PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS STUDY

For:

Meyers Industrial PL 20-0654

Meyers Ave Escondido, CA 92029

APN: 228-312-05-00

Prepared By:

RCE 68075

4-10-2022 EXP: 06-30-23

Gregory W. Lang, P.E. Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, Inc. 119 Aberdeen Drive Cardiff, CA 92007





Prepared for:

VWP Escondido, LLC 2390 E. Camelback Road, Suite 305 Phoenix, AZ 85016

April 10, 2022

PLSA Job No. 3446

DECLARATION OF RESPONSIBLE CHARGE

I, hereby declare that I am the Engineer of Work for this project. That I have exercised responsible charge over the design of the project as defined in section 6703 of the business and professions code, and that the design is consistent with current standards.

I understand that the check of project drawings and specifications by the City of Escondido is confined to a review only and does not relieve me, as engineer of work, of my responsibilities for project design.

Gregory W. Lang R.C.E. 68075 EXP. 6-30-23 DATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION
1.	1 Project Description
1.2	2 Existing Conditions
1.	3 Proposed Conditions
2.	METHODOLOGY
2.	1 Rational Method
2.2	2 Runoff Coefficient
2.	3 Rainfall Intensity9
2.4	4 Tributary Areas10
2.:	5 Hydraulics
2.	6 Curb Inlet and Catch Basin Sizing10
2.	7 Detention Basin Routing
3.	CALCULATIONS/RESULTS12
3.	1 Pre- & Post-Development Peak Flow Comparison
3.2	2 Storm Water Quality
3.	3 Hydromodification
4.	CONCLUSION
	Appendix 1Existing Condition Hydrology Node MapAppendix 2Proposed Condition Hydrology Node MapAppendix 3Hydrology Design SummaryAppendix 4AES Rational Method CalculationsAppendix 5Modified-Puls Detention Routing



NTS

1. INTRODUCTION

This Preliminary Drainage Study for the proposed Meyers Industrial development has been prepared to analyze the hydrologic characteristics of the existing and proposed project site. This report presents both the methodology and the calculations used for determining the storm water runoff from the project site in the existing and proposed conditions produced by the 50-year, 6-hour storm event.

1.1 Project Description

The 4.26-acre project site consists of one undeveloped lot located south of the intersection of Barham Drive and Meyers Avenue along the west side of Meyers Avenue in the City of Escondido, San Diego County, California. The property is identified by the Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 228-312-05-00.

The property is currently undeveloped land. The property is bordered by a modular home community to the west, and by a variety of commercial and industrial developments to the north, east and south.

The site condition is divided into one drainage basin, Basin A, draining to one (1) Point of Compliance, POC-1. Storm water runoff from the project site is routed to POC-1 located near the northeast corner of the site, adjacent to Meyers Avenue.

Treatment of storm water runoff from the site has been addressed in a separate report- "Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for Meyers Industrial" by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, dated April 10, 2022. Hydromodification (HMP) analysis has also been presented within the SWQMP.

Per City of Escondido drainage criteria, the Modified Rational Method should be used to determine peak flowrates when the contributing drainage area is up to 0.5 square mile in size. All public and private drainage facilities shall be designed for a 50-year frequency storm for all tributary areas less than 1 square mile.

Methodology used for the computation of design rainfall events, runoff coefficients, and rainfall intensity values are consistent with the criteria set forth in the "City of Escondido Design Standards and Standard Drawings, April 2014."

1.2 Existing Conditions

In the existing condition, a high point is located at the southwest corner of the property. Runoff from the site sheet flows to the northeast toward Meyers Avenue. Stormwater is collected in the existing curb and gutter along the west side of Meyers Avenue and flows north to an existing curb inlet located at the intersection of Meyers Avenue and E. Barham Drive. The existing City storm drain infrastructure drains north to an existing open channel that ultimately discharges to San Marcos Creek and then into Lake San Marcos.

A residential condominium project is proposed on the adjacent property to the south and west of the existing site. The residential project has been approved by the City of San Marcos and City of Escondido and construction has commenced. The proposed grading as part of the residential condominium project includes new access drives along the southern and western property boundaries. Existing offsite drainage will be intercepted by curb and gutters and proposed storm drains within these access drives and will not flow onto the project site. All existing offsite drainage from the south is intercepted and conveyed to a 36" RCP storm drain proposed in Meyers Ave per Grading and Improvement Plan GP19-0016 and P19-

0014. All existing offsite drainage from the west is intercepted and conveyed to a proposed storm drain in (Future) Sunrise View and Barham Drive per Improvement Plan IP20-00007 and P19-0014.

Per the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey, the project site is predominantly Hydrologic Soil Group B with a small portion of Hydrologic Soil Group C in the northwest corner of the site. However, per the project's site-specific geotechnical report, the site is underlain with shallow bedrock and has very low infiltration rates (0 - 0.01 in/hr). The underlying soil is more accurately represented by Hydrologic Soil Group D. Therefore, for the purpose of this drainage study, the entire site was modeled with Type D soils. Refer to Appendix C of this report for the USDA Web Soil Survey and geotechnical findings. The site is not within a FEMA designated Flood Zone.

Table 1.1 below summarizes the existing condition 50-year peak flow at the project's discharge location. For delineated basin details, please refer to the Existing Condition Hydrology Node Map included in Appendix 1 of this report.

Drainage Basin	POC	Drainage Area (ac)	Runoff Coefficient, C	Time of Concentration, Tc (min)	Intensity, I (in/hr)	Q50 (cfs)
Basin A	POC-1	4.26	0.35	7.5	3.7	5.58

 TABLE 1.1 – Summary of Existing Conditions

1.3 Proposed Conditions

The project will include the construction of a new 67,300+/- SF industrial building, paved roadways and parking areas, retaining walls, and other associated improvements. The project will be accessed by a proposed driveway off Meyers Avenue. Drainage improvements will consist of curb inlets, catch basins, ribbon gutters, brow ditches, storm drain pipes and an underground detention vault located near the northeast corner of the site. The proposed site will consist of one (1) major drainage basin with one (1) outfall to mimic existing conditions. The site grading and onsite storm drain system has been designed to avoid diversion of drainage. Storm water runoff from the project site is routed to POC-1 located near the northeast corner of the site, at a Type A cleanout and 18" storm drain lateral proposed per Improvement Plan P19-0014. The storm drain lateral connects to a proposed 36" RCP public storm drain pipe (per P19-0014) in Meyers Ave, where flow travels north to the existing public storm drain system under Barham Drive.

Prior to discharging from the project site, developed site runoff is drained to one (1) proposed underground detention vault (BMP-1) for peak flow attenuation. The detention vault is also responsible for handling hydromodification requirements for the project site; however, the volume of the BMP is controlled by the 50-year peak flow detention requirement to meet the pre-development peak flow runoff rate. Two (2) Modular Wetland Systems (MWS) are proposed upstream of the underground detention vault to provide storm water treatment. Treatment of storm water runoff from the site has been addressed in a separate report- "Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for Meyers Industrial" by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates. Hydromodification (HMP) analysis has also been presented within the SWQMP.

The underground detention vault has been designed to provide flow control in the form of peak flow attenuation. The vault has been modified to include low-flow and mid-flow orifice outlets and an overflow weir to control peak flows. Overflow relief for the 50-year storm event is provided with a

partition weir installed in the vault and discharged directly to the proposed Type A cleanout and proposed 18" storm drain lateral (per P19-0014). The storm drain lateral will discharge into the proposed 36" RCP storm drain pipe per P19-0014 located in Meyers Avenue.

Runoff from disturbed slopes along the northerly and easterly boundaries of the proposed development will drain to a proposed Type B brow ditch along the top of the proposed wall at the northeast corner of the site. The brow ditch will discharge into the modified Type A cleanout (proposed per P16-0014) with Type F opening at the northeast corner of the site, where flow will discharge into the existing 18" storm drain at POC-1.

The associated fill slopes and landscape areas along the northerly and easterly boundaries of the proposed development will drain directly offsite. These areas do not drain to the storm water treatment BMPs or underground detention facility for peak flow attenuation. See discussion in project SWQMP.

Table 1.2 below summarizes the proposed unmitigated condition 50-year peak flow at the project's discharge location. Table 1.3 summarizes the proposed mitigated condition 50-year peak flow after routing through the project's detention facility. For delineated basin details, please refer to the Proposed Condition Hydrology Node Map included as an Attachment of this report.

 TABLE 1.2 – Summary of Proposed Unmitigated Conditions

Drainage Basin	POC	Drainage Area (ac)	Runoff Coefficient, C	Time of Concentration, Tc (min)	Intensity, I (in/hr)	Q50 Unmitigated (cfs)
Basin A	POC-1	4.26	0.79	7.9	3.61	12.14

Drainage Basin	POC	Drainage Area (ac)	Runoff Coefficient, C	Time of Concentration, Tc (min)	Intensity, I (in/hr)	Q50 Mitigated (cfs)
Basin A	POC-1	4.26	0.79	17.1	2.53	5.53

The proposed Type A cleanout per P19-0014will need to be relocated slightly behind the proposed retaining wall at the northeast corner of the site. The proposed storm drain lateral will also be extended to the relocated Type A cleanout. The proposed project's drainage infrastructure will not significantly alter the existing site's drainage patterns on-site or discharge points. Additionally, the proposed 18" storm drain lateral can sufficiently convey the anticipated Q50 flowrate without any adverse effects. Please refer to Appendix 4 for pre-and post-development drainage calculations.

For additional information regarding the proposed storm drain infrastructure at the northeast corner of the site and within Meyers Ave, refer to Barham Drive and Meyers Avenue Improvement Plan P19-0014 on file with the City of Escondido.

2. METHODOLOGY

Runoff calculations for Meyers Industrial have been performed in accordance with the City of Escondido Design Standards and Standard Drawings dated April 2014. Per City of Escondido drainage criteria, the Modified Rational Method should be used to determine peak flowrates when the contributing drainage area is less than 0.5 square mile. Advanced Engineering Software (AES) were used to calculate the peak runoff from the 50-year, 6-hour storm event using the Rational Method. Please refer to this report's Appendix for the results of these calculations.

2.1 Rational Method

As mentioned above, runoff from the project site was calculated for the 50-year storm event. Runoff was calculated using the Rational Method which is given by the following equation:

 $Q = C \times I \times A$

Where:

Q = Flow rate in cubic feet per second (cfs)

C = Runoff coefficient

I = Rainfall Intensity in inches per hour (in/hr)

A = Drainage basin area in acres, (ac)

Rational Method calculations were performed using the AES 2008 computer program. To perform the hydrology routing, the total watershed area is divided into sub-areas which discharge at designated nodes. The procedure for the sub-area summation model is as follows:

- (1) Subdivide the watershed into an initial sub-areas and subsequent sub-areas, which are generally less than 10 acres in size. Assign upstream and downstream node numbers to each sub-area.
- (2) Estimate an initial T_c by using the appropriate nomograph or overland flow velocity estimation. The minimum T_c considered is 5.0 minutes. All T_c values for the proposed project were assumed to be 5 minutes due to the small size of each contributing drainage area.
- (3) Using the initial T_c , determine the corresponding values of I. Then Q = CIA.
- (4) Using Q, estimate the travel time between this node and the next by Manning's equation as applied to particular channel or conduit linking the two nodes. Then, repeat the calculation for Q based on the revised intensity (which is a function of the revised time of concentration)

2.2 Runoff Coefficient

In accordance with City of Escondido design standards, runoff coefficients were based on land use. An appropriate runoff coefficient (C) for each type of land use in the subarea was selected from Figure 1 of the City of Escondido Design Standards and Standard Drawings and multiplied by the percentage of total area (A) included in that class. The sum of products for all land uses is the weighted runoff coefficient ($\sum[C]$). See Table 2.1 below for weighted runoff coefficient "C" calculations. The Existing and Proposed Condition Hydrology Node Maps show the drainage basin subareas, on-site drainage system and nodal points.

The existing site includes undeveloped land or open space. The existing site is assumed to be 0% impervious. Therefore, a consistent runoff coefficient of 0.35 was used for the existing condition based on Figure 1 of the City of Escondido Design Standards and Standard Drawings.

In the proposed condition, all impervious surfaces were assigned an industrial runoff coefficient of 0.95. All slope soils and landscape areas will be amended and aerated to promote water retention; therefore, developed slopes and landscape areas were assigned a runoff coefficient of 0.25.

Existing Co	Existing Condition Hydrology						
Up Node	Down Node	Total Area (ac)	C_1	A1 (ac)	C ₂	A₂ (ac)	C_{comp}
100	101	0.07	0.35	0.07	0.95	0.00	0.35
101	102	4.19	0.35	4.19	0.95	0.00	0.35
Proposed C	ondition Hyd	drology					
Up Node	Down Node	Total Area (ac)	C_1	A ₁ (ac)	C ₂	A ₂ (ac)	C _{comp}
200	201	0.10	0.25	0.10	0.95	0.00	0.25
201	202	0.11	0.25	0.00	0.95	0.11	0.95
202	202	0.10	0.25	0.10	0.95	0.00	0.25
203	203	0.21	0.25	0.00	0.95	0.21	0.95
204	204	0.35	0.25	0.00	0.95	0.35	0.95
205	205	0.33	0.25	0.00	0.95	0.33	0.95
206	206	0.28	0.25	0.00	0.95	0.28	0.95
206	206	0.19	0.25	0.19	0.95	0.00	0.25
207	207	0.23	0.25	0.00	0.95	0.23	0.95
208	208	1.96	0.25	0.20	0.95	1.77	0.88
212	211	0.15	0.25	0.15	0.95	0.00	0.25
213	211	0.26	0.25	0.26	0.95	0.00	0.25

 TABLE 2.1- Summary of Weighted Runoff Coefficient Calculations

Note: C-values taken from Figure 1 of City of Escondido Design Standards. See Appendix 3 for references.

2.3 Rainfall Intensity

Rainfall intensity is calculated using the chart in Figure 1 - Run-off Intensity Duration Curve of the City of Escondido Design Standards and Standard Drawings. The intensity values for varying time of concentrations were input manually into the AES computer program where runoff calculations were performed. The 6-hour storm rainfall amount (P_6) for the 50-year storm frequency were determined using Isopluvial maps provided from Appendix B of the County of San Diego Hydrology Manual. See Appendix 3 of this report for Isopluvial maps for the 50-year rainfall event.

2.4 Tributary Areas

Drainage basins for the existing and proposed project site are delineated in the Existing and Proposed Condition Hydrology Node Maps located in Appendix 1 and 2 of this report and graphically portray the tributary area for each drainage basin.

2.5 Hydraulics

The hydraulics of existing and proposed storm drain pipes were analyzed using the AES computer program. For pipe flow, a Manning's N value of 0.011 was used to reflect the use of HDPE pipe. A Manning's N value of 0.013 was used to reflect the use of RCP pipe.

2.6 Curb Inlet and Catch Basin Sizing

Curb inlets and catch basins will be sized in accordance with City of Escondido Design Standards and Standard Drawings (April 2014) upon final engineering.

2.7 Detention Basin Routing

The detention facility was modeled using Storm Water Management Model (SWMM) version 5.1. The results of the SWMM study are presented within the PDP SWQMP by Pasco Laret Suiter and Associates for Meyers Industrial. SWMM models were prepared for the pre and post-developed conditions at the site in order to determine if the proposed underground detention vault meets the Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) requirements for the Q_2 to Q_{10} return periods. The Rational Method study provided herein incorporates the composite vault outlet structure and stage-storage-discharge relationships of the SWMM study and is meant to enhance the HMP study to ensure that post-development peak flows are less than or equal to pre-development peak flows for the 6-hour 50-year storm event at the project's Point of Compliance (POC). See vault outlet structure details in Appendix 5.

Hydraulic Modified-Puls detention routing of the aforementioned Rational Method hydrology was performed using the Army Corps of Engineers HEC-HMS 4.3 software. The Modified-Puls detention routing analyzes the developed condition 50-year peak flow rate at the project's detention system. The stage-storage-discharge tables generated from SWMM were input into HEC-HMS to model the design of the vault outlet structure. This procedure was selected in order to model the flow control requirements and to accurately represent the middle stages of the BMP for accurate mid-flow orifice and emergency weir sizing. The stage-storage-discharge tables from the SWMM model have been provided in Appendix 5. The HEC-HMS Modified-Puls results are summarized in Table 2.2.

Detention Basin	Tributary Area (ac)	Runoff Coefficient, C	50-Year Peak Inflow (cfs)	Inflow Tc (min) ⁽¹⁾	50-Year Peak Outflow (cfs)	Outflow Tc (min)	Peak Elevation (ft) ⁽²⁾
BMP-1	3.86	0.84	11.84	10	5.29	17	5.28
	(1) Inflow ti	me of concentra	ation rounded t	o the neares	st time interval	that HEC-HM	S could
Notes:	accept						
	(2) Peak elevation measured from the invert of the mid-flow orifice						
	(3) P6-50year = 2.8 in						

TABLE 2.2- Summary of Detention Basin Routing

A Rational method inflow hydrograph was generated using RickRat Hydro software from Rick Engineering. The parameters of the drainage area were entered into RickRat Hydro software to generate an inflow hydrograph. The data from this hydrograph was then entered into HEC-HMS software to model the release rates from the detention system.

HEC-HMS allows for hydrology input time steps of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 15 & 20 minutes. Rick Rat Hydro requires a minimum time of concentration (Tc) of 5 minutes. Therefore, the time of concentration (Tc) used for the concentration of the hydrograph was rounded to the nearest time interval that RickRat Hydro and HEC-HMS could accept. The peak flow remains as per the modified Rational Method analysis and is not reduced (or increased) from this hydrograph development accordingly.

Rational method hydrographs, stage-storage-discharge relationships and HEC-HMS model output is provided in Appendix 5 of this report.

3. CALCULATIONS/RESULTS

3.1 Pre- & Post-Development Peak Flow Comparison

Below are a series of tables which summarize the calculations provided in the appendices of this report.

Table 3.1 itemizes the existing condition peak flow rate for the 50-year storm event for the existing drainage Basin A at the POC-1 outfall.

Drainage Basin	Outfall Location	Runoff Coefficient, C	Drainage Area (ac)	50-Year Existing Peak Flow (cfs)
Basin A	POC-1	0.35	4.26	5.58

TABLE 3.1- Existing Condition Peak Flow Summary

Table 3.2 itemizes the proposed mitigated condition peak flow rate for the 50-year storm event for the proposed drainage Basin A at the POC-1 outfall.

 TABLE 3.2- Proposed Mitigated Condition Peak Flow Summary

				50-Year
Drainage	Outfall	Runoff	Drainage	Mitigated
Basin	Location	Coefficient, C	Area (ac)	Peak Flow
				(cfs)
Basin A	POC-1	0.79	4.26	5.53

Table 3.3 shows that the total storm water peak flow for the proposed development is less than the existing storm water peak flow for the 50-year rainfall event.

TABLE 3.3- Existing Vs. Proposed Mitigated Condition Peak Flow Summary

Existing Condition	Proposed Mitigated	Existing Vs. Proposed
Q50 (cfs)	Condition Q50 (cfs)	Q50 (cfs)
5.58	5.53	-0.05

3.2 Storm Water Quality

The proposed site will have a Modular Wetland System that will provide the required storm water quality treatment for the project. For information regarding BMP sizing and the water quality design, refer to the "Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for Meyers Industrial" by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates under separate cover.

3.3 Hydromodification

The proposed site will include the implementation of an underground detention structure that will provide the required hydromodification mitigation for the project. For additional information regarding the calculations for the hydromodification sizing calculations, refer to the "Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for Meyers Industrial" by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, under separate cover.

4. CONCLUSION

As shown in Tables 3.1 through 3.3, the proposed project will not contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. This report analyzed the 50-year storm event hydrology for the proposed site using the Advanced Engineering Software (AES) and proved that the post-developed peak flow is less than the pre-developed peak flow at the proposed discharge location, POC-1, located at the northeast corner of the site. In addition, the proposed storm drain system was sized adequately and calculations can be found in the Appendices of this report.

The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. In addition, the proposed project will not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

The project does not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps. Additionally, the project does not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows.

Appendix 1 Existing Condition Hydrology Node Map





FLOWLINE

S	Y	M	B	0	L

HYDROLOGY NODE	
EXISTING Q50 (CFS)	(1.00)
SUB-BASIN AREA	(A=0.10)
WEIGHTED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT	C=0.35
RIGHT-OF-WAY	
PROPERTY LINE	
BASIN BOUNDARY	
SUB-BASIN BOUNDARY	
FLOWLINE	· · · · > · ·

HYDROLOGIC SOIL GROUP

HYDROLOGIC SOIL TYPE: B & C* *FOR THE PURPOSE OF DRAINAGE CALCS, THE ENTIRE SITE WILL BE MODELED WITH TYPE D SOILS. SEE "PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS STUDY FOR MEYERS INDUSTRIAL"BY PLSA DATED APRIL 2022 FOR DISCUSSION.

DEPTH TO GROUNDWATER

DEPTH TO GROUNDWATER > 20 FT

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

DRAINAGE BASIN AREA:	4.26 AC
EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA:	0 AC
EXISTING LANDSCAPE AREA:	0 AC
EXISTING PERVIOUS AREA:	4.26 AC

RUNOFF COEFFICIENT

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF ESCONDIDO STANDARDS, RUNOFF COEFFICIENTS WERE BASED ON LAND USE. AN APPROPRIATE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT WAS SELECTED FROM FIGURE 1 OF THE CITY OF ESCONDIDO DESIGN STANDARDS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS AND MULTIPLIED BY THE PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL AREA IN THAT CLASS. THE SUM OF THE PRODUCTS FOR ALL LAND USES IS THE WEIGHTED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT.

SEE TABLE 2.1 OF THE "PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS STUDY FOR MEYERS INDUSTRIAL" BY PLSA DATED APRIL 2022 FOR WEIGHTED RUNOFF COEFFICEINT "C" CALCULATIONS.

SUMMARY OF EXISTING CONDITION 50-YEAR PEAK FLOWS

DRAINAGE BASIN	DRAINAGE AREA (AC)	IMPERVIOUS AREA (AC)	% IMP	WEIGHTED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT, C	50-YEAR PEAK FLOW (CFS)
BASIN A	4.26	0	0%	0.35	5.58







EXISTING CONDITION HYDROLOGY NODE MAP MEYERS AVE MEYERS AVE ESCONDIDO, CA PLSA JOB NO. 3446 SCALE 1"=30' APRIL 2022 SHEET 1 OF 1

Appendix 2 Proposed Condition Hydrology Node Map





S	Y	M	В	0	L

HYDROLOGY NODE	(100)
MITIGATED Q50 (CFS)	1.00
SUB-BASIN AREA	(A=0.10)
WEIGHTED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT	C=0.35
RIGHT-OF-WAY	
PROPERTY LINE	
BASIN BOUNDARY	
SUB-BASIN BOUNDARY	
FLOWLINE	· · · > ·
PROPOSED BROW DITCH	$\cdot \Longrightarrow \cdot \Longrightarrow \cdot$

HYDROLOGIC SOIL GROUP

HYDROLOGIC SOIL TYPE: B & C* *FOR THE PURPOSE OF DRAINAGE CALCS, THE ENTIRE SITE WILL BE MODELED WITH TYPE D SOILS. SEE "PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS STUDY FOR MEYERS INDUSTRIAL" BY PLSA DATED APRIL 2022 FOR DISCUSSION.

DEPTH TO GROUNDWATER

DEPTH TO GROUNDWATER > 20 FT

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

DRAINAGE BASIN AREA:	4.26 AC
DISTURBED AREA:	4.10 AC
PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS AREA:	3.20 AC
PROPOSED LANDSCAPE AREA:	0.90 AC
PROPOSED PERVIOUS AREA:	0.16 AC

RUNOFF COEFFICIENT

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF ESCONDIDO STANDARDS, RUNOFF COEFFICIENTS WERE BASED ON LAND USE. AN APPROPRIATE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT WAS SELECTED FROM FIGURE 1 OF THE CITY OF ESCONDIDO DESIGN STANDARDS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS AND MULTIPLIED BY THE PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL AREA IN THAT CLASS. THE SUM OF THE PRODUCTS FOR ALL LAND USES IS THE WEIGHTED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT.

SEE TABLE 2.1 OF THE "PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS STUDY FOR MEYERS INDUSTRIAL" BY PLSA DATED APRIL 2022 FOR WEIGHTED RUNOFF COEFFICEINT "C" CALCULATIONS.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CONDITION **50-YEAR PEAK FLOWS**

DRAINAGE BASIN	DRAINAGE AREA (AC)	IMPERVIOUS AREA (AC)	% IMP	WEIGHTED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT, C	50-YEAR MITIGATED PEAK FLOW (CFS)
BASIN A	4.26	3.20	75.2%	0.79	5.53





POR. PARCEL 4 PM 9838

PROPOSED CONDITION HYDROLOGY NODE MAP MEYERS AVE MEYERS AVE ESCONDIDO, CA PLSA JOB NO. 3446 SCALE 1"=30' APRIL 2022 SHEET 1 OF 1

Appendix 3

Hydrology Design Summary







Conservation Service



Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
FaB	Fallbrook sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	С	0.4	5.3%
VsC	Vista coarse sandy loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes	В	5.9	86.7%
VsD	Vista coarse sandy Ioam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, MLRA 20	В	0.5	8.1%
Totals for Area of Inter	est		6.8	100.0%

Hydrologic Soil Group

Description

Hydrologic soil groups are based on estimates of runoff potential. Soils are assigned to one of four groups according to the rate of water infiltration when the soils are not protected by vegetation, are thoroughly wet, and receive precipitation from long-duration storms.

The soils in the United States are assigned to four groups (A, B, C, and D) and three dual classes (A/D, B/D, and C/D). The groups are defined as follows:

Group A. Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission.

Group D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink-swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission.

If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic group (A/D, B/D, or C/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group D are assigned to dual classes.

Rating Options

Aggregation Method: Dominant Condition Component Percent Cutoff: None Specified Tie-break Rule: Higher



Final surface grades around structures should be designed to collect and direct surface water away from structures and toward appropriate drainage facilities. The ground around the structure should be graded so that surface water flows rapidly away from the structure without ponding. In general, we recommend that the ground adjacent to the structure slope away at a gradient of at least 2 percent. Densely vegetated areas where runoff can be impaired should have a minimum gradient of at least 5 percent within the first 5 feet from the structure. Roof gutters with downspouts that discharge directly into a closed drainage system are recommended on structures. Drainage patterns established at the time of fine grading should be maintained throughout the life of the proposed structures.

10.3 Site Runoff Considerations - Stormwater Disposal Systems

It is our understanding that the Client is considering that runoff generated from the facility to be disposed of in engineered subsurface features onsite. We performed percolation testing in order to provide an indication of the infiltration characteristics of the onsite materials. Our testing and findings are summarized in the following sections.

10.3.1 Percolation Testing

Following the drilling of exploratory borings B-1/P-1, B-2/P-2 and B-7/P-3, a 3-inch diameter perforated polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe was placed in the hole and gravel was placed around the pipe. The test holes were presoaked in general accordance with San Diego Region guidelines.

Percolation testing was performed until consistent results were obtained. The results were used to calculate the pre-adjusted percolation rate for the test hole. Upon conclusion of testing, the perforated pipe was removed from the test hole and the test hole was backfilled.

We note that a soil profile's percolation rate is not the same as its infiltration rate. Therefore, the measured/calculated field percolation rate was converted to an estimated infiltration rate utilizing a reduction factor determined using the Porchet method. Additionally, as indicated in the County of San Diego BMP guidelines (County of San Diego, 2016), a feasibility factor of safety of 2.0 is should be applied to the measured infiltration rates to account for remaining uncertainty and long-term deterioration that cannot be technically mitigated.

The following **Table 5** presents the measured percolation rate and corresponding infiltration rate calculated for the test hole.

TABLE 5 Summary of Percolation Testing										
Location	Depth (ft.)	Pre-Adjusted Percolation Rate (in/hr)	Infiltration Rate* (in/hr)							
B-1/P-1	~ 7-8	0.24	0.01							
B-2/P-2	~ 8-9	0	0							
B-7/P-3	~ 9-10	0	0							

*Feasibility factor of safety of 2.0 is included

10.3.2 Summary of Findings

The County of San Diego BMP guidelines indicate that onsite storm-water disposal systems can be designed for "Full-Infiltration" for subsurface materials with corrected infiltration rates equal to or greater than 0.5-inches per hour, and for "Partial Infiltration" for corrected infiltration rates less than 0.5-inches per hour. However, based on the relatively low infiltration rates and the presence of shallow bedrock across the site, it is our preliminary conclusion that the onsite soils in the areas tested are <u>not suitable for direct infiltration of storm-water (No Infiltration)</u>.

We provide the following conclusions regarding the percolation test results:

- It is our opinion that the percolation characteristics at the tested depths are generally representative of the site conditions in the vicinity of the test holes. Percolation testing was performed within natural bedrock materials consisting of primarily of dense sandy soils.
- As discussed in the County of San Diego BMP guidelines for percolation testing, the bottom of the borings where the percolation tests are performed should be at approximately the same depth of the invert of the proposed infiltration facility. The project civil engineer should determine if the tests performed meet this requirement.
- As discussed in the County of San Diego BMP guidelines, a correction factor should be applied to the measured infiltration rates to account for soil assessment method, soil type, soil variability, depth to groundwater, level of pretreatment, redundancy, and compaction during construction. The project civil engineer should determine the appropriate designlevel factor of safety for the proposed disposal system.

Design of the stormwater disposal system should be in accordance with the County of San Diego guidelines.

10.3.3 Structure Setback from Retention Devices

We recommend that storm-water disposal systems be situated at least three times their depth, or a minimum of 15 feet (whichever is greater), from the outside bottom edge of structural foundations.

Structural foundations include (but are not limited to) buildings, loading docks, retaining walls, and screen walls. The invert of storm-water infiltration should be outside a 1:1 (H:V) plane projected from the bottom of adjacent foundations.

Storm-water disposal systems should be checked and maintained on regular intervals. Stormwater devices including bio-swales that are located closer than 10 feet from any foundations/footings should be lined with an impermeable membrane to reduce the potential for saturation of foundation soils. Foundations may also need to be deepened.



APPENDIX A SOIL CLASSIFICATION CHART AND BORING LOGS



BORING NUMBER B-1/P-1 PAGE 1 OF 1 PROJECT NAME Barham Drive/San Marcos, California CLIENT Integral Communities PROJECT NUMBER IPF-72446.4 PROJECT LOCATION Barham Drive/Meyers Avenue, San Marcos, CA DATE STARTED 7/7/17 ___ COMPLETED _7/7/17 GROUND ELEVATION BORING DIAMETER 8-inch EQUIPMENT / RIG Truck-Mounted B-53 HAMMER EFFICIENCY (%) 68 SPT CORRECTION 1.13 CAL CORRECTION 0.62 METHOD 8" Hollow Stem Auger 140 lbs Auto Hammer LOGGED BY WP CHECKED BY GROUNDWATER DEPTH (ft) Not Encountered NOTES ATTERBERG LIMITS (PI:LL) PENETRATION RESISTANCE (blows/6-inches) FINES CONTENT (%) OTHER TESTS POCKET PEN (tsf) DRY DENSITY (pcf) SAMPLE TYPE CONTENT (%) GRAPHIC LOG MOISTURE USCS SYMBOL SPT N60 DEPTH (ft) MATERIAL DESCRIPTION TOPSOIL SILTY SAND - orange-brown, fine to coarse grained; slightly moist, 1 SM BULK ΕI loose 2 @ 2.5' - WEATHERED GRANITICS SILTY SAND with trace CLAY - orange-brown, fine to medium DS 3 MC 10 17 11 118 MAX SM 17 grained, moist, medium dense 4 3 126 5 МС @ 5' - SILTY SAND - brown, fine to coarse grained, dry, very dense 50 for 5" 6 7 4 114 МС 50 for 4"

Total depth: 8-feet Percolation test performed No groundwater encountered Boring backfilled on 7/7/2017

BORING NUMBER B-2/P-2 PAGE 1 OF 1 CLIENT Integral Communities PROJECT NAME Barham Drive/San Marcos, California PROJECT NUMBER IPF-72446.4 PROJECT LOCATION Barham Drive/Meyers Avenue, San Marcos, CA DATE STARTED 7/7/17 ___ COMPLETED _7/7/17 BORING DIAMETER 8-inch GROUND ELEVATION EQUIPMENT / RIG Truck-Mounted B-53 HAMMER EFFICIENCY (%) 68 CAL CORRECTION 0.62 METHOD 8" Hollow Stem Auger 140 lbs Auto Hammer SPT CORRECTION 1.13 LOGGED BY WP CHECKED BY GROUNDWATER DEPTH (ft) Not Encountered NOTES ATTERBERG LIMITS (PI:LL) PENETRATION RESISTANCE (blows/6-inches) FINES CONTENT (%) OTHER TESTS POCKET PEN (tsf) DRY DENSITY (pcf) SAMPLE TYPE CONTENT (%) GRAPHIC LOG MOISTURE USCS SYMBOL SPT N60 DEPTH (ft) MATERIAL DESCRIPTION TOPSOIL SILTY SAND - orange-brown, fine to coarse grained; slightly moist, 1 SM loose 2 @ 2.5' -WEATHERED GRANITICS 20 3 MC 27 39 11 125 SILTY SAND - orange-brown, fine to coarse grained, moist, medium SM 35 dense 4 5 @ 5' - SILTY SAND - orange-brown, fine to coarse grained, moist, 12 MC 28 14 116 20 25 dense 6 7 @ 7.5' - becomes light brown 16 27 47 8 MC 46 10 120 9 6 97 10 MC 50 for 6" @ 10' - becomes very dense

Total depth: 10.5-feet Percolation test performed No groundwater encountered Boring backfilled on 7/7/2017

GEOTECH LOG - COLUMNS BORING LOGS.GPJ GINT STD US LAB.GDT 8/2/17

		esting Selations					BO	RIN	IG N	NUM	IBE PAGI	R B E 1 0	-4 F 1
CLIEN	NT _Int	egral Communities PR	ROJECT I	NAM	E Barha	m Drive/Sa	n Marc	cos, Ca	lifornia	a			
PROJ	ECT N	UMBER _ IPF-72446.4 PR	ROJECT	LOC	ATION _	Barham Driv	e/Mey	ers Av	enue, S	San Ma	arcos,	CA	
DATE	STAR	TED _7/7/17 COMPLETED _7/7/17 GR	Round e	ELEV	ATION _			BORI	NG DIA	METE	R _8-	inch	
EQUIF	PMENT	/ RIG Truck-Mounted B-53 HA	MMER E	EFFI	CIENCY (%) <u>68</u>							
METH	HOD _8	" Hollow Stem Auger 140 lbs Auto Hammer SP	T CORR	RECT	ION <u>1.1</u> ;	3		CAL	ORRE		N <u>0.6</u>	2	
LOGG	GED B	Y CHECKED BY GR	ROUNDW	VATE	R DEPTH	H (ft) Not E	Incour	ntered					
NOTE	S												
DEPTH (ft)	GRAPHIC LOG	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	0 0 1	USCS SYMBOL	SAMPLE TYPE	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (blows/6-inches)	SPT N60	POCKET PEN (tsf)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	DRY DENSITY (pcf)	ATTERBERG LIMITS (PI:LL)	FINES CONTENT (%)	OTHER TESTS
0 1 — 2 —		TOPSOIL SILTY-SAND - orange-brown, fine to coarse grained, slightly mois very dense	st,	SM									
3 — 4 —		@ 2.5' - WEATHERED GRANITICS SILTY-SAND - orange-brown, fine to coarse grained, slightly mois very dense	st,	SM	мс	21 40 40	50		6	121			
5 — 6 —		@ 5' - SILTY SAND, CLAYEY SAND - orange, fine to medium grained, moist, medium dense			мс	5 15 30	28		13	121			
7 — 8 — 9 —		@ 7.5' - SILTY-SAND - orange-brown, fine to coarse grained, slig moist, very dense	ghtly		МС	50 for 6"			11	93			
10— 11—		@10' - becomes dry			мс	36 50 for 3"			9	112			
12-		@ 11.5' -minor seapage			🖂 ЅРТ	50 for 1"			14				

Total depth: 12.5-feet Due to Refusal No groundwater encountered Boring backfilled on 7/7/2017

ince							BO	RIN	IG N	NUN	IBE PAGE	R B ≣ 1 0	6-5 ⊩ 1
CLIENT Integral Communities PROJECT NAME Barham Drive/San Marcos, California													
PROJE		JMBER _ IPF-72446.4 PRC	JECT I	LOC	ATION _E	Barham Driv	e/Mey	ers Av	enue, S	San Ma	arcos,	CA	
DATE	STAR	TED _7/7/17 COMPLETED _7/7/17 GRO	ound e	ELEV	ATION _			BORI	NG DIA	METE	R 8-i	nch	
EQUIP	MENT	/ RIG Truck-Mounted B-53 HAN	MMER E	EFFIC		%) <u>68</u>							
METHO	<u>8</u> DC	Hollow Stem Auger 140 lbs Auto Hammer SPT	CORR	ECT	ION <u>1.1</u>	3		CAL	CORRE	CTIO	N _0.6	2	
LOGGE	ED BY	CHECKED BY GRO	JUNDW	/ATE	R DEPTH	(ft) Not E	ncour	ntered					
NOTES	•										Ś		
DEPTH (ft)	GRAPHIC LOG	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	500 1	SYMBOL	SAMPLE TYPE	PENETRATION RESISTANCE (blows/6-inches)	SPT N60	POCKET PEN (tsf)	MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	DRY DENSITY (pcf)	ATTERBERG LIMITS (PI:LL)	FINES CONTENT (%)	OTHER TESTS
0 1 — 2 —		TOPSOIL SILTY-SAND -orange-brown, fine to coarse grained, slightly moist, loose	, ;	SM	BULK						<u> </u>		COR
3 — 4 —		@ 2.5' - WEATHERED GRANITICS SILTY-SAND - orange-brown, fine to coarse grained, slightly moist medium dense	- — — t,		мс	5 7 10	11		7	99			DS MAX
5 — 6 —		@ 7' - SILTY-SAND - orange- brown, fine to coarse grained, mois very dense	it,		мс	18 50 for 5"			8	121			
8		@ 7.5 -becomes gray brown			МС	50 for 6"			7	110			
10 11			5	SM	мс	34 50 for 6"			6	119			
12													
14 — 15 —		@ 15 - trace GRAVELS			SPT	50 for 3"			2				
16 17					⊠ SPT	50 for 1"			2				

Total depth: 17.5-feet Due to Refusal No groundwater encountered Boring backfilled on 7/7/2017

Appendix 4

AES Rational Method Calculations

EXISTING CONDITION - 50-YEAR STORM

RATIONAL METHOD HYDROLOGY COMPUTER PROGRAM PACKAGE Reference: SAN DIEGO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT 2003,1985,1981 HYDROLOGY MANUAL (c) Copyright 1982-2008 Advanced Engineering Software (aes) Ver. 15.0 Release Date: 04/01/2008 License ID 1452 Analysis prepared by: PASCO LARET SUITER & ASSOCIATES 535 NORTH HIGHWAY 101 SUITE A SOLANA BEACH CA 92705 _____ FILE NAME: 3446E50.DAT TIME/DATE OF STUDY: 09:53 06/03/2021 _____ USER SPECIFIED HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC MODEL INFORMATION: _____ USER SPECIFIED STORM EVENT(YEAR) = 50.00 SPECIFIED MINIMUM PIPE SIZE(INCH) = 3.00 SPECIFIED PERCENT OF GRADIENTS (DECIMAL) TO USE FOR FRICTION SLOPE = 0.95 RAINFALL-INTENSITY ADJUSTMENT FACTOR = 1.000 *USER SPECIFIED: NUMBER OF [TIME, INTENSITY] DATA PAIRS = 9 5.000; 4.200 1) 2) 10.000; 3.200 3) 15.000; 2.700 4) 20.000; 2.300 5) 25.000; 2.200 30.000; 1.900 6) 40.000; 1.600 7) 50.000; 1.350 8) 9) 60.000; 1.200 SAN DIEGO HYDROLOGY MANUAL "C"-VALUES USED FOR RATIONAL METHOD NOTE: ONLY PEAK CONFLUENCE VALUES CONSIDERED *USER-DEFINED STREET-SECTIONS FOR COUPLED PIPEFLOW AND STREETFLOW MODEL* HALF- CROWN TO STREET-CROSSFALL: CURB GUTTER-GEOMETRIES: MANNING WIDTH CROSSFALL IN- / OUT-/PARK- HEIGHT WIDTH LIP HIKE FACTOR (FT) SIDE / SIDE/ WAY (FT) (FT) (FT) (FT) NO. (FT) (n) 1 30.0 20.0 0.018/0.018/0.020 0.67 2.00 0.0312 0.167 0.0150 GLOBAL STREET FLOW-DEPTH CONSTRAINTS: 1. Relative Flow-Depth = 0.00 FEET as (Maximum Allowable Street Flow Depth) - (Top-of-Curb) 2. (Depth) * (Velocity) Constraint = 6.0^{-1} (FT*FT/S) *SIZE PIPE WITH A FLOW CAPACITY GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO THE UPSTREAM TRIBUTARY PIPE.* 100.00 TO NODE 101.00 IS CODE = 21 FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE _____ >>>>RATIONAL METHOD INITIAL SUBAREA ANALYSIS<<<<< _____ *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .3500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 INITIAL SUBAREA FLOW-LENGTH (FEET) = 57.00 UPSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 741.00

```
DOWNSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 733.00
 ELEVATION DIFFERENCE (FEET) = 8.00
 URBAN SUBAREA OVERLAND TIME OF FLOW(MIN.) = 4.731
 WARNING: THE MAXIMUM OVERLAND FLOW SLOPE, 10.%, IS USED IN TC CALCULATION!
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 4.200
 NOTE: RAINFALL INTENSITY IS BASED ON TC = 5-MINUTE.
 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 0.10
                  0.07
 TOTAL AREA (ACRES) =
                        TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                           0.10
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 101.00 TO NODE 102.00 IS CODE = 51
_____
 >>>>COMPUTE TRAPEZOIDAL CHANNEL FLOW<
 >>>>TRAVELTIME THRU SUBAREA (EXISTING ELEMENT) <<<<<
_____
 ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 733.00 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 697.00
 CHANNEL LENGTH THRU SUBAREA (FEET) = 570.00 CHANNEL SLOPE = 0.0632
 CHANNEL BASE (FEET) = 5.00 "Z" FACTOR = 5.000
 MANNING'S FACTOR = 0.025 MAXIMUM DEPTH(FEET) = 1.00
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.745
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .3500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 TRAVEL TIME COMPUTED USING ESTIMATED FLOW(CFS) = 2.85
 TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA BASED ON VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 3.74
 AVERAGE FLOW DEPTH(FEET) = 0.13 TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 2.54
 Tc(MIN.) = 7.27
 SUBAREA AREA(ACRES) = 4.19
                         SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 5.49
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.350
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 4.3
                             PEAK FLOW RATE(CFS) =
                                                 5.58
 END OF SUBAREA CHANNEL FLOW HYDRAULICS:
 DEPTH(FEET) = 0.20 FLOW VELOCITY(FEET/SEC.) = 4.62
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 100.00 TO NODE 102.00 = 627.00 FEET.
_____
 END OF STUDY SUMMARY:
 TOTAL AREA (ACRES) = 4.3
PEAK FLOW RATE (CFS) = 5.58
                       4.3 TC(MIN.) =
                                      7.27
_____
```

END OF RATIONAL METHOD ANALYSIS

PROPOSED CONDITION - 50-YEAR

RATIONAL METHOD HYDROLOGY COMPUTER PROGRAM PACKAGE Reference: SAN DIEGO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT 2003,1985,1981 HYDROLOGY MANUAL (c) Copyright 1982-2008 Advanced Engineering Software (aes) Ver. 15.0 Release Date: 04/01/2008 License ID 1452 Analysis prepared by: PASCO LARET SUITER & ASSOCIATES 535 NORTH HIGHWAY 101 SUITE A SOLANA BEACH CA 92705 _____ FILE NAME: 3446P50.DAT TIME/DATE OF STUDY: 09:58 03/25/2022 _____ _____ USER SPECIFIED HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC MODEL INFORMATION: _____ USER SPECIFIED STORM EVENT(YEAR) = 50.00 SPECIFIED MINIMUM PIPE SIZE(INCH) = 3.00 SPECIFIED PERCENT OF GRADIENTS (DECIMAL) TO USE FOR FRICTION SLOPE = 0.95 RAINFALL-INTENSITY ADJUSTMENT FACTOR = 1.000 *USER SPECIFIED: NUMBER OF [TIME, INTENSITY] DATA PAIRS = 9 5.000; 4.200 1) 2) 10.000; 3.200 3) 15.000; 2.700 4) 20.000; 2.300 5) 25.000; 2.200 30.000; 1.900 6) 40.000; 1.600 7) 50.000; 1.350 8) 9) 60.000; 1.200 SAN DIEGO HYDROLOGY MANUAL "C"-VALUES USED FOR RATIONAL METHOD NOTE: ONLY PEAK CONFLUENCE VALUES CONSIDERED *USER-DEFINED STREET-SECTIONS FOR COUPLED PIPEFLOW AND STREETFLOW MODEL* HALF- CROWN TO STREET-CROSSFALL: CURB GUTTER-GEOMETRIES: MANNING WIDTH CROSSFALL IN- / OUT-/PARK- HEIGHT WIDTH LIP HIKE FACTOR (FT) SIDE / SIDE/ WAY (FT) (FT) (FT) (FT) NO. (FT) (n) 1 30.0 20.0 0.018/0.018/0.020 0.67 2.00 0.0312 0.167 0.0150 GLOBAL STREET FLOW-DEPTH CONSTRAINTS: 1. Relative Flow-Depth = 0.00 FEET as (Maximum Allowable Street Flow Depth) - (Top-of-Curb) 2. (Depth) * (Velocity) Constraint = 6.0^{-1} (FT*FT/S) *SIZE PIPE WITH A FLOW CAPACITY GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO THE UPSTREAM TRIBUTARY PIPE.* 200.00 TO NODE 201.00 IS CODE = 21 FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE _____ >>>>RATIONAL METHOD INITIAL SUBAREA ANALYSIS<<<<< _____ *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 INITIAL SUBAREA FLOW-LENGTH (FEET) = 48.00 UPSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 733.00

```
DOWNSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 713.80
 ELEVATION DIFFERENCE (FEET) = 19.20
 URBAN SUBAREA OVERLAND TIME OF FLOW(MIN.) = 4.921
 WARNING: THE MAXIMUM OVERLAND FLOW SLOPE, 10.%, IS USED IN TC CALCULATION!
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 4.200
 NOTE: RAINFALL INTENSITY IS BASED ON TC = 5-MINUTE.
 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 0.10
 TOTAL AREA (ACRES) =
                    0.10
                          TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                               0.10
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 201.00 TO NODE 202.00 IS CODE = 61
_____
 >>>>COMPUTE STREET FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>> (STANDARD CURB SECTION USED) <<<<<
_____
 UPSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 713.80 DOWNSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 713.10
 STREET LENGTH (FEET) = 87.00 CURB HEIGHT (INCHES) = 6.0
 STREET HALFWIDTH (FEET) = 26.00
 DISTANCE FROM CROWN TO CROSSFALL GRADEBREAK (FEET) = 1.00
 INSIDE STREET CROSSFALL(DECIMAL) = 0.020
 OUTSIDE STREET CROSSFALL(DECIMAL) = 0.020
 SPECIFIED NUMBER OF HALFSTREETS CARRYING RUNOFF = 1
 STREET PARKWAY CROSSFALL(DECIMAL) = 0.018
 Manning's FRICTION FACTOR for Streetflow Section(curb-to-curb) = 0.0150
 Manning's FRICTION FACTOR for Back-of-Walk Flow Section = 0.0200
   **TRAVEL TIME COMPUTED USING ESTIMATED FLOW(CFS) =
                                               0.32
   STREETFLOW MODEL RESULTS USING ESTIMATED FLOW:
   STREET FLOW DEPTH(FEET) = 0.19
  HALFSTREET FLOOD WIDTH (FEET) = 3.20
  AVERAGE FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 1.44
  PRODUCT OF DEPTH&VELOCITY(FT*FT/SEC.) = 0.27
 STREET FLOW TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 1.01 Tc(MIN.) = 5.93
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 4.014
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.617
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) =0.11SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) =0.42TOTAL AREA (ACRES) =0.2PEAK FLOW RATE (CFS) =
                                                     0.52
 END OF SUBAREA STREET FLOW HYDRAULICS:
 DEPTH(FEET) = 0.22 HALFSTREET FLOOD WIDTH(FEET) = 4.76
 FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 1.51 DEPTH*VELOCITY (FT*FT/SEC.) = 0.33
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 202.00 = 135.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 202.00 TO NODE 202.00 IS CODE = 81
 _____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 4.014
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.4984
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.10 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.10
 TOTAL AREA (ACRES) = 0.3 TOTAL RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.62
 TC(MIN.) = 5.93
```

FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 202.00 TO NODE 203.00 IS CODE = 31 _____ >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<< >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<< _____ ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 709.10 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 708.93 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 17.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 6.0 INCH PIPE IS 4.7 INCHES PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 3.72 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 6.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 0.62PIPE TRAVEL TIME (MIN.) = 0.08 Tc(MIN.) = 6.01 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 203.00 = 152.00 FEET. FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 203.00 TO NODE 203.00 IS CODE = 81 _____ >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<< _____ 50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.999 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.6808 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) =0.21SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) =0.80TOTAL AREA (ACRES) =0.5TOTAL RUNOFF (CFS) =1.4 TOTAL AREA (ACRES) = 1.42 TC(MIN.) = 6.01 FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 203.00 TO NODE 204.00 IS CODE = 31 _____ >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<< >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<< _____ ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 708.93 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 707.67 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 126.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 9.0 INCH PIPE IS 5.8 INCHES PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY(FEET/SEC.) = 4.73 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 9.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 1.42PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.44 Tc(MIN.) = 6.45 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 204.00 = 278.00 FEET. FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 204.00 TO NODE 204.00 IS CODE = 81 _____ >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<< 50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.910 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.7891 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.35 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 1.30 0.9 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) = TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 2.68 TC(MIN.) = 6.45FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 204.00 TO NODE 205.00 IS CODE = 31 _____ >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<< >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<

```
ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 707.67 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 706.69
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 94.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 12.0 INCH PIPE IS 7.0 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY(FEET/SEC.) = 5.66
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 12.00
                            NUMBER OF PIPES = 1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 2.68
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.28 Tc(MIN.) =
                                 6.73
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE
                                 205.00 =
                                          372.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 205.00 TO NODE 205.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.854
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8333
 SUBAREA AREA(ACRES) = 0.33 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 1.21
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 1.2 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                        3.85
 TC(MIN.) = 6.73
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 205.00 TO NODE 206.00 IS CODE = 31
_____
 >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<
_____
ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 706.69 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 705.35
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 130.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 12.0 INCH PIPE IS 9.1 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 6.02
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 12.00
                            NUMBER OF PIPES = 1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 3.85
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.36 Tc(MIN.) =
                                 7.09
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 206.00 =
                                         502.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 206.00 TO NODE 206.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
>>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<
50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.782
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8554
 SUBAREA AREA(ACRES) = 0.28 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 1.01
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 1.5 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) = 4.79
 TC(MIN.) = 7.09
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 206.00 TO NODE 206.00 IS CODE = 81
 _____
                  _____
                              _____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
 50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.782
 *USER SPECIFIED (SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.7865
 SUBAREA AREA(ACRES) = 0.19 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 0.18
```

```
TOTAL AREA (ACRES) = 1.7 TOTAL RUNOFF (CFS) = 4.97
 TC(MIN.) =
          7.09
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 206.00 TO NODE 207.00 IS CODE = 31
    ______
 >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<
_____
 ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 705.35 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 702.85
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 247.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 15.0 INCH PIPE IS 8.9 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 6.52
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 15.00
                            NUMBER OF PIPES =
                                          1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 4.97
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.63
                        Tc(MIN.) = 7.72
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 207.00 =
                                         749.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 207.00 TO NODE 207.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.656
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8063
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.23 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.80
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) =
                  1.9 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                        5.60
 TC(MIN.) =
          7.72
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 207.00 TO NODE 208.00 IS CODE = 31
 >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<
_____
 ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 702.85 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 701.00
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 64.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 12.0 INCH PIPE IS 8.1 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 9.88
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 12.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 5.60
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME (MIN.) = 0.11
                        Tc(MIN.) = 7.83
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 208.00 =
                                         813.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 208.00 TO NODE 208.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.635
 *USER SPECIFIED (SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .8800
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8437
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 1.96 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 6.27
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) =
                  3.9 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                       11.84
 TC(MIN.) = 7.83
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 209.00 TO NODE 210.00 IS CODE = 31
```

_____ >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<< >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<< _____ ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 701.00 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 700.62 FLOW LENGTH(FEET) = 38.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 18.0 INCH PIPE IS 14.4 INCHES PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 7.81 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 18.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 11.84PIPE TRAVEL TIME (MIN.) = 0.08 Tc (MIN.) = 7.91 210.00 = LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 851.00 FEET. FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 210.00 TO NODE 211.00 IS CODE = 31 _____ >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<< >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<< _____ ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 700.62 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 686.80 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 50.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 12.0 INCH PIPE IS 6.3 INCHES PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 28.10 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 12.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 11.84PIPE TRAVEL TIME (MIN.) = 0.03 Tc (MIN.) = 7.94 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 211.00 = 901.00 FEET. FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 211.00 TO NODE 211.00 IS CODE = 81 _____ >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<< 50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.612 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8063 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) =0.26SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) =0.23TOTAL AREA (ACRES) =4.1TOTAL RUNOFF (CFS) =12.0 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 12.00 TC(MIN.) = 7.94FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 211.00 TO NODE 211.00 IS CODE = 81 _____ >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<< 50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY(INCH/HOUR) = 3.612 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.7867 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.15 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.14 4.3 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) = TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 12.14 TC(MIN.) = 7.94_____ END OF STUDY SUMMARY: TOTAL AREA (ACRES) = 4.3 TC(MIN.) = 7.94 PEAK FLOW RATE (CFS) = 12.14_____ _____

END OF RATIONAL METHOD ANALYSIS

DETAINED CONDITION - 50 YEAR

RATIONAL METHOD HYDROLOGY COMPUTER PROGRAM PACKAGE Reference: SAN DIEGO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT 2003,1985,1981 HYDROLOGY MANUAL (c) Copyright 1982-2008 Advanced Engineering Software (aes) Ver. 15.0 Release Date: 04/01/2008 License ID 1452 Analysis prepared by: PASCO LARET SUITER & ASSOCIATES 535 NORTH HIGHWAY 101 SUITE A SOLANA BEACH CA 92705 _____ FILE NAME: 3446P50.DAT TIME/DATE OF STUDY: 10:10 03/25/2022 _____ USER SPECIFIED HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC MODEL INFORMATION: _____ USER SPECIFIED STORM EVENT(YEAR) = 50.00 SPECIFIED MINIMUM PIPE SIZE(INCH) = 3.00 SPECIFIED PERCENT OF GRADIENTS (DECIMAL) TO USE FOR FRICTION SLOPE = 0.95 RAINFALL-INTENSITY ADJUSTMENT FACTOR = 1.000 *USER SPECIFIED: NUMBER OF [TIME, INTENSITY] DATA PAIRS = 9 5.000; 4.200 1) 2) 10.000; 3.200 3) 15.000; 2.700 4) 20.000; 2.300 5) 25.000; 2.200 30.000; 1.900 6) 40.000; 1.600 7) 50.000; 1.350 8) 9) 60.000; 1.200 SAN DIEGO HYDROLOGY MANUAL "C"-VALUES USED FOR RATIONAL METHOD NOTE: ONLY PEAK CONFLUENCE VALUES CONSIDERED *USER-DEFINED STREET-SECTIONS FOR COUPLED PIPEFLOW AND STREETFLOW MODEL* HALF- CROWN TO STREET-CROSSFALL: CURB GUTTER-GEOMETRIES: MANNING WIDTH CROSSFALL IN- / OUT-/PARK- HEIGHT WIDTH LIP HIKE FACTOR (FT) SIDE / SIDE/ WAY (FT) (FT) (FT) (FT) NO. (FT) (n) 1 30.0 20.0 0.018/0.018/0.020 0.67 2.00 0.0312 0.167 0.0150 GLOBAL STREET FLOW-DEPTH CONSTRAINTS: 1. Relative Flow-Depth = 0.00 FEET as (Maximum Allowable Street Flow Depth) - (Top-of-Curb) 2. (Depth) * (Velocity) Constraint = 6.0^{-1} (FT*FT/S) *SIZE PIPE WITH A FLOW CAPACITY GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO THE UPSTREAM TRIBUTARY PIPE.* 200.00 TO NODE 201.00 IS CODE = 21 FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE _____ >>>>RATIONAL METHOD INITIAL SUBAREA ANALYSIS<<<<< _____ *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 INITIAL SUBAREA FLOW-LENGTH (FEET) = 48.00 UPSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 733.00

```
DOWNSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 713.80
 ELEVATION DIFFERENCE (FEET) = 19.20
 URBAN SUBAREA OVERLAND TIME OF FLOW(MIN.) = 4.921
 WARNING: THE MAXIMUM OVERLAND FLOW SLOPE, 10.%, IS USED IN TC CALCULATION!
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 4.200
 NOTE: RAINFALL INTENSITY IS BASED ON TC = 5-MINUTE.
 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 0.10
 TOTAL AREA (ACRES) =
                    0.10
                          TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                               0.10
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 201.00 TO NODE 202.00 IS CODE = 61
_____
 >>>>COMPUTE STREET FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>> (STANDARD CURB SECTION USED) <<<<<
_____
 UPSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 713.80 DOWNSTREAM ELEVATION (FEET) = 713.10
 STREET LENGTH (FEET) = 87.00 CURB HEIGHT (INCHES) = 6.0
 STREET HALFWIDTH (FEET) = 26.00
 DISTANCE FROM CROWN TO CROSSFALL GRADEBREAK (FEET) = 1.00
 INSIDE STREET CROSSFALL(DECIMAL) = 0.020
 OUTSIDE STREET CROSSFALL(DECIMAL) = 0.020
 SPECIFIED NUMBER OF HALFSTREETS CARRYING RUNOFF = 1
 STREET PARKWAY CROSSFALL(DECIMAL) = 0.018
 Manning's FRICTION FACTOR for Streetflow Section(curb-to-curb) = 0.0150
 Manning's FRICTION FACTOR for Back-of-Walk Flow Section = 0.0200
   **TRAVEL TIME COMPUTED USING ESTIMATED FLOW(CFS) =
                                               0.32
   STREETFLOW MODEL RESULTS USING ESTIMATED FLOW:
   STREET FLOW DEPTH(FEET) = 0.19
  HALFSTREET FLOOD WIDTH (FEET) = 3.20
  AVERAGE FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 1.44
  PRODUCT OF DEPTH&VELOCITY(FT*FT/SEC.) = 0.27
 STREET FLOW TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 1.01 Tc(MIN.) = 5.93
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 4.014
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.617
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) =0.11SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) =0.42TOTAL AREA (ACRES) =0.2PEAK FLOW RATE (CFS) =
                                                     0.52
 END OF SUBAREA STREET FLOW HYDRAULICS:
 DEPTH(FEET) = 0.22 HALFSTREET FLOOD WIDTH(FEET) = 4.76
 FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 1.51 DEPTH*VELOCITY (FT*FT/SEC.) = 0.33
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 202.00 = 135.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 202.00 TO NODE 202.00 IS CODE = 81
 _____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
   50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 4.014
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.4984
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.10 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.10
 TOTAL AREA (ACRES) = 0.3 TOTAL RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.62
 TC(MIN.) = 5.93
```

FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 202.00 TO NODE 203.00 IS CODE = 31 _____ >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<< >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<< _____ ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 709.10 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 708.93 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 17.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 6.0 INCH PIPE IS 4.7 INCHES PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 3.72 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 6.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 0.62PIPE TRAVEL TIME (MIN.) = 0.08 Tc(MIN.) = 6.01 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 203.00 = 152.00 FEET. FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 203.00 TO NODE 203.00 IS CODE = 81 _____ >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<< _____ 50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.999 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.6808 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) =0.21SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) =0.80TOTAL AREA (ACRES) =0.5TOTAL RUNOFF (CFS) =1.4 TOTAL AREA (ACRES) = 1.42 TC(MIN.) = 6.01 FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 203.00 TO NODE 204.00 IS CODE = 31 _____ >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<< >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<< _____ ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 708.93 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 707.67 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 126.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 9.0 INCH PIPE IS 5.8 INCHES PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY(FEET/SEC.) = 4.73 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 9.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 1.42PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.44 Tc(MIN.) = 6.45 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 204.00 = 278.00 FEET. FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 204.00 TO NODE 204.00 IS CODE = 81 _____ >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<< 50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.910 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA): USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.7891 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.35 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 1.30 0.9 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) = TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 2.68 TC(MIN.) = 6.45FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 204.00 TO NODE 205.00 IS CODE = 31 _____ >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<< >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<

```
ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 707.67 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 706.69
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 94.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 12.0 INCH PIPE IS 7.0 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY(FEET/SEC.) = 5.66
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 12.00
                            NUMBER OF PIPES = 1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 2.68
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.28 Tc(MIN.) =
                                 6.73
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE
                                 205.00 =
                                          372.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 205.00 TO NODE 205.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.854
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8333
 SUBAREA AREA(ACRES) = 0.33 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 1.21
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 1.2 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                        3.85
 TC(MIN.) = 6.73
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 205.00 TO NODE 206.00 IS CODE = 31
_____
 >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<
_____
ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 706.69 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 705.35
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 130.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 12.0 INCH PIPE IS 9.1 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 6.02
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 12.00
                            NUMBER OF PIPES = 1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 3.85
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.36 Tc(MIN.) =
                                 7.09
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 206.00 =
                                         502.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 206.00 TO NODE 206.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
>>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<
50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.782
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8554
 SUBAREA AREA(ACRES) = 0.28 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 1.01
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 1.5 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) = 4.79
 TC(MIN.) = 7.09
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 206.00 TO NODE 206.00 IS CODE = 81
 _____
                  _____
                              _____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
 50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.782
 *USER SPECIFIED (SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.7865
 SUBAREA AREA(ACRES) = 0.19 SUBAREA RUNOFF(CFS) = 0.18
```

```
TOTAL AREA (ACRES) = 1.7 TOTAL RUNOFF (CFS) = 4.97
 TC(MIN.) =
          7.09
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 206.00 TO NODE 207.00 IS CODE = 31
    ______
 >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<
_____
 ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 705.35 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 702.85
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 247.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 15.0 INCH PIPE IS 8.9 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 6.52
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 15.00
                            NUMBER OF PIPES =
                                          1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 4.97
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.63
                        Tc(MIN.) = 7.72
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 207.00 =
                                         749.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 207.00 TO NODE 207.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.656
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .9500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8063
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.23 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.80
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) =
                  1.9 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                        5.60
 TC(MIN.) =
          7.72
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 207.00 TO NODE 208.00 IS CODE = 31
 >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<
_____
 ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 702.85 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 701.00
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 64.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 12.0 INCH PIPE IS 8.1 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 9.88
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 12.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 5.60
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME (MIN.) = 0.11
                        Tc(MIN.) = 7.83
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 208.00 =
                                         813.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 208.00 TO NODE 208.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 3.635
 *USER SPECIFIED (SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .8800
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.8437
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 1.96 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 6.27
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) =
                  3.9 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                       11.84
 TC(MIN.) = 7.83
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 209.00 TO NODE 209.00 IS CODE = 7
```

```
_____
 >>>>USER SPECIFIED HYDROLOGY INFORMATION AT NODE <<<<<
_____
 USER-SPECIFIED VALUES ARE AS FOLLOWS:
 TC(MIN) = 17.00 RAIN INTENSITY(INCH/HOUR) = 2.54
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 3.86 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                      5.29
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 209.00 TO NODE 210.00 IS CODE = 31
_____
 >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<
_____
ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 701.00 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 700.62
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 38.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 15.0 INCH PIPE IS 9.3 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 6.58
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 15.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 5.29
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.10 Tc(MIN.) = 17.10
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE 210.00 =
                                        851.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 210.00 TO NODE 211.00 IS CODE = 31
_____
 >>>>COMPUTE PIPE-FLOW TRAVEL TIME THRU SUBAREA<<<<<
 >>>>USING COMPUTER-ESTIMATED PIPESIZE (NON-PRESSURE FLOW) <<<<<
______
                        ______
 ELEVATION DATA: UPSTREAM(FEET) = 700.62 DOWNSTREAM(FEET) = 686.80
 FLOW LENGTH (FEET) = 50.00 MANNING'S N = 0.011
 DEPTH OF FLOW IN 9.0 INCH PIPE IS 4.6 INCHES
 PIPE-FLOW VELOCITY (FEET/SEC.) = 23.00
 ESTIMATED PIPE DIAMETER(INCH) = 9.00 NUMBER OF PIPES = 1
 PIPE-FLOW(CFS) = 5.29
 PIPE TRAVEL TIME(MIN.) = 0.04
                       Tc(MIN.) = 17.13
 LONGEST FLOWPATH FROM NODE 200.00 TO NODE
                                211.00 =
                                        901.00 FEET.
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 211.00 TO NODE 211.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 2.529
 *USER SPECIFIED(SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.5213
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.26 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.16
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) =
                 4.1 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                       5.43
 TC(MIN.) = 17.13
FLOW PROCESS FROM NODE 211.00 TO NODE
                             211.00 IS CODE = 81
_____
 >>>>ADDITION OF SUBAREA TO MAINLINE PEAK FLOW<<<<<
_____
  50 YEAR RAINFALL INTENSITY (INCH/HOUR) = 2.529
 *USER SPECIFIED (SUBAREA):
 USER-SPECIFIED RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = .2500
 S.C.S. CURVE NUMBER (AMC II) = 0
 AREA-AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENT = 0.5118
 SUBAREA AREA (ACRES) = 0.15 SUBAREA RUNOFF (CFS) = 0.09
 TOTAL AREA(ACRES) =
                 4.3 TOTAL RUNOFF(CFS) =
                                       5.53
```

TC(MIN.) = 17.13

END OF STUDY SUMMARY: TOTAL AREA(ACRES) = 4.3 TC(MIN.) = 17.13 PEAK FLOW RATE(CFS) = 5.53

END OF RATIONAL METHOD ANALYSIS

Appendix 5

Modified-Puls Detention Routing

RATIONAL METHOD HYDROGRAPH PROGRAM COPYRIGHT 1992, 2001 RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY

RUN DATE 3/25/2022 HYDROGRAPH FILE NAME Text1 TIME OF CONCENTRATION 10 MIN. 6 HOUR RAINFALL 2.8 INCHES BASIN AREA 3.86 ACRES RUNOFF COEFFICIENT 0.8437 PEAK DISCHARGE 11.84 CFS

TIME (MIN) =	0	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0
TIME (MIN) =	10	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.5
TIME (MIN) =	20	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.6
TIME (MIN) =	30	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.6
TIME (MIN) =	40	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.6
TIME (MIN) =	50	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.6
TIME (MIN) =	60	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.6
TIME (MIN) =	70	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.7
TIME (MIN) =	80	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.7
TIME (MIN) =	90	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.7
TIME (MIN) =	100	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.7
TIME (MIN) =	110	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.8
TIME (MIN) =	120	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.8
IIME(MIN) =	130	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.9
IIME(MIN) =	140	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.9
IIVIE (IVIIN) =	150	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	1
IIVIE (IVIIN) =	160	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	1
IIVIE (IVIIN) =	170	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	1.1
TIME(MIN) = TIME(MIN)	180	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	1.2
TIME(MIN) = TIME(MIN)	190	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	1.4
TIME(NIN) = TME(NIN) = TME(NIN) = T	200	DISCHARGE	(CFS) = (CFS	1.5
T IIVIE (IVIIIN) = TIME (MINI) = 1	210	DISCHARGE	(CFS) = (CFS	1.0
TIME (IVIIIN) = TIME (MINI) = 1	220	DISCHARGE	(CES) =	2.1
TIME (IVIIIN) = TIME (MINI) = 1	230	DISCHARGE	(CES) =	3 7 8
TIME (MIN) =	250	DISCHARGE	(CES) =	11 84
TIME (MIN) =	260	DISCHARGE	(CES) =	24
TIMF(MIN) =	270	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	1.6
TIME (MIN) =	280	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	1.3
TIME (MIN) =	290	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	1.1
TIME(MIN) =	300	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.9
TIME(MIN) =	310	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.8
TIME(MIN) =	320	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.8
TIME (MIN) =	330	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.7
TIME (MIN) =	340	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.6
TIME (MIN) =	350	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.6
TIME (MIN) =	360	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0.6
TIME (MIN) =	370	DISCHARGE	(CFS) =	0
` '			• •	

Outlet Structure for Discharge of BMP-1

Discharge vs. Elevation Table

Low Flow orific	<u>ce</u>	Mid Slot orific	<u>ce</u>	Emergency C	Emergency Overflow			
No.:	1	No.:	1	Invert:	5.17 ft			
Invert:	0.00 ft	Invert:	2.00 ft	L:	6 ft			
Dia:	1.75 in	Length:	2.00 ft	C _w :	3.1			
Dia:	0.15 ft	Height	0.25 ft	Tank Dimens	<u>sions</u>			
A:	0.02 sf	A:	0.50 sf	Area:	2,700 sq-ft			
C _o :	0.6	C _o :	0.6	Height:	5.67 ft			
				Total Vol:	15,309 cu-ft			

*Note: h = head above the invert of the lowest surface discharge opening.

Н	h*	Volume	Q _{orifice-low}	Q _{slot-mid}	Q _{emerg}	Q _{mid + emerg}	Q _{total}
(ft)	(ft)	(ac-ft)	(cfs)	(cfs)	(cfs)	(cfs)	(cfs)
0.0000		0.0000	0.0000				0.000
0.2500		0.0155	0.0372				0.037
0.5000		0.0310	0.0548				0.055
0.7500		0.0465	0.0679				0.068
1.0000		0.0620	0.0789				0.079
1.2500		0.0775	0.0886				0.089
1.5000		0.0930	0.0973				0.097
1.7500		0.1085	0.1053				0.105
2.0000	0.000	0.1240	0.1127	0.000		0.000	0.113
2.2500	0.250	0.1395	0.1197	1.204		1.204	1.323
2.5000	0.500	0.1550	0.1262	1.702		1.702	1.829
2.7500	0.750	0.1705	0.1325	2.085		2.085	2.217
3.0000	1.000	0.1860	0.1385	2.407		2.407	2.546
3.2500	1.250	0.2014	0.1442	2.692		2.692	2.836
3.5000	1.500	0.2169	0.1497	2.949		2.949	3.098
3.7500	1.750	0.2324	0.1550	3.185		3.185	3.340
4.0000	2.000	0.2479	0.1601	3.405		3.405	3.565
4.2500	2.250	0.2634	0.1651	3.611		3.611	3.776
4.5000	2.500	0.2789	0.1699	3.807		3.807	3.976
4.7500	2.750	0.2944	0.1746	3.992		3.992	4.167
5.0000	3.000	0.3099	0.1792	4.170	0.000	4.170	4.349
5.2500	3.250	0.3254	0.1836	4.340	0.421	4.761	4.945
5.5000	3.500	0.3409	0.1880	4.504	3.526	8.030	8.218
5.6700	3.670	0.3514	0.1909	4.612	6.576	11.188	11.379

Note:

1. Weir equation, $Q=C_wL_e(h)^{3/2}$

2. Orifice equation, $Q=C_oA_e(2gh)^{1/2}$

3. Slot orifice acts as a weir when $h^* < h_{slot}$; slot

orifice acts as an orifice when $h^* \ge h_{slot}$

HEC-HMS Detention Routing Summary

Meyers Industrial

PL 20-0654



Summary Results for Reservoir "BMP-1"		
Project: Mey	yers Simulation Ru Reservoir: BMP-1	n: Q100
Start of Run: 01Jan2000, 0 End of Run: 01Jan2000, 0 Compute Time:25Mar2022, 1	00:00 Basin M 06:05 Meteor 11:31:10 Control	lodel: Post_Dev ologic Model: Met 1 Specifications:Control 1
Volume 1	Units: 🖲 IN 🔿 AC	-FT
Computed Results		
Peak Inflow: 11.84 (CFS) Peak Discharge: 5.29 (CFS) Inflow Volume: n/a Discharge Volume:n/a	Date/Time of Peak Date/Time of Peak Peak Storage: Peak Elevation:	: Inflow: 01Jan2000, 04:09 : Discharge:01Jan2000, 04:17 0.32701 (AC-FT) 5.276 (FT)
Observed Flow Gage BMP 1		
Peak Discharge: 11.84 (CFS) Volume: (IN)	Date/Time of Peak Discharge:01Jan2000, 04:10	
RMSE Std Dev: 0.83 Percent Bias: -17.16 %	Nash-Sutdiffe:	0.309

