathrm{W}_{\text {opening }}=$ $\qquad$ inches $\qquad$ Choose One S.S. Well Screen with 60\% Open Area* Other (Describe): |  |
| D) For 2" High Rectangular Opening: <br> i) Width of Rectangular Opening ( $\mathrm{W}_{\text {oriftece }}$ ) <br> ii) Width of Water Quality Screen Opening ( $W_{\text {opening }}$ ) <br> iii) Height of Water Quality Screen $\left(H_{T R}\right)$ <br> iv) Type of Screen, Describe if "Other" |  |  |
| v) Cross-bar Spacing <br> vi) Minimum Bearing Bar Size | $\qquad$ nches |  |




# Critical Habitat for the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse 

 Unit 11 - Monument Creek

Critical habitat equals the stream plus the following distance outward on each side. $\cdots \cdot . . . .$.
~~ 120 meters ( 394 ft )
$\approx \approx 140$ meters (459 ft)

- , Major Roads


Municipal Lands

## The calm during the storm

 When it rains, oils, sediment and other contaminants are washed from paved surfaces directly into our storm drains and waterways. Non-point source pollution such as stormwater now accounts for $80 \%$ of water pollution in North America and governments are responding with demanding regulations to protect our water resources.
## Removing more pollutants

Stormceptor removes more pollutants from stormwater than any other separator.

- Maintains continuous positive treatment of total suspended solids (TSS) year-round, regardless of flow rate
- Designed to remove a wide range of particle sizes (from 20 to 2,000 microns), as well as free oils, heavy metals and nutrients that attach to fine sediment
- Can be designed to remove a specific particle size distribution (PSD)


## A calm treatment environment

- Stormceptor slows incoming stormwater to create a non-turbulent treatment environment, allowing free oils and debris to rise, and sediment to settle
- Patented scour prevention technology ensures pollutants are captured and contained during all rainfall events, even extreme storms


## PCSWMM for Stormceptor - leading the industry

The most accurate, easy to use design tool available.

- This continuous simulation modeling software combines up-to-date local rainfall data from hundreds of stations across North America with a selection of particle sizes to design the best system for your site
- Developed with Computational Hydraulics International (CHI), internationally acclaimed expert, Dr. Bill James and Imbrium Systems


## Proven performance

- Recent tests conducted for the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) found Stormceptor has the highest TSS removal rate of seven stormwater treatment technologies tested
- Stormceptor STC has been verified not to resuspend previously captured pollutants by NJCAT and an independent testing body
- Stormceptor STC is entering into Tier II of the TARP Program (administered by NJDEP)
- Stormceptor's performance is backed by Canada's stringent Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Program

With over 25,000 units operating worldwide, Stormceptor performs and protects every day, in every storm.

## Stormeeptor

## The calm during the storm




Seamless
Minimal drop between inlet and outlet pipes makes Stormceptor ideal for retrofits and new development projects.


Flexible
Multiple inlets can connect to a single unit.
Can be used as a bend structure.

## Inspection and Maintenance. Easy. Convenient.

When it rains, oils, sediment and other contaminants are captured and contained by over 20,000 Stormceptor units operating worldwide. While Stormceptor's patented scour prevention technology ensures captured pollutants remain in the unit during all rainfall events, the accumulated pollutants must eventually be removed as part of a regular maintenance program.

If neglected, oil and sediment gradually build up and diminish any BMP's efficiency, harming the environment and leaving owners and operators vulnerable to fines, surcharges and bad publicity.

## Maintenance is a must

Ease, frequency and cost of maintenance are often overlooked by specifiers when considering the merits of a stormwater treatment system. In reality, maintenance is fundamental to the long-term performance of any stormwater quality treatment device.

While regular maintenance is crucial, it shouldn't
 be complicated. An ongoing maintenance program with Stormceptor is convenient and practically effortless. With virtually no disruptions, you can concentrate on your core business.

## Quick inspections

Inspections are easily carried out above ground from any standard surface access cover through a visual inspection of the orifice and drop tee components. A sludge judge and oil dip-stick are all that are needed for sediment and oil depth measurements.

## Easy unit access

Maintenance is typically conducted from the same surface access cover, eliminating the need for confined space entry into the unit. Your site remains undisturbed, saving you time and money.

No muss, no fuss and fast
Maintenance is performed quickly and inexpensively with a standard vacuum truck. Servicing usually takes less than two hours, with no disruption to your site.

A complete stormwater management plan for Stormceptor extends beyond installation and performance to regular maintenance. It's the smart, cost-effective way to ensure your unit continues to remove more pollutants than any other separator for decades to come.

## Stormceptor maintenance recommendations

- Units should be inspected post-construction, prior to being put into service.
- Inspect every six months for the first year of operation to determine the oil and sediment accumulation rate.
- In subsequent years, inspections can be based on first-year observations or local requirements.
- Cleaning is required once the sediment depth reaches $15 \%$ of storage capacity, (generally taking one year or longer). Local regulations for maintenance frequency may vary.
- Inspect the unit immediately after an oil, fuel or chemical spill.
- A licensed waste management company should remove captured petroleum waste products from any oil, chemical or fuel spills and dispose responsibly.

With over 20,000 units operating worldwide, Stormceptor performs and protects every day, in every storm.

| Stormceptor Capacities Table |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model \# | Sediment (H3) | Oil (gal)(a) | Total Volume (gal) | Diameter <br> (ti) | Depth (in)(d) | Empty Weight (ton) | Full Weight (ton) |
| STC 450i | 44 | 86 | 470 | 48 | 68 |  |  |
| STC 900 | 78 | 251 | 952 | 72 | 63 |  |  |
| STC 1200 | 115 | 251 | 1234 | 72 | 79 |  |  |
| STC 1800 | 196 | 251 | 1833 | 72 | 113 |  |  |
| STC 2400 | 184 | 840 | 2462 | 72/96 | 104 |  |  |
| STC 3600 | 352 | 840 | 3715 | 72196 | 144 |  |  |
| STC 4800 | 511 | 909 | 5059 | 72/120 | 140 |  |  |
| STC 6000 | 654 | 909 | 6136 | 72/120 | 162 |  |  |
| STC 7200 | 792 | 1059 | 7420 | 72/144 | 148 |  |  |
| STC 11000 | **1021 | *2797 | **11194 | -96/120 | 140 |  |  |
| STC 13000 | **1309 | **2797 | **13348 | *96/120 | 162 |  |  |
| STC 16000 | **1583 | **3055 | **15918 | *96/144 | 148 |  |  |

## Notes:

Sediment and Oil volumes are maximum capacities
Depth = Depth of lank from the invert of the pipe to the bottom of the structure
Diameter = Dlameter of the lower tank below the Invert of the pipe

## Empty Weight = Weight of the Concrete Structure

Full Weight = Weight of the Concrete Structure when it is full of water

## MAINTENANCE

## Inspection and Maintenance. Easy. Convenient.

When it rains, oils, sediment and other contaminants are captured and contained by over 20,000 Stormceptor units operating worldwide. While Stormceptor's patented scour prevention technology ensures captured pollutants remain in the unit during all rainfall events, the accumulated pollutants must eventually be removed as part of a regular maintenance program.

If neglected, oil and sediment gradually build up and diminish any BMP's efficiency, harming the environment and leaving owners and operators vulnerable to fines, surcharges and bad publicity.

## Maintenance is a must

Ease, frequency and cost of maintenance are often overlooked by specifiers when considering the merits of a stormwater treatment system. In reality, maintenance is fundamental to the long-term performance of any stormwater quality treatment device.


While regular maintenance is crucial, it shouldn't
 be complicated. An ongoing maintenance program with Stormceptor is convenient and practically effortless. With virtually no disruptions, you can concentrate on your core business.

## Quick inspections

Inspections are easily carried out above ground from any standard surface access cover through a visual inspection of the orifice and drop tee components. A sludge judge and oil dip-stick are all that are needed for sediment and oil depth measurements.

## Easy unit access

Maintenance is typically conducted from the same surface access cover, eliminating the need for confined space entry into the unit. Your site remains undisturbed, saving you time and money.

## No muss, no fuss and fast

Maintenance is performed quickly and inexpensively with a standard vacuum truck. Servicing usually takes less than two hours, with no disruption to your site.

A complete stormwater management plan for Stormceptor extends beyond installation and performance to regular maintenance. It's the smart, cost-effective way to ensure your unit continues to remove more pollutants than any other separator for decades to come.


## Stormceptor maintenance recommendations

- Units should be inspected post-construction, prior to being put into service.
- Inspect every six months for the first year of operation to determine the oil and sediment accumulation rate.
- In subsequent years, inspections can be based on first-year observations or local requirements.
- Cleaning is required once the sediment depth reaches $15 \%$ of storage capacity, (generally taking one year or longer). Local regulations for maintenance frequency may vary.
- Inspect the unit immediately after an oil, fuel or chemical spill.
- A licensed waste management company should remove captured petroleum waste products from any oil, chemical or fuel spills and dispose responsibly.

With over 20,000 units operating worldwide, Stormceptor performs and protects every day, in every storm.

## APPENDIX B BACKUP CALCULATIONS

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources


| Number of PSQF Volume | 1.00 0.13 | ac-ft | Depth H:V | 2.50 ft $4: 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Additional | 20 ft |
| Sizing |  |  |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Average Depth | 2.50 | ft |  |  |
| A1+A2 | 4529 | sq ft |  |  |
| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |  |  |
| L= | 200 | ft |  |  |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 0 | ft |  |  |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |  |  |
| L= | 220 | ft |  |  |
| W= | 20 | ft |  |  |


| 6 " weir +1 | ft freeboard +3 ft berm |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | 238 ft |  |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 38 | ft |









Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 9 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 3126.74 ft |  |
| Width | 160 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 11.06 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 88 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 160 ft |
|  | 6.08 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

EURV

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | EURV $_{\mathrm{k}}$ | EURV $_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Type A | 2338.07 | 74.78 | 4.49 | 2.13 | 0.80 |  |
| Type B | 788.67 | 25.22 | 1.59 | 1.36 | 0.18 |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV $=$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 8}$ | ac-ft |
|  |  |  | EURV Total $=$ | $\mathbf{1 . 8 5}$ | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Required WQCV = |  |  |  | 0.46 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100-year Detention Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 4.72 | 0.44 | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |
| Type B | 1.59 | 0.15 | 0.27 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | $\begin{array}{lc}0.00 & 0.00 \\ 10-\text {-year Volume }= \\ 100-\text {-year Volume }= \\ & \\ 100 \text {-year Volume + WQCV } & =\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0.59 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | 1.20 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | 1.66 | ac-ft |  |
|  | Number of PSQF | 1.00 | Depth | 2.67 ft |  |  |
|  | Volume | 1.20 | ac-ft H:V |  | :1 |  |
|  |  |  | Additional |  |  |  |
|  | Sizing |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Depth | 3.00 | $f t$ |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom Slope | 0.005 | ft/ft |  |  |  |
|  | Average Depth | 2.67 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1+A2 | 39035 | sq ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1 "Bottom" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 132 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{W}=$ | 125 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A2 "Top" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 153.36 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 147 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | 6 l weir + $1 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{freeboard}+3 \mathrm{ft}$ berm |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 171 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 165 | ft |  |  |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | $\mathrm{I}-25$ Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 10 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1922.96 ft |  |
| Width | 160 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 7.06 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 88 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 160 ft |
|  | 3.88 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

EURV

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | EURV $_{\mathrm{k}}$ | EURV $_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Type A | 1922.96 | 100.00 | 3.88 | 2.13 | 0.69 |  |
| Type B | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.36 | 0.00 |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV $=$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 9}$ | ac-ft |
|  |  |  | EURV Total $=$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2 5}$ | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.29 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100-year Detention Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 3.88 | 0.36 | 0.76 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.36 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume $=$ | 0.76 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | year Volume + WQCV = | 1.05 | ac-ft |  |
|  | Number of PSQF | 2.00 | Depth |  |  |  |
|  | Volume | 0.38 | ac-ft $\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V}$ |  | :1 |  |
|  |  |  | Additional | 20.7755 |  |  |
|  | Sizing |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Average Depth | 2.60 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1+A2 | 12732 | sq ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1 "Bottom" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 161.22449 |  |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 26 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A2 "Top" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 182 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 47 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | 6 l weir + 1 ft | reeboard + 3 | ft berm |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 200 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 65 | ft |  |  |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | $\mathrm{I}-25$ Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 11 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 3580.58 ft |  |
| Width | 160 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 9.47 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 88 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 160 ft |
|  | 5.21 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

EURV

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | EURV $_{\mathrm{k}}$ | EURV $_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Type A | 1051.63 | 29.37 | 2.12 | 2.13 | 0.38 |  |
| Type B | 2528.95 | 70.63 | 3.08 | 1.36 | 0.35 |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV $=$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 3}$ | ac-ft |
|  |  |  | EURV Total $=$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7 4}$ | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.39 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100-year Detention Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 2.12 | 0.20 | 0.42 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 5.11 | 0.48 | 0.88 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.67 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 1.29 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | year Volume + WQCV = | 1.69 | ac-ft |  |
|  | Number of PSQF | 2.00 | Depth |  |  |  |
|  | Volume | 0.65 | ac-ft $\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V}$ |  | :1 |  |
|  |  |  | Additional | 86759 |  |  |
|  | Sizing |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Average Depth | 1.98 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1+A2 | 28370 | sq ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1 "Bottom" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 406.620123 |  |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 26 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A2 "Top" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 422.48772 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 42 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | 6 " weir + 1 ft | freeboard + 3 | ft berm |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 440 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 60 | ft |  |  |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 12 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 2005.07 ft |  |
| Width | 160 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 7.36 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 88 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 160 ft |
|  | 4.05 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.13 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 2005.07 | 100.00 | 2.03 | 1.36 | 0.23 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.23 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | V Total = | 0.84 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Requir | WQCV = | 0.31 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | etention Volu |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Type B | 4.05 | 0.38 | 0.70 |  |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year | Volume $=$ | 0.38 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-yea | Volume = | 0.70 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-y | year Volume | WQCV = | 1.00 | ac-ft |  |



Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 13 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1147.91 ft |  |
| Width | Varies ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 2.91 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | Varies ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 160 ft |
|  | 1.45 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

EURV

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{V}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 635.75 | 55.38 | 0.41 | 2.13 | 0.07 |  |  |
| Type B | 512.16 | 44.62 | 1.03 | 1.36 | 0.12 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.19 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | Total $=$ | 0.40 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.12 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100-year Detention Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.41 | 0.04 | 0.08 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 1.03 | 0.10 | 0.18 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.13 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.26 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | year Volume + WQCV = | 0.38 | ac-ft |  |
|  | Number of PSQF | 1.00 | Depth |  |  |  |
|  | Volume | 0.26 | ac-ft $\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V}$ |  | :1 |  |
|  |  |  | Additional |  |  |  |
|  | Sizing |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Average Depth | 2.88 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1+A2 | 7825 | sq ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1 "Bottom" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 50 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 50 | $f t$ |  |  |  |
|  | A2 "Top" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 73 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 73 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | 6 " weir + 1 ft | eeboard + | 3 ft berm |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 91 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 91 | ft |  |  |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 14 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 894.50 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 1.23 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.23 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)


| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}($ ac- tt$)$ | $\mathrm{V}_{100}(\mathrm{a}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0.49 | 0.05 | 0.10 |
| Type B | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |


| 100-year Volume $=$ | 0.10 | ac-ft |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$ *Based on added pavement

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 15 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1149.66 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 1.58 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 0.63 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)
EURV

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | $E^{\text {E }}$ ( $V_{\text {k }}$ | EURV ${ }_{V}$ (a |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 456.26 | 39.69 | 0.25 | 2.13 | 0.04 |  |  |
| Type B | 693.4 | 60.31 | 0.38 | 1.36 | 0.04 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.09 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | Total $=$ | 0.22 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |  |


| Required WQCV = |  |  |  | 0.07 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100-year Detention Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.25 | 0.02 | 0.05 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 0.38 | 0.04 | 0.07 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 0.00 <br> 100 -year Volume $=$  <br> $100-$ year Volume $=$  <br>  100-year Volume + WQCV $=$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0.06 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | 0.11 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | 0.18 | ac-ft |  |
|  | Number of PSQF | 1.00 | Depth | 2.90 ft |  |  |
|  | Volume | 0.11 | ac-ft H:V | 4 :1 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Additional | 23.2 ft |  |  |
|  | Sizing |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Average Depth | 2.90 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1+A2 | 3445 | sq ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1 "Bottom" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 40 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 19 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A2 "Top" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 63.2 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 42 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | 6 l weir +1 ft freeboard +3 ft berm |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 81 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 60 | ft |  |  |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 16 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 777.47 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 1.07 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.07 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)


Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 17 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1003.04 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 2.76 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.11 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

EURV

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | EURV $_{\mathrm{k}}$ | EURV $_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Type A | 248.26 | 24.75 | 0.27 | 2.13 | 0.05 |  |
| Type B | 754.78 | 75.25 | 0.83 | 1.36 | 0.09 |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV $=$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 4}$ | ac-ft |
|  |  |  | EURV Total $=$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 6}$ | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.12 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100-year Detention Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.05 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 0.83 | 0.08 | 0.14 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.10 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.20 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100 | year Volume + WQCV = | 0.31 | ac-ft |  |
|  | Number of PSQF | 1.00 | Depth |  |  |  |
|  | Volume | 0.20 | ac-ft $\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V}$ |  | :1 |  |
|  |  |  | Additional | 81600 |  |  |
|  | Sizing |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Average Depth | 2.85 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1+A2 | 5993 | sq ft |  |  |  |
|  | A1 "Bottom" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 59.1997293 |  |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 29 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | A2 "Top" |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L= | 82.0157347 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 52 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | 6 " weir + 1 ft f | freeboard + | 3 ft berm |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{L}=$ | 100 | ft |  |  |  |
|  | W= | 70 | ft |  |  |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 18 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 980.58 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 1.35 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.35 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | EURV ${ }_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 178.32 | 18.19 | 0.102 .13 | 0.02 |  |  |
| Type B | 802.26 | 81.81 | $0.44 \quad 1.36$ | 0.05 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.07 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total = | 0.17 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.06 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year De | etention Volume |  |  |  |


| Soil Type | Area $($ acre $)$ | $V_{10}($ ac-ft $)$ | $V_{100}($ ac |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| Type B | 0.44 | 0.04 | 0.08 |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 19 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 966.52 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 1.33 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.33 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a
EURV
Soil Type Length (ft) Length (\%) Area (acre) EURV EURV $_{\mathrm{k}}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$
Type A
Type B
Type C/D


Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 20 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 141.92 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 0.20 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 0.20 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 2.13$ | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 141.92 | 100.00 | $0.08 \quad 1.36$ | 0.01 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.01 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total = | 0.02 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.01 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | tention Volume |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $V_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.01 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume $=$ | 0.01 | $\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | ear Volume + WQCV = | 0.02 | ac-ft |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 21 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 127.85 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 0.18 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 0.18 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 2.13$ | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 127.85 | 100.00 | $0.07 \quad 1.36$ | 0.01 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.01 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total $=$ | 0.02 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.01 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | tention Volume |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $V_{100}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.01 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.01 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | ear Volume + WQCV = | 0.02 | ac-ft |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 22 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1591.22 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 4.38 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.75 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)
EURV

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 2.13$ | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 1591.22 | 100.00 | $1.75 \quad 1.36$ | 0.20 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.20 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total = | 0.50 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.18 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | tention Volume |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $V_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 1.75 | 0.16 | 0.30 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.16 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.30 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | ear Volume + WQCV = | 0.48 | ac-ft |  |


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 |  |
| ---: | :---: | :--- |
| Volume | 0.30 | $\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Sizing |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Average Depth | 2.85 | ft |
| A1+A2 | 9214 | sq ft |


| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L= | 62 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 50 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | 84.76 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 72 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| 6 6" weir +1 | ft | freeboard +3 ft berm |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | 103 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 90 | ft |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 23 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1821.69 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 2.51 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.00 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)



Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 24 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 2845.02 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 3.92 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.57 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | $E^{\text {E }}$ ( $V_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{V}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.13 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 2845.02 | 100.00 | 1.57 | 1.36 | 0.18 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.18 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | V Total = | 0.44 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | wQCV |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Require | WQCV = | 0.16 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no i |
|  |  | 100-year D | etention Vol |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Type B | 1.57 | 0.15 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-yea | Volume $=$ | 0.15 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-yea | Volume = | 0.27 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-y | year Volume | WQCV = | 0.43 | ac-ft |  |


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 | ac-ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sizing |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Average Depth | 2.87 | ft |
| A1+A2 | 8179 | sq ft |
| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |
| L= | 54 | ft |
| W= | 49 | ft |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |
| L= | 76.92 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 72 | ft |
| 6 " weir + 1 ft freeboard +3 ft berm |  |  |
| L= | 95 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 90 | ft |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 25 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1634.94 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 2.25 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 0.90 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)
EURV

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 2.13$ | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 1634.94 | 100.00 | $0.90 \quad 1.36$ | 0.10 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.10 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total = | 0.26 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.09 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | tention Volume |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $V_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 0.90 | 0.08 | 0.15 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.08 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.15 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | ear Volume + WQCV = | 0.25 | ac-ft |  |


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 |  |
| ---: | :---: | :--- |
| Volume | 0.15 | $\mathrm{ac-ft}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Sizing |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Average Depth | 2.90 | ft |
| A1+A2 | 4640 | sq ft |


| Depth | 2.90 ft |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{H}: \mathrm{V}$ | $4: 1$ |
| Additional | 23.22 ft |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 26 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 989.42 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 1.36 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.36 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)


Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 27 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 2272.38 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 3.13 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 3.13 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 2.13$ | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 2272.38 | 100.00 | $1.25 \quad 1.36$ | 0.14 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.14 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total = | 0.36 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.13 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | etention Volume |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 1.25 | 0.12 | 0.21 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.12 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.21 | $\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | year Volume + WQCV = | 0.35 | ac-ft |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 28 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 4982.35 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 6.86 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 2.75 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.13 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 4982.35 | 100.00 | 2.75 | 1.36 | 0.31 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.31 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | V Total = | 0.78 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Requir | WQCV = | 0.29 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | etention Volu |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Type B | 2.75 | 0.26 | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year | Volume $=$ | 0.26 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year | Volume = | $0.47$ | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-y | ear Volume | WQCV = |  | ac-ft |  |


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 |  | Depth | 2.60 ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0.47 | ac-ft | H:V | 4 :1 |
|  |  |  | Additional | 20.8 ft |
| Sizing |  |  |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Average Depth | 2.60 | ft |  |  |
| A1+A2 | 15784 | sq ft |  |  |


| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L= | 160 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 35 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |
| L= | 180.8 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 56 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| 6" weir +1 | ft | freeboard +3 ft berm |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | 199 | ft |
| W= | 74 | ft |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 29 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 2731.62 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 3.76 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.51 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |




Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 30 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 4751.83 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 6.55 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 2.62 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)
EURV


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 |  | Depth | 2.73 ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0.45 | ac-ft | H:V | 4:1 |
|  |  |  | Additional | 21.8 ft |
| Sizing |  |  |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Average Depth | 2.73 | ft |  |  |
| A1+A2 | 14363 | sq ft |  |  |


| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L= |  |  |
| W= | 110 | ft |
|  | 48 | ft |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | 131.8 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 69 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| 6" weir +1 | ft | freeboard +3 ft berm |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | 150 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 87 | ft |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 31 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 2301.81 ft |  |
| Width | 60 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 3.17 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 24 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.27 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |




Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 32 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1647.34 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 4.54 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.82 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 2.13$ | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 1647.34 | 100.00 | $1.82 \quad 1.36$ | 0.21 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.21 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total $=$ | 0.52 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.19 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | etention Volume |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $V_{100}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 1.82 | 0.17 | 0.31 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.17 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.31 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-- | year Volume + WQCV = | 0.50 | ac-ft |  |


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ac-ft |
| Sizing |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Average Depth | 2.73 | ft |
| A1+A2 | 9959 | sq ft |
| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |
| L= | 110 | ft |
| W= | 29 | ft |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |
| L= | 131.8 | ft |
| W= | 51 | ft |
| 6 l weir + 1 ft | board | ft be |
| L= | 150 | ft |
| W= | 69 | ft |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 33 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 811.41 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 2.24 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 2.24 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 2.13$ | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 811.41 | 100.00 | $0.89 \quad 1.36$ | 0.10 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.10 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total = | 0.25 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.09 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | etention Volume |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 0.89 | 0.08 | 0.15 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.08 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.15 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | year Volume + WQCV = | 0.25 | ac-ft |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 34 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 917.51 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 2.53 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 1.01 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |




Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: FSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 35 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: 100-year Volume |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1904.94 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 5.25 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 2.10 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.13 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 1904.94 | 100.00 | 2.10 | 1.36 | 0.24 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.24 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | V Total = | 0.60 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Requir | WQCV = | 0.22 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | etention Volu |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Type B | 2.10 | 0.20 | 0.36 |  |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year | Volume $=$ | 0.20 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-yea | Volume = | $0.36$ | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-y | ear Volume | WQCV = |  |  |  |


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 |  | Depth | 2.60 ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0.36 | ac-ft | H:V | 4 :1 |
|  |  |  | Additional | 20.8 ft |
| Sizing |  |  |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Average Depth | 2.60 | ft |  |  |
| A1+A2 | 12070 | sq ft |  |  |


| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L= | 160 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 24 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |
| L= | 180.8 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 45 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| 6" weir +1 | ft | freeboard +3 ft berm |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | 199 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 63 | ft |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 80\% TSS REMOVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 36 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: Stormceptor, Tributary Area |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 2523.77 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 6.95 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 6.95 acres | *Treated Area |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) EURV ${ }_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{\mathrm{V}}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 2.13$ | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 2523.77 | 100.00 | 2.78 1.36 | 0.32 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 1.21$ | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | EURV = | 0.32 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total = | 0.79 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Required WQCV = | 0.29 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no increase for sedimentation <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year D | tention Volume |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $V_{100}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Type B | 2.78 | 0.26 | 0.48 |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-year Volume = | 0.26 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-year Volume = | 0.48 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100- | ear Volume + WQCV = | 0.77 | ac-ft |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 100\% WQCV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 37 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: WQCV |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1329.88 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 2.95 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (I/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 2.95 acres | *Treated Area 100\%WQCV |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a $\quad 1.0$ WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | $E^{\text {E }}$ ( $V_{\text {k }}$ | $\mathrm{EURV}_{V}(\mathrm{a}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.13 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 1329.88 | 100.00 | 1.18 | 1.36 | 0.13 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.13 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | V Total = | 0.42 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | wQCV |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Require | WQCV = | 0.12 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no i |
|  |  | 100-year D | etention Vol |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Type B | 1.18 | 0.11 | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-yea | Volume $=$ | 0.11 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-yea | Volume = | 0.20 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-y | year Volume | WQCV = | 0.33 | ac-ft |  |


| Number of PSQF Volume | 1.00 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0.12 | ac-ft |
| Sizing |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Average Depth | 2.84 | ft |
| A1+A2 | 3767 | sq ft |
| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |
| L= | 64 | ft |
| W= | 12 | ft |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |
| L= | 86.72 | ft |
| W= | 35 | ft |
| 6 l weir + 1 ft | eboard | ft be |
| L= | 105 | ft |
| W= | 53 | ft |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: $100 \%$ WQCV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 38 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: WQCV |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1744.20 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 4.09 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 4.09 acres | *Treated Area 100\%WQCV |

a $\quad$ 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil TypeType A | EURV |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | $E^{\text {E }}$ ( $V_{\text {k }}$ | $E \cup$ RV ${ }_{V}(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ |  |  |
|  | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.13 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 1744.2 | 100.00 | 1.64 | 1.36 | 0.19 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.19 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | EURV Total = |  | 0.55 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
| WQCV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Required WQCV = |  |  | 0.17 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no i |
| 100-year Detention Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) $\mathrm{V}_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 0.00$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type B | 1.64 | $0.15 \quad 0.28$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | $0.00 \quad 0.00$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 10-year Volume = |  |  | 0.15 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-year Volume = |  |  | 0.28 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-year Volume + WQCV = |  |  | 0.45 | ac-ft |  |



Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 100\% WQCV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 39 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: WQCV |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 1731.57 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 4.77 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | 1 (l/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 4.77 acres | *Treated Area 100\%WQCV |

a $\quad$ 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)



Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 100\% WQCV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 40 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: WQCV |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 2044.72 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 5.63 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 5.63 acres | *Treated Area 100\%WQCV |

a $\quad$ 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)



## Water Quality Facility Sizing

RESPEC Water and Natural Resources


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 |  | Depth | 2.85 ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0.08 | ac-ft | H:V | 3.5 :1 |
|  |  |  | Additional | 19.95 ft |
| Sizing |  |  |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Average Depth | 2.85 | ft |  |  |
| A1+A2 | 2547 | sq ft |  |  |
| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |  |  |
| L= | 60 | ft |  |  |
| W= | 7 | ft |  |  |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |  |  |
| L= | 79.95 | ft |  |  |
| W= | 27 | ft |  |  |
| 6 " weir + 1 ft | board | 3 ft ber |  |  |
| L= | 96 | ft |  |  |
| W= | 43 | ft |  |  |

Water Quality Facility Sizing
RESPEC Water and Natural Resources

| Project Identifier: | I-25 Design Build | CONCEPTUAL PLAN GOAL: 100\% WQCV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section ID: | Basin 42 | FACILITY SIZED BASED ON: WQCV |
| Date: | 8/10/2012 |  |
| Completed by: | THT |  |
| Checked by: |  |  |
| Basin Parameters |  |  |
| Total Length | 3562.01 ft |  |
| Width | 120 ft |  |
| Tributary Area | 9.81 acres |  |
| Impervious ratio | (1/100) |  |
| Added Width | 48 ft | *Existing pavement width is 72 ft , new pavement width is 120 ft |
|  | 9.81 acres | *Treated Area 100\%WQCV |
| a | 1.0 WQCV | Drain Time (Table 3-2) |

a 1.0 WQCV Coeff Drain Time (Table 3-2)

| Soil Type | Length (ft) | Length (\%) | Area (acre) | $E^{\text {E }}$, $V_{\text {k }}$ | EURV ${ }_{\text {V }}$ (ac |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type A | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.13 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Type B | 3562.01 | 100.00 | 3.93 | 1.36 | 0.45 |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | EURV = | 0.45 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  |  | V Total $=$ | 1.11 | ac-ft | *For information purposes only |
|  |  | WQCV |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Require | WQCV = | 0.41 | ac-ft | *Based on total pavement, no i <br> *For information purposes only |
|  |  | 100-year De | tention Vol |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Type | Area (acre) | $\mathrm{V}_{10}$ (ac-ft) | $V_{100}$ (ac-ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Type A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Type B | 3.93 | 0.37 | 0.67 |  |  |  |  |
| Type C/D | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 10-yea | Volume $=$ | 0.37 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  |  | 100-yea | Volume = | 0.67 | ac-ft | *Based on added pavement |
|  |  | 100-y | year Volume | WQCV = | 1.08 | ac-ft |  |


| Number of PSQF | 1.00 |  | Depth | 2.35 ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0.41 | ac-ft | H:V | $4: 1$ |
|  |  |  | Additional | 18.8 ft |
| Sizing |  |  |  |  |
| Depth | 3.00 | ft |  |  |
| Bottom Slope | 0.005 | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Average Depth | 2.35 | ft |  |  |
| A1+A2 | 15157 | sq ft |  |  |


| A1 "Bottom" |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L= | 260 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 18 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| A2 "Top" |  |  |
| L= | 278.8 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 37 | ft |
|  |  |  |
| 6" weir +1 | ft | freeboard +3 ft berm |
| L= | 297 | ft |
| $\mathrm{W}=$ | 55 | ft |


[^0]:    ${ }^{\text {' }}$ The term "maximized storm" refers to the optimization of the storage volume of a BMP. The WQCV for the "maximized" storm represents the point of diminishing returns in terms of the number of storm events and volume of runoff fully treated versus
    the storage volume provided.

