## Vilage of Oregon

## Urban Service Area Amendment Request: Autumn Ridge Phases 3 and 5

June 10, 2023

## VILAGE OF OREGON

VANDEWALE \& ASSOCIATES

## Table of Contents

Introduction ..... 1
Plan Consistency and Need ..... 1
1.1. Document Consistency ..... 1
1.2. Applicable Neighborhood Plan or Studies ..... 2
1.3. Need for the Addition to the USA ..... 3
Intergovernmental Cooperation ..... 4
2.1. Document Notification of Adjacent Local Governmental Units ..... 4
2.2. Adjacent Local Governmental Unit(s) Objections or Support ..... 5
Land Use ..... 5
3.1. Proposed USAA Boundary and Existing Rights-of-Way Map. ..... 5
3.2. USA Amendment Area Data ..... 5
3.3. Existing and Planned Land Use Map ..... 7
3.4 Proposed Quantity and Type of Housing Units ..... 7
3.5 Land Use Phasing ..... 7
Natural Resources: ..... 7
4.1. Natural Features ..... 7
4.2. Parks and Stormwater Management Facilities Map ..... 8
4.3. Environmental Corridors ..... 8
4.4. Proposed Environmental Corridors Map ..... 9
4.5. Environmental Corridors Requirements ..... 9
Utilities and Stormwater Management ..... 9
5.1. Proposed Sanitary Sewer ..... 9
5.2. USAA Average Daily and Peak Wastewater Flow ..... 9
5.3. Average Wastewater Treatment Plant Daily Flow. ..... 9
5.4. Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity ..... 10
5.5. Proposed USAA Public Water Supply ..... 10
5.6. Estimated USAA Daily and Peak Hourly Water Demand ..... 10
5.7. Average Daily and Peak Hourly Water Demand ..... 10
5.8. Water Supply System Capacity ..... 10
5.9. Proposed Stormwater Management Standards ..... 11
5.10. Stormwater Management Plan. ..... 11
5.11. Engineering Reports ..... 12
Map 1: Proposed Amendment Area ..... 13
Map 1a: Proposed Amendment Area Concept Plans ..... 14
Map 2: Existing Land Use ..... 15
Map 3: Planned Land Use ..... 16
Map 3a: Planned Land Use with Concept Plans ..... 17
Map 3b: Planned Land Use - Village ETJ Extent. ..... 18
Map 4: Natural Features ..... 19
Map 4a: Natural Features From Comprehensive Plan ..... 20
Map 4b: Amendment Area Planned Utilities ..... 21

## Introduction

The Village of Oregon is requesting a 47.2-acre addition to its Urban Service Area to provide sanitary sewer, potable water, and other urban services to a site immediately south of the Village's municipal boundary on the east side of CTH MM. As depicted on Map 1 in Section 3.1, this would include 25 acres currently within the Town of Rutland, 21.2 acres in the Town of Oregon, and 1 acre of CTH MM right-of-way, immediately adjacent to the Village's current USA boundary.

One portion of the project (56.1 acres) is already located within the Village's Urban Service Area. The other portion of the project (47.2 acres) is not located within the Village's Urban Service Area. Both areas are currently unincorporated and are anticipated to be annexed into the Village this summer.
As part of the Urban Service Area Amendment request (47.2 acres), 21.2 acres are currently in an agricultural/farmhouse use, while the other 25 acres is currently in a golf course use presently owned by "Hofer Living Trust". The remaining area (1 acre) is street right-of-way along CTH MM.
The developer, Glenn Hofer, currently owns all parcels and is proposing to develop a Planned Neighborhood residential area called "Autumn Ridge Phases 3, 4, and 5". It is likely that CTH MM will be annexed along with the subject properties, and the Village is planning jurisdictional transfer of the road to the southern edge of the proposed USA amendment area within the next two years.
On June 1, 2023, the Village of Oregon Plan Commission recommended a Resolution to the Village Board to initiate an Urban Service Area Amendment for the 47.2 acres and that the proposed development within the Urban Service Area Amendment is consistent with the Village Comprehensive Plan. On June 5, 2023, the Village of Oregon Village Board adopted the recommended Resolution (Appendix A).

## Plan Consistency and Need

### 1.1. Document Consistency

With the exception of existing right-of-way on CTH MM, the bulk of the proposed USA addition is depicted as Planned Neighborhood on the Village's Future Land Use Map (Map 3b), which is part of the Village's Comprehensive Plan. This map was most recently amended in 2023 to change the planned Phase 4 (as shown on Map 1a) and the planned Phase 5 (as shown on Map 1a) from Recreational Business to Planned Neighborhood. The 21.2-acre portion of the proposed USA addition area fronting on CTH MM (Phase 3 as shown on Map 1a) has been identified as Planned Neighborhood dating back to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan.

The Village's Planned Neighborhood land use category is described in the Comprehensive Plan as, "A carefully planned mixture of predominantly Single-Family Residential, combined with one or more of the following land use categories: Two-Family Residential, Mixed Residential, Neighborhood Office, Neighborhood Commercial, Institutional, and Parks and Open Space."

The concept plan for the amendment area (Map 1a) is consistent with this description. The site is expected to include primarily single-family residential, some two-family residential, stormwater management areas, and public recreation facilities. The Comprehensive Plan also notes (p. 52) that areas were only depicted as Planned Neighborhood if they could "logically be served by current and planned sanitary sewer facilities." The Village's Future Land Use Map (Map 3b) also depicts a "Potential Urban Service Expansion Area", which includes the requested amendment area in this application.

The planned land use is a logical continuation of the residential neighborhood currently under construction in Autumn Ridge Phase 1 and 2, directly west of the proposed USA Amendment area. It is also a logical continuation of the existing residential neighborhoods in the Village to the north surrounding the golf course. Finally, the proposed amendment is consistent with the single-family residential uses in the Town of Oregon to the south of the proposed amendment area. In total, the proposed development of Phases 3, 4, and 5 serves as a form of infill development between existing Village neighborhoods and utilities (to the north and west), and existing Town neighborhoods (to the south).

Overall, throughout the Comprehensive Plan a wide variety of goals, strategies, and recommendations align with the proposed development related to transportation, housing, land use, utilities, and community character.

Oregon Park and Recreation Plan (2018) (Appendix B):

- Planned park location near the proposed amendment area was established in Phase 2 is shown on the Map 3. No planned parks or trails are located within the proposed amendment area, but one is proposed to serve Phase 5.
- Overall, the proposed development aligns with the community goals, helps meet the projected future needs and demands, and implements the recommendations for future park and trail locations.
Beginning in early 2023, the Village started an update of both the Comprehensive Plan and Park and Recreation Plan. Significant public input was done at the forefront of this process in January - March. Below is a summary of key related input to the proposed USA amendment:
- Expand housing options, parks, trails, and open space, promote a small town feel and grow sustainably, optimize land use growth opportunities, grow efficiently on public utilities, and mitigation of flooding through proper stormwater management.

It is anticipated that both plans will be completed and adopted by the end of 2023 , incorporating several of these key ideas and topics, which also align with the proposed USA amendment.

As noted above, approximately half of the proposed USA Amendment area is in the Town of Oregon and the other half is in the Town of Rutland. To note, the entire amendment area is within the Village's Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (Map 3b).

- Town of Rutland Comprehensive Plan (2007) (Appendix C)
o Proposed Phase 5 parcel shown as Residential - Medium Density (1 acre lots) on the Town's 2017 Amended Future Land Use Map.
- Town of Oregon Comprehensive Plan (2010) (Appendix C)
o Proposed Phase 3 and 4 parcels shown as Agricultural Preservation Area on the Town's Future Land Use Map.
o Proposed Phase 3 and 4 parcels shown as Agricultural Transition Area on the Town's Farmland Preservation Plan Map.
Finally, the Village's Comprehensive Plan and Park and Recreation Plan are consistent with CARPC's 2050
Regional Development Framework. In addition, the Village's recent housing projects as documented in Section 1.3 below are consistent with the framework.

While the proposed USA Amendment and conceptual plans don't align perfectly with the Regional Development Framework's goals and objectives, the Village-wide approach to urban development patterns and housing do reflect the framework's overarching goals and objectives more closely. In the broader perspective, these include providing walkable neighborhoods, diversity in housing, increasing infiltration of stormwater runoff, generating new housing supply to meet demands, enhancing stewardship areas, and ensuring good connectivity among developments.
On June 1, 2023, the Village of Oregon Plan Commission recommended a Resolution to the Village Board to initiate an Urban Service Area Amendment for the 47.2 acres and that the proposed development within the Urban Service Area Amendment is consistent with the Village Comprehensive Plan. On June 5, 2023, the Village of Oregon Village Board adopted the recommended Resolution (Appendix A).

### 1.2. Applicable Neighborhood Plan or Studies

In 2017, the landowner and developer, Glenn Hofer, originally developed the neighborhood plan, which included Autumn Ridge Phases 1, 2, and 3. The original plan is nearly identical to what is currently being completed in Phase 1 and 2, and the concept plan for Phases 3 (in the proposed amendment area). In 2022,

Glenn Hofer purchased the Foxboro Golf Course and then developed the neighborhood plans for Phase 4 and 5, in addition to a golf course reconfiguration plan (Appendix D).

The concept plan for the proposed amendment area includes mostly mid-sized single-family lots, with some two-family residential lots (Map 1a and Attachment E), consistent with the Planned Neighborhood land use category described in Section 1.1. The concept plan also includes increased bicycle and pedestrian accommodations throughout each phase, in addition to a park for increased outdoor recreational opportunities in this area of the Village.

As part of the plan, utility and infrastructure connectivity is significantly improved. This includes:

- Foxfield Road extension across CTH MM to serve as the main connection to Phase 3, 4, and 5 .
- Foxboro Drive extension south from its existing terminus at the golf course club house to serve Phase 4 and 5.
- Interconnected stormwater infrastructure between Phase 3, 4, and 5 with improved stormwater management on the golf course.
- Interconnected sewer and water infrastructure between Phase 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and the existing Village neighborhoods to the north.


### 1.3. Need for the Addition to the USA

Historically, Oregon has grown in three directions from downtown: to the northeast between CTH MM and the USH 14 Bypass, to the west along both sides of Jefferson Street between Netherwood Road and Lincoln Road, and to the southeast along both sides of Janesville Street and Wolfe Street between Union Road and the USH 14 Bypass. The Village has a very low inventory of developable lots on its southeast side, with the remaining 4 unsold lots in Autumn Ridge Phase 2 as the only currently available supply. All other vacant lots in the community are located on either the northeast side or west side of the Village. In total, there are approximately 134 vacant platted residential parcels in the Village as of 2022. The majority of these parcels are zoned for single-family development. See Appendix F from the Village's 2022 Housing Affordability Report Map.

## Autumn Ridge Phase 2

| Sold to Home Builders | 27 out of 31 Lots |
| :--- | :--- |
| Not Yet Under Construction | 17 out of 31 Lots |
| Under Construction | 7 out of 31 Lots |
| Sold to Homeowner | 13 out of 31 Lots |

Source: Glen Hoffer, Developer
To note, all lots have been sold and developed as part of Autumn Ridge Pbase 1.
With the addition of new lots and homes in Autumn Ridge Phases 3, 4, and 5, some turnover in the existing housing stock could take place as existing residents move into the proposed development. While the new single-family homes will not be considered affordable housing by Dane County area median income standards, some of the existing housing stock vacated by residents moving to the new development could provide availability of more affordable housing units within the existing municipal boundaries. Furthermore, the planned new two-family units within the proposed development (Phase 3) also provides some additional housing diversity in the Village, in addition to new affordable units.

Other ongoing or near-term residential housing projects in the Village that are recently completed or under construction include:

- 153 workforce and senior apartments (Prairie Brook Apartments)
o Completed in 2022
- 49 market rate apartments (Rosewood Apartments)
o Completed in 2021
- 133 mixed housing units (Highlands of Netherwood Neighborhood)
o Completed in 2022: Phase 1 and 2

0 Ongoing construction: Phase 3 and The Villas
o To be constructed in the future: Phase 4

- 210 mixed housing units (Veridian Greenview Preserve Neighborhood)

0 To be constructed in the future: 104 single-family units, 78 carriage single-family units, and 28 twin homes

- 31 single-family housing units (Autumn Ridge Phase 2)
o Ongoing construction: 31 units
- 25 single-family housing units (Bergamont Phase 5D)
o Ongoing construction: 25 units
- 70 workforce apartments (Northpointe CC Lane)
o To be constructed in the future: anticipated completion in 2024/2025
- 49 market rate apartments (Coyle N. Main Street Apartments)
o To be constructed in the future: anticipated completion in 2024/2025
In the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, it was projected that by 2030 the Village would have a total population of 13,943 residents (increase of 4,712 from 2010) and 5,530 total housing units (an increase of 1,755 from 2010). It was also projected, to support this growth, the Village would need an additional 440 acres of residential land. While the Village's Comprehensive Plan analysis is dated, the Village's actual population in 2022 (11,815 residents) was not far from the 2020 projected population total in the 2013 plan (11,587 projected total population). A more up to date population projection for the Village was recently done as part of the Comprehensive Plan update in early 2023. It projects a population total of 13,639 by 2030 and 15,919 by 2040.

CARPC's Regional Development Framework also provides population projections for the Village of Oregon, which show the Village's population increasing by $58 \%$ or 5,962 residents between 2020 and 2050 (Table 3). Household projections for the Village of Oregon show a $51 \%$ increase or 2,063 new households over that same time period (Table 4).

The only significant recent Village annexations have been Autumn Ridge Phase 1 (17 acres) and Phase 2 (20 acres) and the Highlands of Netherwood ( 75 acres). In order to support the projected population increase over the next 10 years, the USA addition of 47.2 acres and 118 new housing units in Autumn Ridge Phases 3, 4, and 5 are needed to meet demand and continue to diversify the community's available housing stock.

In total, the Village is actively working to meet residential housing demand through a mix of housing styles, types, and affordability levels, all of which are either under construction today or ready to be constructed to meet the community's residential demand in the near future. The Village had a $2.8 \%$ housing vacancy rate in 2021, well below a healthy community's housing vacancy rate of $5 \%$.

## Intergovernmental Cooperation

### 2.1. Document Notification of Adjacent Local Governmental Units

The developer and Village staff hosted a public neighborhood meeting in 2022 to discuss the proposed golf course reconfiguration and neighborhood plan for Phases 3, 4, and 5. Several neighbors within the Town of Oregon attended the meeting and provided feedback on the proposed plans.
Additionally, the developer and Village staff attended a Town of Oregon meeting on July 18, 2023 where the proposed amendment, development, and eventual Village annexation was discussed.
Finally, the developer and Village staff also contacted Town of Rutland staff about the project, but have not yet received any feedback.
All documentation related to these initiatives will be provided to CARPC once completed.

### 2.2. Adjacent Local Governmental Unit(s) Objections or Support

During the various Town meetings that took place, Town residents asked questions and provided feedback on the proposed plans. Comments generally centered on stormwater management in and around the proposed development. Any documented letter of support, neutrality, or opposition from the Towns will be provided to CARPC.

## Land Use

### 3.1. Proposed USAA Boundary and Existing Rights-of-Way Map

See Map 1. The proposed addition to the USA is comprised of two existing parcels and one portion of road right-of-way.

One parcel, totaling 21.2 acres, is currently being farmed with one existing farmhouse on-site (Phase 3). One parcel, totaling 25 acres, is currently being used as part of Foxboro Golf Course (Phase 5). Both are owned by Hofer Living Trust, the intended developer of Phases 3, 4, and 5, Glenn Hofer. One continuous piece of road right-of-way along CTH MM constitutes the rest of the proposed amendment area. CTH MM is a collector road that links the Village to existing residential development in the Town of Oregon. Any future access onto CTH MM will need to be approved by Dane County.

While not part of the proposed USA amendment area, the proposed development also includes 24.6 acres in Phase 4, which is currently being used as part of the Foxboro Golf Course.

### 3.2. USA Amendment Area Data

Existing Land Use Within Proposed USA Amendment Area (Phases 3 and 5)

|  | Existing <br> Total Acres | Existing <br> Developed <br> Acres On-Site | Existing <br> Enviro <br> Corridor <br> Acres | Existing <br> Housing <br> Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Land Use |  |  |  |  |
| Agriculture/Farming/Farmhouse | 21 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1 |
| Golf Course | 25.1 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Street Right-of-Way | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 7 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |

## Existing Land Use Within Proposed Neighborhood (Phase 3, 4, and 5)

|  | Existing <br> Total Acres | Existing <br> Developed <br> Acres On-Site | Existing <br> Enviro <br> Corridor <br> Acres | Existing <br> Housing <br> Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Land Use |  |  |  |  |
| Agriculture/Farming/Farmhouse | 21 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1 |
| Golf Course | 49.6 | 2.8 | $24.6^{*}$ | 0 |
| Street Right-of-Way | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |

*The existing portion of the Golf Course that makes up Phase 4 of the planned neighborbood (already located within the Village's USA boundary) is proposed to be developed into residential homes. The Village requests that CARPC amend the existing Environmental Corridor shown in this area where Phase 4 is planned.

Planned Land Use Within Proposed USA Amendment Area (Phase 3 and 5)

|  | Total Acres | Existing Developed Acres On-Site | Future Enviro Corridor Acres | Projected <br> Housing <br> Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planned Land Use Phase 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Planned Neighborhood | 10.8 | 2.0 |  | 42 |
| Street Right-of-Way | 4.8 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Park and Open Space/Stormwater Management | 6.4 |  | 6.4 |  |
| Phase 3 Total | 22.0 | 3.1 | 6.4 | 42 |
| Planned Land Use Phase 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Planned Neighborhood | 10.7 |  |  | 34 |
| Street Right-of-Way | 3.4 |  |  |  |
| Park and Open Space/Stormwater Management | 1.9 |  | 1.9 |  |
| Other Outlot | 0.6 |  |  |  |
| Golf Course | 8.6 | 0.8 | 8.6 |  |
| Phase 5 Total | 25.2 | 0.8 | 10.5 | 34 |
| Planned Land Use Totals (Phase 3 and 5) |  |  |  |  |
| Planned Neighborhood | 21.5 | 2 |  | 76 |
| Street Right-of-Way | 8.2 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Park and Open Space/Stormwater Management | 8.3 |  | 8.3 |  |
| Other Outlot | 0.6 |  |  |  |
| Golf Course | 8.6 | 0.8 | 8.6 |  |
| Total | 47.2 | 3.9 | 16.9 | 76 |

Note: Totals may not match subtotals exactly due to rounding.
Note: Conceptual parcels that straddle the border between Phases 4 and 5 were presumed for this analysis to be located within Phase 5.

Planned Land Use Within Proposed Neighborhood (Phase 3, 4, and 5)

|  | Total Acres | Existing Developed Acres On-Site | Future Enviro Corridor Acres | Projected Housing Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planned Land Use Phase 4 (not part of proposed USA amendment) |  |  |  |  |
| Planned Neighborhood | 13.5 |  |  | 42 |
| Street Right-of-Way | 4.6 |  |  |  |
| Park and Open Space/Stormwater Management |  |  |  |  |
| Other Outlot | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| Golf Course | 6.3 | 2 | 6.3 |  |
| Phase 4 Total | 24.6 | 2 | 6.3 | 42 |
| Planned Land Use Totals (Phase 3, 4, and 5) |  |  |  |  |
| Planned Neighborhood | 35 |  |  |  |
| Street Right-of-Way | 12.8 |  |  |  |
| Park and Open Space/Stormwater Management | 8.3 |  |  |  |
| Other Outlot | 0.8 |  |  |  |
| Golf Course | 14.9 |  |  |  |
| Total | 71.8 | 5.9 | 24.9 | 118 |

Note: Totals may not match subtotals exactly due to rounding.

Note: Conceptual parcels that straddle the border between Phases 4 and 5 were presumed for this analysis to be located within Phase 5.

### 3.3. Existing and Planned Land Use Map

Map 2 depicts Existing Land Use for the amendment area and Map 1a the conceptual parcels for planned development. See Introduction and Section 3.1 for more information.

Map 3 and 3a depict Planned Land Use.
Within the proposed USA amendment area, approximately 19.6 acres of the site is planned for detached single-family dwelling units on lots averaging 0.3 acres $(+/-13,000$ square feet) in size. Approximately 1.9 acres is planned for two-family attached dwelling units on lots averaging 0.2 acres $(+/-8,712$ square feet in size). Additionally, two stormwater management areas are planned. A large detention area is planned for the northern portion of Phase 5 and a greenway with detention areas is planned to run through Phase 3. These two areas will be connected through the proposed park space in Phase 5. More detail is provided in Section 5.9. Further, one park in Phase 5, totaling 1.9 acres, is also planned. Finally, 7.1 acres of right-of-way are anticipated, primarily to serve the planned residential homes and park. The 1.1 acres of right-of-way along CTH MM running between Phases 2 and Phase 3 will remain in right-of-way use following completion of the development and be expanded to 1.46 acres following replatting.

Following the CARPC and WisDNR approval process, the developer will seek annexation of all three existing parcels into the Village. Zoning and subdivision review will occur following annexation. It is anticipated that the lots that make up Phases 3, 4, and 5 will be zoned SR-4 (less than 12,000 sf) or TR-6 (duplex).
It is likely that CTH MM will be annexed along with the subject property, and the Village is open to accepting a jurisdictional transfer of the road to the southern edge of the proposed USA amendment area.

### 3.4 Proposed Quantity and Type of Housing Units

Within the proposed USA amendment area, 76 lots are proposed for single-family dwelling units ( 66 dwelling units) and 8 lots are proposed for two-family duplexes ( 10 dwelling units). For the entire proposed neighborhood (Phase 3, 4, and 5), there is anticipated to be 118 total units. All phases of the project will reflect the scale and type of housing currently being constructed in Autumn Ridge Phase 1 and 2 to the west and the existing Village neighborhood to the north. Additionally, the new neighborhood is proposed to be significantly smaller lots than the existing Town development to the south.

### 3.5 Land Use Phasing

Although the requested amendment is under 100 developable acres, and thus does not require a 10-year staging map for this application, a preliminary 3-part phasing plan has been devised by the developer. Phase 3 is anticipated to begin construction immediately following CARPC and WisDNR approval and Village annexation, platting, and zoning processes in 2023. Phases 4 and 5 are anticipated to begin following the build out of Phase 3 in preceding years.

## Natural Resources:

### 4.1. Natural Features

See Map 4. There are no wetlands, floodplains, woodlands, unique flora or fauna, or surface water on the site. There is one area of steep slopes above $12 \%$ running through a small portion of Phase 3 . There is also hydric soil in the far northwest corner of the amendment area and a portion of area also has karst and carbonate bedrock. There are also some areas of "Highly Erodible Soils" as defined by the USDA on the site in the proposed Phases 3 and 5.

Additionally, there are small portions of both Phase 3 and 5 within CARPC's Stewardship Areas. CARPC recommends these areas be planned for parks, conservancy, and stormwater management. Generally, much
of the recommended future environmental corridor is planned for a greenway, stormwater management area, and recreational space within the preliminary plans (Map 4). Site grading during the construction process will ensure a safe transition and gentle slope between future recreational park space and stormwater management and greenway areas. Detailed site grading plans will be reviewed during the required Village Site Plan, Zoning, and Subdivision processes.

The existing portion of the Golf Course that makes up Phase 4 of the planned neighborhood (already located within the Village's USA boundary) is proposed to be developed into residential homes. The Village requests that CARPC amend the existing Environmental Corridor shown in this area where Phase 4 is planned.

The Wisconsin DNR Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation for Endangered Resources Review Preliminary Assessment (completed April 28, 2023) indicates that a formal Endangered Resources Review letter is not needed (Appendix G). However, the location of the proposed amendment area overlaps with the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee High Potential Zone. This means that any project within the zone should take steps to determine if suitable habitat is present for the bee. The proposed development within the amendment area may include some areas in Phase 5 that are suitable habitat.

The Village recognizes the recommendations of the DNR in respect to suitable active season and suitable overwintering habitat for the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee. Through the development review process, the Village and developer will further explore inclusion of this type of habitat within the parks, stormwater management areas, and greenways. Applicable to this site and the proposed development, this would mean the inclusion of prairies, marshes/wetlands, non-compact soils, or sandy soils. Additionally, it is recommended that the parks, stormwater management areas, and greenways include native trees, shrubs, and flowering plants, plants that bloom spring through fall, and the removal and control of invasive plants in any habitat used for foraging, nesting, or overwintering.
Map 4a depicts the proposed amendment area overlaid on the Natural Features Map from the Village's Comprehensive Plan. The only environmental constraints depicted within the amendment area on this map are the $12 \%$ to $20 \%$ slopes running through both parcels. It is anticipated that during the site grading process of both phases, these steep slopes will be graded to be non-steep.

### 4.2. Parks and Stormwater Management Facilities Map

See Map 3a. One Neighborhood Park is planned for the amendment area as part of Phase 5. Park access will be provided through sidewalks on both sides of all proposed new streets. These sidewalks will connect to the existing sidewalks to the west and the larger Village-wide networks as well. Additionally, the existing Golf Course is planned to be configured and residents of the new development will benefit from the private green space to the north of both Phase 4 and 5 .
Additionally, two stormwater management areas are planned. A large detention area is planned for the northern portion of Phase 5 and a greenway with detention areas is planned to run through Phase 3. These two areas will be connected through the proposed park space in Phase 5. A preliminary Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Report has been prepared for Phase 3 by the developer's engineer (Appendix H). Village staff are currently working with the developer's engineer to fine tune the stormwater plans and report. The final version is planned to be included with the subdivision plat. Both will require approvals by the Village and meeting all requirements of Dane County and the state of Wisconsin.
The stormwater areas are described in greater depth in Section 5.9.

### 4.3. Environmental Corridors

Within the proposed USA amendment area (Phase 3 and 5), there are a total of 16.9 acres proposed as Environmental Corridor, which comprise the planned parks, stormwater management areas, and the remnant portion of the golf course. The proposed corridor contains approximately $35 \%$ of the total amendment area, a significant increase from today.

Within the proposed total project area (Phase 3, 4, and 5), there are a total of 24.9 acres proposed as Environmental Corridor, which comprise the planned parks, stormwater management areas, and the remnant portion of the golf course. The proposed corridor contains approximately $35 \%$ of the total project area, a significant increase from today.

### 4.4. Proposed Environmental Corridors Map

See Map 4.

### 4.5. Environmental Corridors Requirements

The proposed corridor contains planned park space, the greenway, and stormwater retention/groundwater recharge areas. Exact locations of stormwater areas and park land may be refined through the platting process and the corridor may need to be adjusted accordingly prior to plat approval.

The proposed corridor achieves the intended goals outlined for Environmental Corridors in the Water Quality Plan for Dane County. It protects water quality and public health by including the groundwater recharge area as part of the corridor, as well as an additional planned stormwater retention area. It also provides and encourages outdoor recreation options by including planned neighborhood park space.

## Utilities and Stormwater Management

### 5.1. Proposed Sanitary Sewer

No new interceptor will be installed to facilitate the proposed development. Instead, wastewater will be handled by existing sanitary sewer mains in the area. The downstream sanitary sewer is 8 " PVC to match the proposed main size within the USA amendment area. Sanitary sewer infrastructure will be connected to the north (Lexington Street), looped through Phases 3, 4, and 5, and connect to the west (Foxfield Road). The 2023 Sewer Study confirmed that there is sufficient downstream capacity for the contemplated development for Phases 3, 4, and 5. See Appendix I and Map 4b.

### 5.2. USAA Average Daily and Peak Wastewater Flow

Within the proposed USA amendment area (Phase 3 and 5): each housing unit in the proposed development is expected to contribute an additional 250 gallons per day, amounting to approximately 18,750 gallons total per day for the 75 dwelling units in the amendment area. Peak flow is estimated to be a total of 75,000 gallons per day.

Within the proposed totalproject area (Phase 3, 4, and 5): each housing unit in the proposed development is expected to contribute an additional 250 gallons per day, amounting to approximately 30,750 gallons total per day for the 123 dwelling units in the development area. Peak flow is estimated to be a total of 123,000 gallons per day.

These values assume 2.5 persons per home and 100 gallons per person per day. A peaking factor of 4 was provided by the developer's engineer.

### 5.3. Average Wastewater Treatment Plant Daily Flow

Per the 2020 Facilities Plan for the Village of Oregon Wastewater Treatment Plant (Appendix K), the average daily flow is 1.32 million gallons per day.

No new interceptor will be installed to facilitate the proposed development. Instead, wastewater will be handled by existing sanitary sewer mains in the area. The downstream sanitary sewer is $8 "$ PVC to match the proposed main size within the USA amendment area. Sanitary sewer infrastructure will be connected to the north (Lexington Street), looped through Phases 3, 4, and 5, and connect to the west (Foxfield Road). The 2023 Sewer Study indicates that the existing sanitary sewer at Lexington Street sees a total daily flow of 4,752
gpd and a peak flow of 16 gpm . The study confirmed that there is sufficient downstream capacity for the contemplated development for Phases 3, 4, and 5. See Appendix I.

### 5.4. Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity

Per the 2020 Facilities Plan (Appendix K), the existing Village wastewater treatment plant's rated capacity is 1.8 million gallons per day, with a reserve capacity of 0.48 million gallons per day. The Park Street interceptor will be experiencing additional flow from the proposed Autumn Ridge Phase 3, 4, and 5 development. Sewer flows from these areas travel the Park Street interceptor prior to being discharged into the pumping stion at the Wastewater Treatment Plant. A map of this flow path, analysis, and capacity can all be found in Appendix I.

As noted in Section 5.3, daily flow rates for the interceptor sewer were 4,752 gpd and a peak flow of 16 gpm. Sufficient capacity was identified and confirmed by the 2023 Sewer Study.

As described in Section 5.2, the average daily flow expected at build-out for the total project area is approximately 30,750 gallons per day, with a peak load of approximately 120,000 gallons per day, indicating the Village's treatment plant has ample capacity to support the planned development.

### 5.5. Proposed USAA Public Water Supply

The Village's 2015 Water System Master Plan calls for 12" main along the east-west extension of Foxfield Road to eventually complete a loop and connect to a future elevated storage tank. Also, per the Master Plan, an 8 " main would be included on the north-south running portion of CTH MM. To note, the Village's Water System Master Plan is currently being updated.
There is an existing 12 " water main under Foxfield Road and 8 " water main under Lexington Street that will be connected and looped through the proposed development. The new connection will be a 12 " water main. See Map 4b.

### 5.6. Estimated USAA Daily and Peak Hourly Water Demand

Within the proposed USA amendment area (Phase 3 and 5): at build-out, the 75 anticipated housing units would be expected to use an average water total of 18,750 gallons per day, with a peak daily demand of 63,750 gallons per day. Peak hourly demand is estimated at 43 gallons per minute.
These totals assume 100 gallons per person per day, 2.5 persons per housing unit, 75 housing units, $15 \%$ water loss, and a peaking factor of 4 ( 18,500 gallons per day $\times 85 \%$ accounting for water loss $\times 4$ peaking factor).

Within the proposed total project area (Phase 3, 4, and 5): at build-out, the 123 anticipated housing units would be expected to use an average water total of 30,750 gallons per day, with a peak daily demand of 104,550 gallons per day. Peak hourly demand is estimated at 43 gallons per minute.

These totals assume 100 gallons per person per day, 2.5 persons per housing unit, 123 housing units, $15 \%$ water loss, and a peaking factor of 4 ( 30,750 gallons per day $\mathrm{x} 85 \%$ accounting for water loss x 4 peaking factor).

### 5.7. Average Daily and Peak Hourly Water Demand

Per the Village Public Works Department, the current average daily water demand is approximately 770,000 gallons, with an average demand of 535 gpm . The current average peak hourly water demand is $1,900 \mathrm{gpm}$. To note, the Village's Water System Master Plan is currently being updated.

### 5.8. Water Supply System Capacity

The Village currently operates three groundwater wells (3, 4, and 5) for water supply. Each well yields between 800 and 1,000 gallons per minute (gpm). The current well pumping capacity with all three wells
operating simultaneously is $2,650 \mathrm{gpm}$. Additionally, the Village also has an existing 1.268 million gallons of water storage capacity in standpipes, ground storage reservoirs, and water towers.
This translates to a capacity of 2.38 million gallons per day and an estimated unused capacity of 1.610 million gpd with all 3 wells in operation. If one of the Village's largest wells is out of services ( $1,000 \mathrm{gpm}$ ), the firm capacity is $1,650 \mathrm{gpm}$ or 2.376 million gallons per day. The Village utilized its existing water storage capacity daily to fluctuate with demand and keep water in the storage system fresh. The additional estimated demand from the total proposed project (Phase 3, 4, and 5) is $30,750 \mathrm{gpd}$, with peak demand of $104,550 \mathrm{gpd}$, well within the Water System's capacity.

The Village has drilled a fourth well (Well \#6) in the Highlands of Netherwood neighborhood. Construction of a well house and booster station for Well \#6 is scheduled to begin in 2024, with an estimated online date of mid-2025. When Well \#6 is integrated into the Village's system, it will increase the system capacity by 1,000 gpm (estimated).

### 5.9. Proposed Stormwater Management Standards

The Village of Oregon has taken a proactive approach to addressing stormwater management needs. The Village recognizes the necessity for properly managing stormwater runoff from existing and new development because of its location in an area of poorly defined stormwater flow, leading to the Oregon Branch of the Badfish Creek.

In 1998-99 the Village conducted a comprehensive stormwater management study. The study divided the Village in sub-watersheds, and modeled stormwater runoff, and conveyance capacities for each system. Also, where capacity problems were identified, the study analyzed alternative management approaches, and recommendations were developed. An implementation plan prioritized the recommendations and established a schedule. At this point in time, the Village has expended over $\$ 1,000,000$ in stormwater management projects.
The Village enforces a policy of stormwater management on all new development and redevelopment. The requirements of the policy addressed both stormwater quantity and quality. In 2016, the Village updated this policy, as well as other Dane County storm water and erosion control requirements, into Chapter 22 of the Oregon Municipal Code of Ordinances.
The Village's standards, as documented in Chapter 22 of their ordinance, includes:

- Except for redevelopment projects, all stormwater management facilities shall be designed, installed, and maintained to effectively accomplish the following under post-development conditions:
o Maintain pre-development peak runoff rates for the 2-year, 24-hour storm event (2.85 inches over 24 -hour duration).
o Reduce the peak runoff rates for the 10-year, 24 -hour storm event (4.10 inches over 24-hour duration) to pre-development peak runoff rates for the 2 - year, 24 -hour storm event ( 2.85 inches over 24 -hour duration).
o Reduce the peak runoff rates for the 100-year, 24-hour storm event (6.63 inches over 24-hour duration) to pre-development peak runoff rates for the 10-year, 24 -hour storm event ( 4.10 inches over 24 -hour duration).
Map 3a depicts the stormwater management areas provided within the proposed development.


### 5.10. Stormwater Management Plan

A combination of dry infiltration beds, detention ponds, and a greenway make up the stormwater management areas planned within Phases 3, 4, and 5, depicted as such on Map 3a.
Generally, Phases 3, 4, and 5 drain to the northeast where the largest stormwater detention area is planned. The infiltration areas, detention ponds, and greenway function to hold and slow stormwater on-site during large precipitation events. Overall, the goal of the proposed development is to maximize stormwater volume retention on-site to lessen downstream runoff. This will be accomplished by reducing peak runoff rates for 2 -
year, 10-year, and 100-year event in accordance with the Village's stormwater standards as noted in Section 5.9 above.

During an event in which stormwater leaves the proposed amendment area, it is planned to travel to the northeast. Today, the drainage pattern within the Foxboro Golf Course is ill-defined. The improved drainage pattern in Phase 5 will assist in limiting off-site stormwater events from occurring. Eventually, the golf course drains through the US-14 right-of-way, under US-14 through existing culverts, into properties owned by L\&S Investments east of US-14, and finally lands within the Oregon Branch of the Badfish Creek. The developer, Glenn Hofer, has discussed the conceptual development plans with the downstream property owners potentially affected by the drainage pattern prior to ending up in Badfish Creek. He is currently in the process of discussions with both.

To note, stormwater management in Autumn Ridge Phase 1 and 2 (west side of Foxfield Road) drains into the existing stormwater detention areas in both phases. Runoff is controlled by wet and dry ponds to meet and exceed the Village's requirements as noted in Section 5.9. See Appendix L for previous Stormwater Reports completed for Phase 1 and 2. Phase 1 stormwater is collected at a wet pond on the NW corner of Phase 1. This discharges to an outlet structure, pipe, and system to the north. It is in no way connected to the system for Phase 2. Phase 2 can overflow to the SE during extreme events. If/when this occurs, there are culverts under CTH MM and then under Harding where it will pass by the planned Phase 3 stormwater basins.

The Village ultimately assumes ownership and maintenance of stormwater detention ponds and collection systems. Prior to taking over the facilities, the developer must demonstrate that the systems are clean, built as designed, operating satisfactorily, and have full capacity for sediment retention. This typically does not occur until $80+\%$ of homes are built in the development. Overall, prior to any activity occurring, Dane County will have to review and approve any stormwater plans for Phases 3, 4, and 5.

### 5.11. Engineering Reports

As indicated above, the Village completed a Sewer Capacity Study in 2021. However, due to proposed changes associated with Phases 3,4 , and 5 now planned to connect to the existing sanitary sewer system to the north (instead of west), the study was updated in 2023. All updated study results have been included within this application and the full study can be found in Appendix I.
Additionally, in response to the proposed development, the Village completed an Intersection Control Evaluation on Wolfe Street (CTH MM) and Foxfield Road in 2023. The results of the study found that the proposed Phases 3, 4, and 5 will not negatively impact traffic operations on the CTH MM corridor. The intersection is anticipated to operate acceptably through 2033. Recommended intersection improvements included turning lanes along CTH MM and stop signs and turning lanes along Foxfield Road at the future 4way intersection. All study results have been included within this application and the full study can be found in Appendix J.

Map 1: Proposed Amendment Area


Map 1a: Proposed Amendment Area Concept Plans


Map 2: Existing Land Use


Map 3: Planned Land Use


Map 3a: Planned Land Use with Concept Plans


Map 3b: Planned Land Use - Village ETJ Extent


Map 4: Natural Features


Map 4a: Natural Features From Comprehensive Plan


Map 4b: Amendment Area Planned Utilities
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Attachment A: Plan Commission and Village Board USA Amendment Resolutions

## RESOLUTION \# 23-04

## RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND URBAN SERVICE AREA AMENDMENT PLAN COMMISSION OF THE VILLAGE OF OREGON

Resolution regarding the recommendation of the Plan Commission to the Village Board to initiate an Amendment to the Oregon Urban Service Area to include 47.2 acres of property owned by Hofer Living Trust located at 969 Johnson Avenue and 958 County Highway MM (Parcel Numbers: 051007385001 and 050913197210 ), to accommodate the proposed residential development.

WHEREAS, the Village of Oregon has been approached by the property owner to develop the existing agricultural and a portion of the Foxboro Golf Course property located on the southeast side of the Village, on full public water and sanitary sewer services to accommodate a residential development; and,

WHEREAS, the extension of the public water and sanitary sewer lines to serve the proposed residential development will require an amendment of the Oregon Urban Service Area to extend its boundary to include the 2 parcels; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed residential development is consistent with the Village of Oregon Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2013 and amended in 2023, which depicts the area in the Planned Neighborhood land use category, which allows for a mix of predominantly residential development; and,

WHEREAS, the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC), acting as the regional agent of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, requires the Village Board to pass a resolution requesting the amendment of the Oregon Urban Service Area; and,

WHEREAS, the Village of Oregon Plan Commission advises the Village Board on all development-related matters, as consistent with Wisconsin Statutes;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Village of Oregon Plan Commission hereby recommends the Village Board pass the required Resolution to formally-request the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) consider and approve the requested amendment to the Oregon Urban Service Area to include within its boundary the 2 parcels totaling 47.2 acres, located at 969 Johnson Avenue and 958 County Highway MM.

SO RESOLVED by action of the Oregom Plan Commission on June 1, 2023.


Greg Schnelle, Plan Commission Chair

# VILLAGE OF OREGON <br> DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN 

RESOLUTION NO. 23-23

## INITIATING AN AMENDMENT TO THE OREGON URBAN SERVICE AREA TO INCLUDE <br> 47.2 ACRES OF PROPERTY OWNED BY HOFER LIVING TRUST LOCATED AT 969 JOHNSON AVENUE AND 958 COUNTY HIGHWAY MM (PARCEL NUMBERS: 051007385001 AND 050913197210), TO ACCOMMODATE PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

WHEREAS, the Village of Oregon has been approached by the property owners to develop the existing agricultural and a portion of the Foxboro Golf Course property located on the southeast side of the Village, on full public water and sanitary sewer services to accommodate a residential development; and,

WHEREAS the extension of the public water and sanitary sewer lines to serve the proposed residential development will require an amendment of the Oregon Urban Service Area to extend its boundary to include the 2 parcels; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed residential development is consistent with the Village of Oregon Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2013 and amended in 2023, which depicts the area in the Planned Neighborhood land use category, which allows for a mix of predominantly residential development; and,

WHEREAS, the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC), acting as the regional agent of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, requires the Village Board to pass a resolution requesting the amendment of the Oregon Urban Service Area; and,

WHEREAS, the Village of Oregon Plan Commission advises the Village Board on all development-related matters, as consistent with Wisconsin Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Oregon Plan Commission adopted Resolution Number 23-04 on June 1, 2023, recommending the Village Board pass the required resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Village of Oregon Village Board hereby adopts Resolution Number 23-23 to formally-request the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) consider and approve the requested amendment to the Oregon Urban Service Area to include within its boundary the 2 parcels totaling 47.2 acres, located at 969 Johnson Avenue and 958 County Highway MM.

Adopted by the Oregon Village Board on this 5 $5^{\text {th }}$ day of June 2023.


Countersignature:


Attachment B: Future Park Facilities Map from Park and Open Space Plan


Attachment C: Town of Oregon and Town of Rutland Future Land Use and Farmland Preservation Maps

## Dane County Comprehensive Plan Town of Orgeon Planned Land Use



## Farmland Preservation Plan Map for Town of Oregon, Dane County WI

Map created August 2nd 2010 by
Dane County Planning and Development 608-267-4115

Farmland Preservation Zoning Districts: A-1Exclusive Agriculture and A-3

| Farmland Preservation Categories | $\square$ | Section Boundary |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION | $\square$ | Parcel Boundary |
| $\square$ | AGRICULTURAL TRANSITION | Water |
| $\square$ | EXISTING NON AGRICULTURAL | $\square$ |



Attachment D: Foxboro Golf Course Reconfiguration Plan


## Attachment E: Proposed Neighborhood Plan



Attachment F: 2022 Village of Oregon Housing Affordability Report Map


Attachment G: Wisconsin DNR Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation for Endangered Resources Review Preliminary Assessment

## Endangered Resources Preliminary Assessment

Created on $\mathbf{4 / 2 8 / 2 0 2 3}$. This report is good for one year after the created date.
DNR staff will be reviewing the ER Preliminary Assessments to verify the results provided by the Public Portal. ER Preliminary Assessments are only valid if the project habitat and waterway-related questions are answered accurately based on current site conditions. If an assessment is deemed invalid, a full ER review may be required even if the assessment indicated otherwise.

## Results

A search was conducted of the NHI Portal within a 1-mile buffer (for terrestrial and wetland species) and a 2-mile buffer (for aquatic species) of the project area. Based on these search results, below are your next steps.

## Actions required to comply with state and/or federal endangered species laws:

The project overlaps the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee High Potential Zone. The USFWS has created a Rusty Patched Bumble Bee High Potential Zone to show where there is a high likelihood for the species to be present. If a project overlaps with this zone then steps should be taken to determine if suitable habitat is present for the bee. Shapefiles and an interactive map of the zone can be found on the USFWS rusty patched bumble bee guidance page: (https://www.fws.gov/species/rusty-patched-bumble-bee-bombus-affinis)

- Suitable active season habitat includes, but is not limited to: prairies, woodlands, marshes/wetlands, agricultural landscapes and residential parks and gardens. The RPBB relies on diverse and abundant flowering plant species in proximity to suitable overwintering sites for hibernating queens.
- Suitable overwintering habitat includes, but is not limited, to: non-compacted soils, sandy soils, or woodlands. Overwintering habitat does not include wetlands.
- Non-suitable habitat includes, but is not limited to: permanently flooded areas/open water, paved areas, areas planted to annual row crops, forest where invasive shrubs are dominant and spring ephemeral flowers are absent, and areas mowed too frequently to allow development of diverse wildflower resources (e.g., road shoulders, medians, lawns).

If your project is $100 \%$ within non-suitable habitat then no further actions are necessary. However, if suitable habitat is present within the project site, assume presence and follow one or more the USFWS' recommended conservation measures below:

For prescribed fire, mowing/haying, grazing, pesticide use and tree clearing/thinning, follow the voluntary conservation measures outlined in the Conservation Management Guidelines for the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (Bombus affinis)] document:
((https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ConservationGuidanceRPBBv1_27Feb2018_0.pdf))
For all other projects:

- use native trees, shrubs and flowering plants in landscaping,
- provide plants that bloom from spring through fall ((refer to the Wisconsin Native Plant Species List: (https://p.widencdn.net/tanvm9/NH0936)),
- remove and control invasive plants in any habitat used for foraging, nesting, or overwintering

If none of the above conservation measures can be followed or for more information on implementing the above conservation measures, contact the USFWS Bloomington Field Office at (952) 252-0092 or TwinCities@fws.gov for further consultation.

For more information, refer to the Screening Guidance for the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (RPBB):
(https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/endangeredresources/documents/NHIbeescreening.pdf).

A copy of this document can be kept on file and submitted with any other necessary DNR permit applications to show that the need for an ER Review has been met. This notice only addresses endangered resources issues. This notice does not constitute DNR authorization of the proposed project and does not exempt the project from securing necessary permits and approvals from the DNR and/or other permitting authorities.

## 吕 Project Information

| Landowner name | HOFER LIVING TR, GLENN \& MICHELLE |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project address | 958 COUNTY HIGHWAY MM, Oregon, WI <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> 1020 COUNTY HIGHWAY MM, Oregon, WI <br> 969 JOHNSON AVE, Oregon, WI |
| Project description | Proposed residential neighborhood development with homes, park, and stormwater |

## 를 Project Questions

| Does the project involve a public property? |  | No |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Is there any federal involvement with the project? |  |  |
| Is the project a utility, agricultural, forestry or bulk sampling (associated with mining) project? |  |  |
| Is the project property in Managed Forest Law or Managed Forest Tax Law? |  | No |
| Project involves tree or shrub removal? | Nos |  |
| Is project near (within 300 ft) a waterbody or a shoreline? |  | Ye |
| Is project within a waterbody or along the shoreline? | No |  |




 the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/.
https://dnrx.wisconsin.gov/nhiportal/public
101 S. Webster Street . PO Box 7921 . Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7921

Attachment H: Preliminary Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Report (Phase 3)

# SECOND ADDITION TO AUTUMN RIDGE VILLAGE OF OREGON DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN 

## STORM WATER MANAGEMENT AND EROSION CONTROL REPORT



OWNER
Glenn \& Michelle Hofer Living Trust
E13431 Grace Street
Merrimac, WI 53561

May 16, 2023

PREPARED BY
D'Onofrio, Kottke \& Associates, Inc.
7530 Westward Way
Madison, Wisconsin 53717

FN: 22-05-143
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## INTRODUCTION

The intent of this report is to provide details on how the proposed "Second Addition to Autumn Ridge" residential plat will be developed so that it is constructed in accordance with applicable storm water management standards.

The proposed development is approximately a 17.7-acre plat located in the Village of Oregon. The site is located just to the East of County Hwy MM (Wolfe St.), and South of the Foxboro Golf Club in the SE $1 / 4$ of the NE $1 / 4$, Section 13, Township 05N, Range 09E. More specifically parcel number 0509-131-9721-0 Village of Oregon, Dane County, Wisconsin. A project location map can be found in Exhibit \#1.

The existing layout of the site consists of predominantly agricultural tilled land with surface water generally draining from south/north and west to the east side of the site. In developed conditions the site will create approximately 32 single family lots, 4 duplex lots and 3 Outlots. The plat has two watersheds that will be routed to a wet detention/infiltration basin system for treatment. The soil conditions on site consist of hydrologic soil group type B soils. A site soils map can be found in Exhibit \#2.

The proposed improvements for this plat requires land disturbing activity in excess of one acre and the future cumulative addition of 20,000 square feet of impervious surface area. Therefore, according to the Village of Oregon and State of Wisconsin ordinances, the site requires storm water management approvals and permits.

## STANDARDS \& RESULTS

The proposed development requires the following storm water management performance standards.

## Sediment Control

Standard: Reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, total suspended solids load leaving the site by eighty percent ( $80 \%$ ) based on the average annual rainfall.

Design Results: Sediment from the site will be reduced by $80 \%$ by routing the site runoff to a wet detention basin in the Southeast corner of the plat. WinSLAMM was used for modeling the sediment load reduction. See appendix B for sediment reduction calculations. Water leaving the site to the southeast will be clean runoff mostly from yards and roofs.

## Temperature Control

Standard: For development of sites within thermally sensitive areas, provisions and practices to reduce the temperature of the storm water runoff shall be included.

Design Results: The proposed site does not fall within a defined thermally sensitive area.

## Runoff Rate Control

Standard: For new developments, storm water management practices shall be designed and implemented to maintain post-development peak runoff discharge rates at predevelopment rates for the 1 -year and 2 -year, 24 -hour design storm event. Reduce the peak runoff rates for the 10 -year, 24 hour storm event to the 2 -year, 24 -hour predevelopment peak flow rate. Reduce the 100 -year, 24 hour storm event to the 10 -year, 24 -hour predevelopment peak flow rate. Maintain postdevelopment peak runoff discharge rates at predevelopment rates for the 200-year, 24-hour design storm event.

Design Results: The basin system will maintain the required peak runoff rates for the 1, 2, 10, 100, and 200 -year, 24 -hour storm events. The peak flow comparison chart for site can be found in the stormwater management measures section of this report and the HydroCAD output can be found within Appendix D. The disturbed areas will be deep tilled prior to restoration to maintain existing soils classes.

## Infiltration

Standard: For new developments, design practices to infiltrate sufficient runoff volume so the post-development infiltration volume shall be at least $90 \%$ of the predevelopment infiltration volume.

Design Results: The proposed development was designed to meet the $90 \%$ stayon requirement through an infiltration basin. The infiltration basin was sized using WinSLAMM modeling software. A minimum of $60 \%$ sediment reduction will occur in the proposed wet detention basin cell prior to entering the designed infiltration basin. The infiltration design calculations can be found in Appendix C.

## STORM WATER MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Stormwater from the site will be treated by routing runoff to a wet detention/infiltration basin systems located at the south and east side of the plat. Peak flow, sediment reduction, and stayon requirements will be met for the entire plat.

HydroCAD Stormwater Modeling software has been used to analyze the stormwater runoff characteristics for the development. HydroCAD uses the TR-55 methodology for determining peak discharge rates. The model output shows the runoff leaving the site in existing and proposed conditions. The site was designed to utilize a combination wet detention basin and infiltration basin system prior to leaving the site in proposed conditions. In this system, the wet detention basin will limit flow into the infiltration basin for the 1 -year, 24 -hour storm event to remove sediment before entering the infiltration basin. During larger storms, the two basins will fill and act as one basin to limit peak flow from the site (see basin details in Appendix A). The detention and infiltration basins were modeled dynamically to better represent the elevations of the two basins working together. Draintile is installed in the infiltration basins to assist with the establishment of vegetation during the first 2-3 years. The 4" orifice in the wet pond release structure will be plugged and a separate 4 " diameter pipe will act as the low flow outlet that will allow runoff to bypass the infiltration basin temporarily. Once the vegetation is well established in the infiltration basin, the upstream and downstream ends of the $4 "$ pipe will be plugged and the $4 "$ orifice opened up to function as designed. Storm events greater than the 2 -year will overflow into the release structure and then into the infiltration basin.

The peak flow results from the stormwater modeling and basin design are shown in the chart on the next page. The chart shows the proposed results from the drainage area along with a comparison of the runoff volume leaving the site through the 200 -year storm event. The detention basin system will maintain the peak runoff rates leaving the plat per the Village's requirements.

WinSLAMM was used to perform sediment reduction calculations for the proposed site. Appendix B contains the calculation results. The stormwater management system will provide $80 \%$ sediment removal. The peak flow results from stormwater modeling and detention basin design are shown in the chart on the next page. This chart shows a comparison of the drainage area in existing conditions and in post construction conditions. Infiltration modeling for the site was calculated using WinSLAMM software and meets the $90 \%$ predevelopment standard per the ordinance. The infiltration calculations can be found in Appendix C.

## PEAK FLOW COMPARISION CHART <br> Second Addition to Autumn Ridge

| TOTAL | 1-year | 2-year | 10-year | 100-year | 200-year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRE-DEVELOPMENT | 5.51 | 8.89 | 23.70 | 61.34 | 74.69 |
| POST-DEVELOPMENT (NO CONTROLS) | $24.83$ | $32.27$ | $60.15$ | $120.74$ | $140.71$ |
| POST-DEVELOPMENT (WITH CONTROLS) | 2.25 | 3.38 | 8.20 | 23.07 | 40.98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONTROLS |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOUTH BASIN SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |
| WET DETENTION BASIN: BOTTOM=957.0, OUTLET = 962.0, TOP OF BERM = 966.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISCHARGE RATE | 0.48 | 1.75 | 10.98 | 43.42 | 54.92 |
| PEAK BASIN ELEVATION | 963.47 | 963.62 | 964.08 | 965.01 | 965.14 |
| INFILTRATION BASIN: BOTTOM = 960.0, OUTLET = 961.0, TOP OF BERM = 965.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISCHARGE RATE (TO DITCH) | 0.44 | 0.69 | 1.47 | 9.65 | 20.20 |
| PEAK BASIN ELEVATION | 961.35 | 961.57 | 963.00 | 964.17 | 964.42 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NORTHEAST BASIN SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |
| WET DETENTION BASIN: BOTTOM=955.0, OUTLET = 960.0, TOP OF BERM = 964.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISCHARGE RATE | 0.40 | 0.46 | 1.51 | 12.73 | 22.23 |
| PEAK BASIN ELEVATION | 961.16 | 961.51 | 962.60 | 963.49 | 963.75 |
| INFILTRATION BASIN: BOTTOM = 959.0, OUTLET = 960.0, TOP OF BERM = 962.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISCHARGE RATE (TO DITCH) | 0.36 | 0.43 | 0.80 | 10.68 | 18.49 |
| PEAK BASIN ELEVATION | 960.35 | 960.40 | 960.84 | 961.72 | 961.90 |

## CONCLUSIONS

As the results indicate, the storm water management system for the proposed development meets the Village of Oregon and State of Wisconsin Ordinances. The peak flow, sediment control and infiltration requirements have been addressed and met for this site.

EXHIBITS
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YOUR NATURAL RESOURGE FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT

## AERIAL PHOTO

AUTUMN RIDGE - PHASE 3

VILLAGE OF OREGON, WISCONSIN


APPENDIX A

## DETENTION POND \& INFILTRATION BASIN DETAIL




## APPENDIX B

## SEDIMENT REDUCTION CALCULATIONS

# DETENTION BASIN SEDIMENTATION REDUCTION CALCULATIONS (SLAMM) 

WinSlamm Design
The following Slamm design shows that $80 \%$ of sediment is being removed from the proposed site

## Model Schematic:



## Model Input Information:

```
Data file name: U:\User\2205143\Engineering\SWMP\WinSLAMM\2205143.mdb
WinSLAMM Version 10.4.0
Rain file name:C:\WinSLAMM Files\Rain Files\WisReg - Madison WI 1981.RAN
Particulate Solids Concentration file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\v10.1 WI_AVG01.pscx
Runoff Coefficient file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\WI_SLO6 Dec06.rsvx
Residential Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\WI_Res and Other Urban Dec06.std
Institutional Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
Commercial Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
Industrial Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
Other Urban Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\WI_Res and Other Urban Dec06.std
Freeway Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\Freeway Dec06.std
Apply Street Delivery Files to Adjust the After Event Load Street Dirt Mass Balance: False
Pollutant Relative Concentration file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files\WI_GEOO3.ppdx
Source Area PSD and Peak to Average Flow Ratio File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP Source Area PSD Files.csv
Cost Data file name:
Seed for random number generator: -42
Study period starting date: 01/01/81 Study period ending date: 12/31/81
Start of Winter Season: 12/02 End of Winter Season: 03/12
Date: 05-15-2023
    Time: 20:40:44
```

Site information:


LU\# 2 - Residential: NE Basin Total area (ac): 6.540
2 -Roofs 2: 0.872 ac. Pitched Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP.cpz 3 -Roofs 3: 0.104 ac. Pitched Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP.cpz 26 - Driveways 2: 0.872 ac. Disconnected Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash N U R P . c p z$ 27 - Driveways 3: 0.104 ac . Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz 46 - Large Landscaped Areas 2: 2.616 ac . Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP.cpz 47 - Large Landscaped Areas 3: 0.485 ac . Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C: $\mathrm{WWinSLAMM} \mathrm{Files} \backslash$ NURP.cpz 48 - Large Landscaped Areas 4: 1.182 ac. Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash N U R P . c p z$ 70 - Water Body Areas: 0.305 ac. Source Area PSD File:

LU\# 3 - Residential: Untreated Total area (ac): 4.605
2 -Roofs 2: 0.073 ac. Pitched Connected Source Area PSD File: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP.cpz
3 -Roofs 3: 0.133 ac. Pitched Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP.cpz
26 - Driveways 2: 0.073 ac . Disconnected Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash N U R P . c p z$
27 - Driveways 3: 0.133 ac. Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
 47 - Large Landscaped Areas 3: 0.623 ac . Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP.cpz 48 - Large Landscaped Areas 4: 2.402 ac . Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C: $\backslash$ WinSLAMM Files $\backslash N U R P . c p z$ 57 - Undeveloped Areas 1: 0.949 ac. Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash N U R P . c p z$

Control Practice 1: Wet Detention Pond CP\# 1 (DS) - DS Wet Pond \# 1
Particle Size Distribution file name: Not needed - calculated by program Initial stage elevation ( ft ): 5
Peak to Average Flow Ratio: 3.8
Maximum flow allowed into pond (cfs): No maximum value entered
Outlet Characteristics:
Outlet type: Orifice 1

1. Orifice diameter (ft): 0.33
2. Number of orifices: 1
3. Invert elevation above datum (ft): 5

Outlet type: Broad Crested Weir

1. Weir crest length (ft): 30
2. Weir crest width ( ft ): 10
3. Height from datum to bottom of weir opening: 7.5

Outlet type: Vertical Stand Pipe

1. Stand pipe diameter ( ft ): 3
2. Stand pipe height above datum ( ft ): 6.5

| Pond stage and surface area |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | Stage | Pond Area | Natural Seepage | Other Outflow |
| Number (ft) |  | (acres) | (in/hr) | (cfs) |
| 0 | 0.00 | 0.0000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | 0.01 | 0.0497 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 4.00 | 0.1576 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | 5.00 | 0.3064 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 7.00 | 0.4358 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 | 9.00 | 0.5744 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Control Practice 2: Biofilter CP\# 1 (DS) - DS Biofilters \# |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Top area (square feet) $=21859$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Bottom aea (square feet) $=9060$ |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Depth (ft): 5.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Biofilter width (ft) - for Cost Purposes Only: 10 |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Infiltration rate (in/hr) $=0.5$ |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Random infiltration rate generation? No |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Infiltration rate fraction (side): 0.001 |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Infiltration rate fraction (bottom): 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Depth of biofilter that is rock filled (ft) 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Porosity of rock filled volume $=0$ |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Engineered soil infiltration rate: 3.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Engineered soil depth $(\mathrm{ft})=0.5$ |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Engineered soil porosity $=0.24$ |  |  |  |  |
| 14. Percent solids reduction due to flow through engineered soil $=0$ |  |  |  |  |
| 15. Biofilter peak to average flow ratio $=3.8$ |  |  |  |  |
| 16. Number of biofiltration control devices $=1$ |  |  |  |  |
| 17. Particle size distribution file: Not needed - calculated by program |  |  |  |  |
| 18. Initial water surface elevation (ft): 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Data Soil Type Fraction in Eng. Soil |  |  |  |  |
| User-Defined Soil Type 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
| Biofilter Outlet/Discharge Characteristics: |  |  |  |  |
| Outlet type: Broad Crested Weir |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Weir crest length ( ft ): 10 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Weir crest width ( ft ): 10 |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Height of datum to bottom of weir opening: 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Outlet type: Vertical Stand Pipe |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Stand pipe diameter ( ft ): 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Stand pipe height above datum (ft): 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Outlet type: Surface Discharge Pipe |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Surface discharge pipe outlet diameter (ft): 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Pipe invert elevation above datum ( ft ): 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Number of surface pipe outlets: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Practice 3: Wet Detention Pond CP\# 2 (DS) - DS Wet Pond \# 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Particle Size Distribution file name: Not needed - calculated by program |  |  |  |  |
| Initial stage elevation (ft): 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Peak to Average Flow Ratio: 3.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum flow allowed into pond (cfs): No maximum value entered |  |  |  |  |
| Outlet Characteristics: |  |  |  |  |
| Outlet type: Orifice 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Orifice diameter (ft): 0.33 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Number of orifices: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Invert elevation above datum (ft): 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Outlet type: Broad Crested Weir |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Weir crest length (ft): 30 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Weir crest width (ft): 10 |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Height from datum to bottom of weir opening: 7.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Outlet type: Vertical Stand Pipe1. Stand pipe diameter (ft): |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

2. Stand pipe height above datum (ft): 6.5
Pond stage and surface area

| Entry | Stage <br> Number | (ft) | Pond Area <br> (acres) | Natural Seepage <br> (in/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.00 | 0.0000 | 0.00 | Other Outflow |
| (cfs) |  |  |  |  |

Control Practice 4: Biofilter CP\# 2 (DS) - DS Biofilters \# 2

1. Top area (square feet) $=8874$
2. Bottom aea (square feet) $=2923$
3. Depth (ft): 3.5
4. Biofilter width ( ft ) - for Cost Purposes Only: 10
5. Infiltration rate (in/hr) $=0.5$
6. Random infiltration rate generation? No
7. Infiltration rate fraction (side): 0.001
8. Infiltration rate fraction (bottom): 1
9. Depth of biofilter that is rock filled (ft) 0
10. Porosity of rock filled volume $=0$
11. Engineered soil infiltration rate: 3.6
12. Engineered soil depth $(\mathrm{ft})=0.5$
13. Engineered soil porosity $=0.24$
14. Percent solids reduction due to flow through engineered soil $=0$
15. Biofilter peak to average flow ratio $=3.8$
16. Number of biofiltration control devices $=1$
17. Particle size distribution file: Not needed - calculated by program
18. Initial water surface elevation (ft): 0
Soil Data Soil Type Fraction in Eng. Soil
Biofilter Outlet/Discharge Characteristics:
Outlet type: Broad Crested Weir
19. Weir crest length (ft): 20
20. Weir crest width ( ft ): 10
21. Height of datum to bottom of weir opening: 3
Outlet type: Vertical Stand Pipe
22. Stand pipe diameter ( ft ): 3
23. Stand pipe height above datum (ft): 2.5
Outlet type: Surface Discharge Pipe
24. Surface discharge pipe outlet diameter ( ft ): 0.5
25. Pipe invert elevation above datum ( ft ): 1.5
26. Number of surface pipe outlets: 1

## Output Sediment Reduction:



Total site sediment reduction in developed conditions $=\underline{80.87 \%}$

| Runoff Volume |  | Part. Solids Yield (lbs) |  | Part. Solids Conc. (mg/L) |  |  |  | Summary Table |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data File: U:\User\2205143\Engineering\SW/MP\W/inSLAMMM\2205143.mdb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\wedge$ |
| Rain File: WisReg - Madison Wl 1981.RAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date: 05-15-23 Time: $2: 38: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Col. \#: | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |
| Control Practice No. | Control Practice Type | Control Practice Name or Location | Total Inflow Volume (cf) | Total Outflow Volume (cf) | Percent Volume Reduction | Total Influent Load (lbs) | Total Effluent Load (lbs) | Percent Load Reduction | Flow Weighted Influent Conc (mg/L) | $\begin{array}{r} F \\ W e \\ E f \\ \text { Conc } \end{array}$ |
| 1 | Wet Detention Pond | DS Wer Pond \# 1 | 306585 | 307424 | -0.274 | 1561 | 249.5 | 84.02 | 81.57 |  |
| 2 | Biofilter | DS Biofilters \# 1 | 307424 | 21549 | 92.99 | 249.5 | 33.36 | 86.63 | 13.00 |  |
| 3 | Wet Detention Pond | DS Wet Pond \# 2 | 165704 | 166155 | -0.272 | 725.6 | 118.1 | 83.72 | 70.14 |  |
| 4 | Biofilter | DS Biofilters \# 2 | 166155 | 38460 | 76.85 | 118.1 | 46.93 | 60.26 | 11.38 |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\nabla$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |

The chart above shows that over $60 \%$ sediment reduction will occur prior to the infiltration basins.

## APPENDIX C

## INFILTRATION DESIGN

## Infiltration Design - RESIDENTAIL

Pre-Development Runoff (SLAMM) = 102034 CF

```
E] Pre-Development Areas a... - }
```

|  | Description | Area [ac] | CN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Imp | 0.190 | 98 |
| 2 | Per | 20.810 | 68 |
| 3 |  | 0.000 | 0 |
| 4 |  | 0.000 | 0 |
| 5 |  | 0.000 | 0 |
| 6 |  | 0.000 | 0 |
|  | Total Area [ac] | 21.000 |  |
|  | Composite CN |  | 68 |
|  | Total Model Area [ac]: | 21.000 |  |

Summary of Stay-On Requirements

| Lot Area | Rain <br> Total <br> ac | Rain <br> in | Outfall <br> Total <br> cf | Total <br> Total <br> cf | Pre-Dev <br> Losses <br> cf | Pre- <br> Runoff <br> cf | cf <br> Developed <br> cf | 90\% <br> STAYON <br> in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | 28.81 | 2196186 | 116627 | 2079559 | 64738 | 2131448 | 25.16 |  |


| POST-DEVELOPED LOSSES | 2079559 |
| ---: | :---: |
| PRE-DEVELOPED LOSSES | $\div$ |

## SLAMM Stay-On Calculations

| Runoff Volume [ cf ] |  | Part. Solids Yield (lbs) |  | Part. Solids Conc. (mg/L) |  | Pollutant Yield (lbs) |  | Pollutan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data File: U:\User \2205143\Engineering\SW/MP\WinSLAMMM\2205143.mdb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rain File: WisRieg-Madison W/ 1981.RAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date: 05-15-23 Time: 8:57:08 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Runoff Volume Total (cf) at the Outfall |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rain Number | Start Date | Rain Total (in) | Outfall Total (cf) | Rv | Total Losses [in.] | Calculated CN* | Event Peak Flow (cts) | Pre-Dev Runoff Vol. |
| 100 | 11/18/81 | 0.05 | 22.22 | 0.006 | 0.05 | 97.9 | 0.010 | 0 |
| 101 | 11/19/81 | 0.26 | 270.9 | 0.014 | 0.26 | 91.0 | 0.009 | 0 |
| 102 | 11/23/81 | 0.18 | 158.9 | 0.012 | 0.18 | 93.4 | 0.017 | 0 |
| 103 | 11/25/81 | 0.89 | 1558 | 0.023 | 0.87 | 76.1 | 0.065 | 0 |
| 104 | 11/30/81 | 0.37 | 473.1 | 0.017 | 0.36 | 87.9 | 0.018 | 0 |
| 105 | 12/03/81 | . |  |  | . |  |  |  |
| 106 | 12/14/81 | - |  |  | - | - | - |  |
| 107 | 12/20/81 | - |  |  | - | - | - |  |
| 108 | 12/26/81 | - |  |  | - | - | - |  |
| 109 | 12/31/81 | - | - |  | - | - | - |  |
| Minimum: |  | 0.00 | 0 | 0.001 | 0.01 | 68.3 | 0.001 | 0.0 |
| Maximum: |  | 2.59 | 40508 | 0.205 | 2.06 | 99.5 | 1.318 | 32612.0 |
| Average: |  | 0.26 | 1070 | 0.013 | 0.25 | 73.8 | 0.635 | 719.3 |
| Total: |  | 28.81 | 116627 |  | 27.32 |  |  | 64738.00 |
| * Note: NRCS does not recommend using CN method for rains < 0.5 in. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| See 'PreDevelopment Areas and CN' Help for more info. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX D

## HYDROCAD OUTPUT



## Existing



## 2205143

Prepared by HP Inc.
Printed 5/15/2023
HydroCAD® 10.10-7a s/n 02063 © 2021 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

## Area Listing (selected nodes)

| Area <br> (acres) | CN | Description <br> (subcatchment-numbers) |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0.190 | 98 | Imp (3S) |
| 20.810 | 68 | Type B Soils (3S) |
| $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 8}$ | TOTAL AREA |

## 2205143

Prepared by HP Inc.
HydroCAD® 10.10-7a s/n 02063 © 2021 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

## Soil Listing (selected nodes)

| Area <br> (acres) | Soil <br> Group | Subcatchment <br> Numbers |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0.000 | HSG A |  |
| 0.000 | HSG B |  |
| 0.000 | HSG C |  |
| 0.000 | HSG D |  |
| 21.000 | Other | 3S |
| $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ |  | TOTAL AREA |

## 2205143

Prepared by HP Inc.
Printed 5/15/2023
HydroCAD® 10.10-7a s/n 02063 © 2021 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

## Ground Covers (selected nodes)

| HSG-A <br> (acres) | HSG-B <br> (acres) | HSG-C <br> $($ acres $)$ | HSG-D <br> (acres) | Other <br> $($ acres $)$ | Total <br> $($ acres $)$ | Ground <br> Cover | Subcatchment <br> Numbers |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.190 | 0.190 | Imp | $3 S$ |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 20.810 | 20.810 | Type B Soils | 3S |
| $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ | TOTAL AREA |  |

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment 3S: Existing
Runoff Area=21.000 ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>0.37$ " Flow Length=950' Tc=22.0 min CN=68 Runoff=5.51 cfs 0.644 af

Total Runoff Area $=21.000$ ac Runoff Volume $=0.644$ af Average Runoff Depth $=0.37$ "
$99.10 \%$ Pervious $=20.810$ ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.190$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 3S: Existing

Runoff $=5.51$ cfs @ 12.40 hrs , Volume $=\quad 0.644$ af, Depth> $0.37{ }^{\prime \prime}$

Routed to nonexistent node 4L
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 1yr 24hr Rainfall=2.49"

22.0950 Total

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment 3S: Existing
Runoff Area=21.000 ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>0.53$ " Flow Length=950' Tc=22.0 min CN=68 Runoff=8.89 cfs 0.928 af

Total Runoff Area $=\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ ac Runoff Volume $=0.928$ af Average Runoff Depth $=\mathbf{0 . 5 3 "}$
$99.10 \%$ Pervious $=20.810$ ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.190$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 3S: Existing

Runoff $=\quad 8.89$ cfs @ 12.37 hrs, Volume= 0.928 af, Depth> 0.53"

Routed to nonexistent node 4L
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 2yr 24hr Rainfall=2.85"

$22.0 \quad 950$ Total

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment 3S: Existing
Runoff Area=21.000 ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>1.23$ " Flow Length=950' $\mathrm{Tc}=22.0 \mathrm{~min} \quad \mathrm{CN}=68$ Runoff= 23.70 cfs 2.153 af

Total Runoff Area $=\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ ac Runoff Volume $=2.153$ af Average Runoff Depth $=1.23$ "
$99.10 \%$ Pervious $=20.810$ ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.190$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 3S: Existing

Runoff $=\quad 23.70$ cfs @ 12.35 hrs, Volume= 2.153 af, Depth> 1.23"

Routed to nonexistent node 4L
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 10yr 24hr Rainfall=4.10"

22.0950 Total

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment 3S: Existing
Runoff Area=21.000 ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>3.04$ " Flow Length=950' Tc=22.0 min CN=68 Runoff=61.34 cfs 5.314 af

Total Runoff Area $=\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ ac Runoff Volume $=5.314$ af Average Runoff Depth $=3.04$ "
$99.10 \%$ Pervious $=20.810$ ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.190$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 3S: Existing

Runoff $=61.34$ cfs @ 12.33 hrs, Volume= 5.314 af, Depth> 3.04"

Routed to nonexistent node 4L
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 100yr 24hr Rainfall=6.63"

$22.0 \quad 950$ Total

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method
Subcatchment 3S: Existing
Runoff Area=21.000 ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>3.69$ " Flow Length=950' $\mathrm{Tc}=22.0 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{CN}=68$ Runoff=74.69 cfs 6.454 af

Total Runoff Area $=21.000$ ac Runoff Volume $=6.454$ af Average Runoff Depth $=3.69$ "
$99.10 \%$ Pervious $=20.810$ ac $0.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.190$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 3S: Existing

Runoff $=74.69$ cfs @ 12.33 hrs, Volume $=6.454$ af, Depth> 3.69"

Routed to nonexistent node 4L
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 200yr 24hr Rainfall=7.45"

$22.0 \quad 950$ Total



## 2205143

Prepared by HP Inc.
HydroCAD® 10.10-7a s/n 02063 © 2021 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

## Area Listing (selected nodes)

| Area <br> (acres) | CN | Description <br> (subcatchment-numbers) |
| ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 4.274 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots (4S, 7S, 8S) |
| 7.941 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots (4S, 7S, 8S) |
| 1.512 | 88 | 60\% Lots (4S) |
| 5.505 | 74 | Open Space (4S, 7S, 8S) |
| 0.819 | 100 | Pond (4S, 7S) |
| 0.949 | 68 | Undeveloped (8S) |
| $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | TOTAL AREA |

## 2205143

Prepared by HP Inc.
HydroCAD® 10.10-7a s/n 02063 © 2021 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

## Soil Listing (selected nodes)

| Area <br> (acres) | Soil <br> Group | Subcatchment <br> Numbers |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0.000 | HSG A |  |
| 0.000 | HSG B |  |
| 0.000 | HSG C |  |
| 0.000 | HSG D |  |
| 21.000 | Other | 4S, 7S, 8S |
| $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ |  | TOTAL AREA |

## 2205143

Prepared by HP Inc.
Printed 5/15/2023
HydroCAD® 10.10-7a s/n 02063 © 2021 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

## Ground Covers (selected nodes)

| HSG-A <br> (acres) | HSG-B <br> (acres) | HSG-C <br> (acres) | HSG-D <br> (acres) | Other <br> $($ acres $)$ | Total <br> (acres) | Ground <br> Cover | Subcatchment <br> Numbers |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 4.274 | 4.274 | $30 \%$ Lots | $4 \mathrm{~S}, 7 \mathrm{~S}, 8 \mathrm{~S}$ |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 7.941 | 7.941 | $40 \%$ Lots | $4 \mathrm{~S}, 7 \mathrm{~S}, 8 \mathrm{~S}$ |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.512 | 1.512 | $60 \%$ Lots | 4 S |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 5.505 | 5.505 | Open Space | $4 \mathrm{~S}, 7 \mathrm{~S}, 8 \mathrm{~S}$ |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.819 | 0.819 | Pond | $4 \mathrm{~S}, 7 \mathrm{~S}$ |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.949 | 0.949 | Undeveloped | 8 S |
| $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 0 0}$ | TOTAL AREA |  |

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

## Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

## Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Runoff Area=9.853 ac $5.22 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth>0.97" Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 $\mathrm{min} \quad \mathrm{CN}=82$ Runoff=12.91 cfs 0.794 af

Runoff Area=6.541 ac 4.66\% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.91" Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min $\mathrm{CN}=81$ Runoff=8.05 cfs 0.497 af

Runoff Area=4.606 ac 0.00\% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.63" Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=75 Runoff=3.69 cfs 0.240 af

Avg. Flow Depth=0.25' Max Vel=0.81 fps Inflow=3.69 cfs 0.403 af $\mathrm{n}=0.035 \mathrm{~L}=700.0$ ' $\mathrm{S}=0.0026$ '/' Capacity= 96.40 cfs Outflow=2.25 cfs 0.389 af

Peak Elev=963.47' Storage=22,706 cf Inflow=12.91 cfs 0.794 af Primary $=0.48$ cfs 0.376 af Secondary $=0.00$ cfs 0.000 af Outflow $=0.48$ cfs 0.376 af

Peak Elev=961.35' Storage=4,139 cf Inflow=0.48 cfs 0.376 af Discarded $=0.15 \mathrm{cfs} 0.119$ af Primary $=0.29$ cfs 0.162 af Secondary $=0.00 \mathrm{cfs} 0.000$ af Outflow=0.44 cfs 0.282 af

Pond 4P: E Wet
Peak Elev=961.16' Storage=13,075 cf Inflow=8.05 cfs 0.497 af Primary $=0.40$ cfs 0.290 af Secondary $=0.00$ cfs 0.000 af Outflow= 0.40 cfs 0.290 af

Pond 5P: E Inf
Peak Elev=960.35' Storage=1,821 cf Inflow=0.40 cfs 0.290 af Discarded $=0.06$ cfs 0.053 af Primary $=0.30$ cfs 0.200 af Secondary $=0.00 \mathrm{cfs} 0.000$ af Outflow=0.36 cfs 0.253 af

## Link 1L: OUT

Total Runoff Area $=21.000$ ac Runoff Volume $=1.531$ af Average Runoff Depth $=\mathbf{0 . 8 8}$ "
$\mathbf{9 6 . 1 0 \%}$ Pervious $=20.181$ ac $3.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.819$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Runoff = 12.91 cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af, Depth> 0.97"

Routed to Pond 2P : W Wet
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 1yr 24hr Rainfall=2.49"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 1.512 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 3.216 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 2.690 | 81 | 30\% Lots |
| $*$ | 1.921 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.514 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 9.853 | 82 | Weighted Average |
|  | 9.339 |  | $94.78 \%$ Pervious Area |
|  | 0.514 |  | $5.22 \%$ Impervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope <br> (ft/ft) | Velocity <br> (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet <br> Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> $24.0^{\prime \prime}$ Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3'r=0.50' $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

[^0]
## Summary for Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Runoff $=8.05 \mathrm{cfs} @ 12.19 \mathrm{hrs}$, Volume= $\quad 0.497$ af, Depth> 0.91"
Routed to Pond 4P:E Wet

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 1yr 24hr Rainfall=2.49"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 4.360 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.694 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 1.182 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.305 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 6.541 | 81 | Weighted Average |
|  | 6.236 |  | 95.34\% Pervious Area |
|  | 0.305 |  | $4.66 \%$ Impervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> 24.0" Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

[^1]
## Summary for Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Runoff $=3.69$ cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume $=\quad 0.240$ af, Depth> $0.63{ }^{\prime \prime}$

Routed to Reach 1R : Channel
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 1yr 24hr Rainfall=2.49"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.365 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.890 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 2.402 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.000 | 100 | Pond |
| $*$ | 0.949 | 68 | Undeveloped |
|  | 4.606 | 75 | Weighted Average |
|  | 4.606 |  | 100.00\% Pervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope (ft/ft) | Velocity <br> (ft/sec) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (cfs) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet <br> Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> 24.0" Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

[^2]
## Summary for Reach 1R: Channel

Inflow Area $=14.459 \mathrm{ac}, 3.55 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth $>0.33$ " for 1 yr 24 hr event
Inflow $=3.69$ cfs @ 12.19 hrs , Volume $=0.403 \mathrm{af}$
Outflow = $2.25 \mathrm{cfs} @ 12.32 \mathrm{hrs}$, Volume $=0.389 \mathrm{af}$, Atten= $39 \%$, Lag= 7.9 min
Routed to Link 1L : OUT
Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Max. Velocity $=0.81 \mathrm{fps}$, Min. Travel Time $=14.4 \mathrm{~min}$
Avg. Velocity $=0.43 \mathrm{fps}$, Avg. Travel Time $=27.2 \mathrm{~min}$
Peak Storage= 1,928 cf @ 12.32 hrs
Average Depth at Peak Storage= $0.25^{\prime}$, Surface Width= 12.00'
Bank-Full Depth= 2.00' Flow Area= 36.0 sf, Capacity= 96.40 cfs
$10.00^{\prime} \times 2.00^{\prime}$ deep channel, $n=0.035$ Earth, dense weeds
Side Slope Z-value= 4.0 '/' Top Width= 26.00'
Length=700.0' Slope= 0.0026 '/'
Inlet Invert= 957.85', Outlet Invert= 956.00'

## Summary for Pond 2P: W Wet



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 963.47' @ 15.16 hrs Surf.Area= 17,496 sf Storage= 22,706 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=294.1$ min calculated for 0.375 af ( $47 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=199.5 \mathrm{~min}(1,022.2-822.7$ )


Primary OutFlow Max=0.48 cfs @ 15.16 hrs HW=963.47' TW=961.24' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-1=Culvert (Passes 0.48 cfs of 8.92 cfs potential flow)
-2=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls $0.48 \mathrm{cfs} @ 5.50 \mathrm{fps}$ )
$\square_{3=O r i f i c e / G r a t e ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}$ )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=962.00' TW=961.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\left\llcorner_{4=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}\right.$ )

## Summary for Pond 3P: W Inf

| Inflow Area $=$Inflow | 9.853 ac, 5.22\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 0.46" for 1yr 24 hr event |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.48 cfs @ | 15.16 hrs, Volume= | 0.376 af |  |
| Outflow | 0.44 cfs @ | 21.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.282 af, At | Atten= 8\%, Lag= 350.2 min |
| Discarded = | 0.15 cfs @ | 21.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.119 af |  |
| Primary = Routed to | 0.29 cfs @ <br> 1R : Chan | 21.00 hrs , Volume= nel | 0.162 af |  |
| Secondary = Routed to | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs} @ \\ \text { h } 1 \mathrm{R}: \text { Chanr } \end{gathered}$ | 2.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 961.35' @ 21.00 hrs Surf.Area= 12,296 sf Storage= 4,139 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=123.4$ min calculated for 0.281 af ( $75 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=49.3 \mathrm{~min}(1,071.5-1,022.2$ )


Discarded OutFlow Max=0.15 cfs @ 21.00 hrs HW=961.35' (Free Discharge)
—1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.15 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=0.29 cfs @ 21.00 hrs HW=961.35' TW=957.94' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$-2=$ Culvert (Passes 0.29 cfs of 0.47 cfs potential flow)
-3=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.29 cfs @ 2.01 fps)
-4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=961.00' TW=957.85' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )

## Summary for Pond 4P: E Wet

| Inflow Area =Inflow = | 6.541 ac, 4.66\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 0.91" for 1yr 24 hr event |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.05 cfs @ | 12.19 hrs , Volume= | 0.497 af |  |
| Outflow | 0.40 cfs @ | 13.13 hrs , Volume= | 0.290 af, Atten $=95 \%$, Lag $=56.6 \mathrm{~min}$ |  |
| Primary | 0.40 cfs @ | 13.13 hrs , Volume= | 0.290 af |  |
| Routed to Pond 5P : E Inf |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary = Routed to | $0.00 \text { cfs @ }$ 5P : E Inf | 2.00 hrs, Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 961.16' @ 15.04 hrs Surf.Area= 12,249 sf Storage= 13,075 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=277.3$ min calculated for 0.290 af ( $58 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=186.2 \mathrm{~min}(1,011.7-825.5)$


Primary OutFlow Max=0.40 cfs @ 13.13 hrs HW=961.08' TW=960.19' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L1=Culvert (Passes 0.40 cfs of 4.72 cfs potential flow)
-2=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.40 cfs @ 4.54 fps )
$\square_{3=O r i f i c e / G r a t e ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}$ )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=960.00' TW=960.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\leftarrow_{4=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}$ )

## Summary for Pond 5P: E Inf



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Peak Elev= 960.35' @ 16.62 hrs Surf.Area= 5,523 sf Storage= 1,821 cf

Plug-Flow detention time $=78.1$ min calculated for 0.252 af ( $87 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=39.0 \mathrm{~min}(1,050.7-1,011.7$ )

| Volume | Invert | Avail.Storage | Storage Description |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\# 1$ | 960.00 | 13,680 cf | Custom Stage Data (Prismatic) Listed below (Recalc) |


| Elevation <br> (feet) | Surf.Area <br> (sq-ft) | Inc.Store <br> (cubic-feet) | Cum.Store <br> (cubic-feet) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 960.00 | 4,806 | 0 | 0 |
| 962.00 | 8,874 | 13,680 | 13,680 |


| Device | Routing | Invert | Outlet Devices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#1 | Discarded | $960.00{ }^{\prime}$ | $0.500 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ Exfiltration over Surface area |
|  |  |  | Conductivity to Groundwater Elevation $=-25.00$ |
| \#2 | Primary | $959.00^{\prime}$ | 12.0" Round Culvert |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{L}=50.0^{\prime} \mathrm{RCP}$, end-section conforming to fill, $\mathrm{Ke}=0.500$ |
|  |  |  | Inlet / Outlet Invert= 959.00' / 958.50' S=0.0100 '/' Cc= 0.900 |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{n}=0.013$, Flow Area $=0.79 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| \#3 | Device 2 | 960.00' | 6.0" Vert. Orifice/Grate $\quad \mathrm{C}=0.600$ Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#4 | Device 2 | 961.00' | 36.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate $\mathrm{C}=0.600$ |
|  |  |  | Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#5 | Secondary | 961.50' | 20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir |
|  |  |  | Head (feet) 0.200 .400 .600 .801 .001 .201 .401 .60 |
|  |  |  | Coef. (English) $2.492 .562 .702 .692 .682 .692 .67 \quad 2.64$ |

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.06 cfs @ 16.62 hrs HW=960.35' (Free Discharge)
_1=Exfiltration ( Controls 0.06 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=0.30 cfs @ 16.62 hrs HW=960.35' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$廿_{2}=$ Culvert (Passes 0.30 cfs of 3.32 cfs potential flow)

- $3=$ Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.30 cfs @ 2.02 fps)

4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=960.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )

## Summary for Link 1L: OUT

Inflow Area $=21.000$ ac, $3.90 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth $>0.34$ " for 1 yr 24 hr event
Inflow $=\quad 2.25$ cfs @ 12.32 hrs, Volume $=0.589$ af
Primary $=2.25 \mathrm{cfs} @ 12.32 \mathrm{hrs}$, Volume= 0.589 af , Atten= $0 \%$, Lag $=0.0 \mathrm{~min}$ Routed to nonexistent node 3L

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

## Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Reach 1R: Channel

Pond 2P: W Wet

Pond 3P: W Inf
Peak Elev=961.57' Storage=6,858 cf Inflow=1.75 cfs 0.554 af Discarded $=0.16$ cfs 0.127 af Primary $=0.53$ cfs 0.321 af Secondary $=0.00$ cfs 0.000 af Outflow= 0.69 cfs 0.448 af

Runoff Area=9.853 ac $5.22 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>1.23$ " Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 $\mathrm{min} \quad \mathrm{CN}=82$ Runoff=16.55 cfs 1.013 af

Runoff Area=6.541 ac $4.66 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>1.17{ }^{\prime \prime}$ Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=81 Runoff=10.41 cfs 0.638 af

Runoff Area=4.606 ac $0.00 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>0.84$ " Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=75 Runoff=5.10 cfs 0.323 af

Avg. Flow Depth=0.32' Max Vel=0.94 fps Inflow=5.10 cfs 0.644 af $\mathrm{n}=0.035 \mathrm{~L}=700.0$ ' $\mathrm{S}=0.0026$ '/' Capacity $=96.40 \mathrm{cfs}$ Outflow=3.38 cfs 0.628 af

Peak Elev=963.62' Storage=25,280 cf Inflow=16.55 cfs 1.013 af Primary $=1.75$ cfs 0.554 af Secondary $=0.00$ cfs 0.000 af Outflow= 1.75 cfs 0.554 af

## Pond 4P: E Wet

Peak Elev=961.51' Storage=17,493 cf Inflow=10.41 cfs 0.638 af Primary $=0.46$ cfs 0.346 af Secondary $=0.00$ cfs 0.000 af Outflow= 0.46 cfs 0.346 af

Pond 5P: E Inf
Peak Elev=960.40' Storage=2,088 cf Inflow=0.46 cfs 0.346 af Discarded $=0.07$ cfs 0.054 af Primary $=0.36$ cfs 0.248 af Secondary= 0.00 cfs 0.000 af Outflow=0.43 cfs 0.302 af

## Link 1L: OUT

Total Runoff Area $=21.000$ ac Runoff Volume $=1.974$ af Average Runoff Depth $=1.13$ "
96.10\% Pervious $=20.181$ ac $3.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.819$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Runoff = 16.55 cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= 1.013 af, Depth> 1.23"

Routed to Pond 2P : W Wet
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 2yr 24hr Rainfall=2.85"


[^3]
## Summary for Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Runoff $=\quad 10.41$ cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= $\quad 0.638$ af, Depth> 1.17"
Routed to Pond 4P: E Wet

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 2yr 24hr Rainfall=2.85"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 4.360 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.694 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 1.182 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.305 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 6.541 | 81 | Weighted Average |
|  | 6.236 |  | 95.34\% Pervious Area |
|  | 0.305 |  | $4.66 \%$ Impervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> 24.0" Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

[^4]
## Summary for Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Runoff $=5.10$ cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume $=0.323$ af, Depth> $0.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$

Routed to Reach 1R : Channel
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 2yr 24hr Rainfall=2.85"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.365 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.890 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 2.402 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.000 | 100 | Pond |
| $*$ | 0.949 | 68 | Undeveloped |
|  | 4.606 | 75 | Weighted Average |
|  | 4.606 |  | 100.00\% Pervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope (ft/ft) | Velocity <br> (ft/sec) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (cfs) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet <br> Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> 24.0" Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

[^5]
## Summary for Reach 1R: Channel



Routed to Link 1L : OUT
Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Max. Velocity $=0.94 \mathrm{fps}$, Min. Travel Time $=12.4 \mathrm{~min}$
Avg. Velocity $=0.51 \mathrm{fps}$, Avg. Travel Time $=23.0$ min
Peak Storage= 2,507 cf @ 12.30 hrs
Average Depth at Peak Storage= 0.32' , Surface Width= 12.54'
Bank-Full Depth= 2.00' Flow Area= 36.0 sf, Capacity= 96.40 cfs
$10.00^{\prime} \times 2.00^{\prime}$ deep channel, $n=0.035$ Earth, dense weeds
Side Slope Z-value= 4.0 '/' Top Width= 26.00'
Length=700.0' Slope= 0.0026 '/'
Inlet Invert= 957.85', Outlet Invert= 956.00'

## $\ddagger$

## Summary for Pond 2P: W Wet



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 963.62' @ 13.22 hrs Surf.Area= 17,906 sf Storage= 25,280 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=235.7$ min calculated for 0.554 af ( $55 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=146.4 \mathrm{~min}(963.7$ - 817.3 )


Primary OutFlow Max=1.75 cfs @ 13.22 hrs HW=963.62' TW=961.26' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-1=Culvert (Passes 1.75 cfs of 9.46 cfs potential flow)
-2=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.51 cfs @ 5.80 fps )
$\square_{3=O r i f i c e / G r a t e ~(W e i r ~ C o n t r o l s ~}^{1.25}$ cfs @ 1.12 fps )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=962.00' TW=961.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\left\llcorner_{4=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}\right.$ )

## Summary for Pond 3P: W Inf



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 961.57' @ 15.36 hrs Surf.Area= 12,839 sf Storage= 6,858 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=136.1 \mathrm{~min}$ calculated for 0.448 af ( $81 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=71.2 \mathrm{~min}(1,034.9-963.7)$

| Volume | Invert | Avail.Storage | Storage Description |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\# 1$ | 961.00 | $66,155 \mathrm{cf}$ | Custom Stage Data (Prismatic) Listed below (Recalc) |


| Elevation <br> (feet) | Surf.Area <br> (sq-ft) | Inc.Store <br> (cubic-feet) | Cum.Store <br> (cubic-feet) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 961.00 | 11,420 | 0 | 0 |
| 963.00 | 16,438 | 27,858 | 27,858 |
| 965.00 | 21,859 | 38,297 | 66,155 |


| Device | Routing | Invert | Outlet Devices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#1 | Discarded | 961.00' | $0.500 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ Exfiltration over Surface area |
|  |  |  | Conductivity to Groundwater Elevation =949.00' |
| \#2 | Primary | 961.00' | 12.0" Round Culvert |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{L}=50.0^{\prime} \mathrm{RCP}$, end-section conforming to fill, $\mathrm{Ke}=0.500$ |
|  |  |  | Inlet / Outlet Invert= 961.00' / 960.50' S=0.0100 '/' Cc= 0.900 |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{n}=0.013$, Flow Area $=0.79 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| \#3 | Device 2 | 961.00' | 6.0" Vert. Orifice/Grate $\quad \mathrm{C}=0.600$ Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#4 | Device 2 | 963.00 | 36.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate $\mathrm{C}=0.600$ |
|  |  |  | Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#5 | Secondary | 964.00' | 20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir |
|  |  |  | Head (feet) 0.200 .400 .600 .801 .001 .201 .401 .60 |
|  |  |  | Coef. (English) $2.492 .562 .702 .692 .682 .692 .67 \quad 2.64$ |

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.16 cfs @ 15.36 hrs HW=961.57' (Free Discharge)

Primary OutFlow Max=0.53 cfs @ 15.36 hrs HW=961.57' TW=957.98' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$-2=$ Culvert (Passes 0.53 cfs of 1.12 cfs potential flow)
-3=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.53 cfs @ 2.70 fps)
-4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=961.00' TW=957.85' (Dynamic Tailwater)
5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs)

## Summary for Pond 4P: E Wet

| Inflow Area = | 6.5 | 4.66\% Impervious, | 1.17 | " for 2yr 24hr event |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow = | 10.41 cfs @ | 12.18 hrs, Volume= | 0.638 af |  |
| Outflow | 0.46 cfs @ | 13.41 hrs , Volume= | 0.346 af, At | Atten= 96\%, Lag= 73.6 min |
| Primary | 0.46 cfs @ | 13.41 hrs , Volume= | 0.346 af |  |
| Routed to | d 5P : E Inf |  |  |  |
| Secondary $=$ | 0.00 cfs @ | 2.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 961.51' @ 15.08 hrs Surf.Area= 12,824 sf Storage= 17,493 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=283.9$ min calculated for 0.346 af ( $54 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= $193.2 \mathrm{~min}(1,013.0-819.9)$


Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=960.00' TW=960.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\left\llcorner_{4=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}\right.$ )

## Summary for Pond 5P: E Inf

| Inflow Area $=$Inflow = | $\begin{aligned} & 6.541 \mathrm{ac}, \\ & 0.46 \mathrm{cfs} @ \end{aligned}$ | 4.66\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 0.63" for 2yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 13.41 hrs, Volume= | 0.346 af |  |
| Outflow | 0.43 cfs @ | 16.81 hrs , Volume= | 0.302 af, A | Atten= $7 \%$, Lag= 204.1 min |
| Discarded = | 0.07 cfs @ | 16.81 hrs, Volume= | 0.054 af |  |
| Primary = Routed to | $\begin{aligned} & 0.36 \text { cfs @ } \\ & 1 \mathrm{~L}: \text { OUT } \end{aligned}$ | 16.81 hrs, Volume= | 0.248 af |  |
| Secondary = Routed to | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \mathrm{cfs} @ \\ & 1 \mathrm{~L}: \text { OUT } \end{aligned}$ | 2.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Peak Elev= 960.40' @ 16.81 hrs Surf.Area= 5,621 sf Storage= 2,088 cf

Plug-Flow detention time $=75.9$ min calculated for 0.302 af ( $87 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=37.6 \mathrm{~min}(1,050.6-1,013.0)$

| Volume | Invert | Avail.Storage | Storage Description |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\# 1$ | 960.00 | $13,680 \mathrm{cf}$ | Custom Stage Data (Prismatic) Listed below (Recalc) |


| Elevation <br> (feet) | Surf.Area <br> (sq-ft) | Inc.Store <br> (cubic-feet) | Cum.Store <br> (cubic-feet) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 960.00 | 4,806 | 0 | 0 |
| 962.00 | 8,874 | 13,680 | 13,680 |


| Device | Routing | Invert | Outlet Devices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#1 | Discarded | 960.00' | $0.500 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ Exfiltration over Surface are |
|  |  |  | Conductivity to Groundwater Elevation $=-25.00$ |
| \#2 | Primary | $959.00{ }^{\prime}$ | 12.0" Round Culvert |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{L}=50.0^{\prime} \mathrm{RCP}$, end-section conforming to fill, $\mathrm{Ke}=0.500$ |
|  |  |  | Inlet / Outlet Invert=959.00' $958.50^{\prime} \quad \mathrm{S}=0.0100$ '// Cc= 0.900 $\mathrm{n}=0.013$, Flow Area $=0.79 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| \#3 | Device 2 | 960.00' | 6.0" Vert. Orifice/Grate $\quad \mathrm{C}=0.600$ Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#4 | Device 2 | 961.00 | 36.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate $\mathrm{C}=0.600$ |
|  |  |  | Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#5 | Secondary | 961.50' | 20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir |
|  |  |  | Head (feet) 0.200 .400 .600 .801 .001 .201 .401 .60 |
|  |  |  | Coef. (English) 2.492 .562 .702 .692 .682 .692 .672 .64 |

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.07 cfs @ 16.81 hrs HW=960.40' (Free Discharge)
_1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.07 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=0.36 cfs @ 16.81 hrs HW=960.40' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L2=Culvert (Passes 0.36 cfs of 3.41 cfs potential flow)

- $3=$ Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.36 cfs @ 2.15 fps)
-4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=960.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )


## Summary for Link 1L: OUT

 Routed to nonexistent node 3L

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Reach 1R: Channel

Pond 2P: W Wet

Pond 3P: W Inf
Discarded

Pond 4P: E Wet

Pond 5P: E Inf Discarded $=0.08$ cfs 0.063 af Primary $=0.72$ cfs 0.448 af Secondary $=0.00$ cfs 0.000 af Outflow= 0.80 cfs 0.511 af

Runoff Area=9.853 ac $5.22 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth>2.24" Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=82 Runoff=30.00 cfs 1.842 af

Runoff Area=6.541 ac $4.66 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>2.16$ " Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=81 Runoff=19.22 cfs 1.178 af

Runoff Area=4.606 ac $0.00 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>1.70$ " Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=75 Runoff=10.66 cfs 0.653 af

Avg. Flow Depth=0.53' Max Vel=1.27 fps Inflow=10.66 cfs 1.517 af $\mathrm{n}=0.035 \mathrm{~L}=700.0$ ' $\mathrm{S}=0.0026$ '/' Capacity=96.40 cfs Outflow=8.16 cfs 1.491 af

Peak Elev=964.08' Storage=33,763 cf Inflow=30.00 cfs 1.842 af Primary $=10.98$ cfs 1.324 af Secondary $=0.00$ cfs 0.000 af Outflow= 10.98 cfs 1.324 af

Peak Elev=963.00' Storage=27,864 cf Inflow=10.98 cfs 1.324 af Primary $=1.25$ cfs 0.864 af Secondary $=0.00$ cfs 0.000 af Outflow=1.47 cfs 1.037 af

Peak Elev=962.60' Storage=32,428 cf Inflow=19.22 cfs 1.178 af Primary $=1.51$ cfs 0.575 af Secondary= 0.00 cfs 0.000 af Outflow= 1.51 cfs 0.575 af

Peak Elev=960.84' Storage=4,730 cf Inflow=1.51 cfs 0.575 af Link 1L: OUT

Inflow=8.20 cfs 1.939 af Primary $=8.20$ cfs 1.939 af

Total Runoff Area $=21.000$ ac Runoff Volume $=3.672$ af Average Runoff Depth $=2.10$ "
96.10\% Pervious $=20.181$ ac $3.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.819$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Runoff $=30.00$ cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= 1.842 af, Depth> 2.24"

Routed to Pond 2P : W Wet
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 10yr 24hr Rainfall=4.10"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 1.512 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 3.216 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 2.690 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 1.921 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.514 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 9.853 | 82 | Weighted Average |
|  | 9.339 |  | 94.78\% Pervious Area |
|  | 0.514 |  | $5.22 \%$ Impervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity $\qquad$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> 24.0" Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

10.1800 Total

## Summary for Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Runoff $=\quad 19.22$ cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= $\quad 1.178$ af, Depth> 2.16"
Routed to Pond 4P : E Wet

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 10yr 24hr Rainfall=4.10"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 4.360 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.694 | 81 | 30\% Lots |
| $*$ | 1.182 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.305 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 6.541 | 81 | Weighted Average |
|  | 6.236 |  | $95.34 \%$ Pervious Area |
|  | 0.305 |  | $4.66 \%$ Impervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> 24.0" Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

[^6]
## Summary for Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Runoff $=10.66$ cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume $=0.653$ af, Depth> 1.70"

Routed to Reach 1R : Channel
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 10yr 24hr Rainfall=4.10"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.365 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.890 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 2.402 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.000 | 100 | Pond |
| $*$ | 0.949 | 68 | Undeveloped |
|  | 4.606 | 75 | Weighted Average |
|  | 4.606 |  | 100.00\% Pervious Area |


| Tc <br> $(\mathrm{min})$ | Length <br> $(\mathrm{feet})$ | Slope <br> $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity <br> $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec})$ | Capacity <br> $(\mathrm{cfs})$ | Description |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 | Sheet Flow, Sheet <br> Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \quad$ P2 <br> Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow |  |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 | Paved Kv=20.3 fps |  |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 <br> Pipe Channel, Channel <br> $24.0^{\prime \prime}$ Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim= 6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ <br> $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |  |

[^7]
## Summary for Reach 1R: Channel

| Inflow Area $=$ | 14.459 ac, | $3.55 \%$ | Impervious, Inflow Depth $>$ | $1.26 "$ for 10 yr 24 hr event |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Inflow | $=$ | $10.66 \mathrm{cfs} @$ | 12.18 hrs , Volume= | 1.517 af |
| Outflow | $=$ | $8.16 \mathrm{cfs} @$ | 12.27 hrs , Volume= | 1.491 af , Atten $=23 \%$, Lag= $=5.0 \mathrm{~min}$ |

Routed to Link 1L : OUT
Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Max. Velocity= 1.27 fps , Min. Travel Time $=9.2 \mathrm{~min}$
Avg. Velocity $=0.66 \mathrm{fps}$, Avg. Travel Time $=17.8 \mathrm{~min}$
Peak Storage= 4,484 cf @ 12.27 hrs
Average Depth at Peak Storage= 0.53' , Surface Width= 14.23'
Bank-Full Depth= 2.00' Flow Area= 36.0 sf, Capacity= 96.40 cfs
$10.00^{\prime} \times 2.00^{\prime}$ deep channel, $n=0.035$ Earth, dense weeds
Side Slope Z-value= 4.0 '/' Top Width= 26.00'
Length= 700.0' Slope= 0.0026 '/'
Inlet Invert= 957.85', Outlet Invert= 956.00'

## Summary for Pond 2P: W Wet

| Inflow Area = | 9.85 | 5.22\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.24" for 10yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow | 30.00 cfs @ | 12.18 hrs, Volume= | 1.842 af |  |
| Outflow | 10.98 cfs @ | 12.41 hrs , Volume= | 1.324 af, Atten= 63\%, Lag= 13.9 min |  |
| Primary | 10.98 cfs @ | 12.41 hrs , Volume= | 1.324 af |  |
| Routed to Pond 3P : W Inf |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary = | 0.00 cfs @ | 2.00 hrs, Volume= | 0.000 af |  |
| Routed to | 3P : W Inf |  |  |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 964.08' @ 12.41 hrs Surf.Area= 19,210 sf Storage= 33,763 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=132.4$ min calculated for 1.320 af ( $72 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= 61.0 min ( 865.3-804.2)


Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=962.00' TW=961.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\complement_{4=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}$ )

## Summary for Pond 3P: W Inf



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 963.00' @ 14.31 hrs Surf.Area= 16,439 sf Storage= 27,864 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=219.8 \mathrm{~min}$ calculated for 1.035 af ( $78 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=147.5 \mathrm{~min}(1,012.8-865.3$ )

| Volume | Invert | Avail.Storage | Storage Description |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $\# 1$ | $961.00^{\prime}$ | $66,155 \mathrm{cf}$ | Custom Stage Data (Prismatic) Listed below (Recalc) |


| Elevation <br> (feet) | Surf.Area <br> (sq-ft) | Inc.Store <br> (cubic-feet) | Cum.Store <br> (cubic-feet) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 961.00 | 11,420 | 0 | 0 |
| 963.00 | 16,438 | 27,858 | 27,858 |
| 965.00 | 21,859 | 38,297 | 66,155 |


| Device | Routing | Invert | Outlet Devices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#1 | Discarded | 961.00' | $0.500 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ Exfiltration over Surface area |
|  |  |  | Conductivity to Groundwater Elevation =949.00' |
| \#2 | Primary | 961.00' | 12.0" Round Culvert |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{L}=50.0^{\prime} \mathrm{RCP}$, end-section conforming to fill, $\mathrm{Ke}=0.500$ |
|  |  |  | Inlet / Outlet Invert= 961.00' / 960.50' S=0.0100 '/' Cc= 0.900 |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{n}=0.013$, Flow Area $=0.79 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| \#3 | Device 2 | 961.00' | 6.0" Vert. Orifice/Grate $\quad \mathrm{C}=0.600$ Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#4 | Device 2 | 963.00 | 36.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate $\mathrm{C}=0.600$ |
|  |  |  | Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#5 | Secondary | 964.00' | 20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir |
|  |  |  | Head (feet) 0.200 .400 .600 .801 .001 .201 .401 .60 |
|  |  |  | Coef. (English) $2.492 .562 .702 .692 .682 .692 .67 \quad 2.64$ |

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.22 cfs @ 14.31 hrs HW=963.00' (Free Discharge)
—1=Exfiltration ( Controls 0.22 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=1.25 cfs @ 14.31 hrs HW=963.00' TW=958.07' (Dynamic Tailwater)
—2=Culvert (Passes 1.25 cfs of 4.41 cfs potential flow)

- 3=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 1.25 cfs @ 6.37 fps )
—4=Orifice/Grate (Weir Controls 0.00 cfs @ 0.06 fps )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=961.00' TW=957.85' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs)


## Summary for Pond 4P: E Wet

| Inflow Area = | 6.541 ac | 4.66\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.16" for 10yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow | 19.22 cfs @ | 12.18 hrs, Volume= | 1.178 af |  |
| Outflow | 1.51 cfs @ | 13.46 hrs , Volume= | 0.575 af , Atten= 92\%, Lag= 76.7 min |  |
| Primary | 1.51 cfs @ | 13.46 hrs , Volume= | 0.575 af |  |
| Routed to Pond 5P : E Inf |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary = | 0.00 cfs @ | 2.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |
| Routed | 5P : E Inf |  |  |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 962.60' @ 13.47 hrs Surf.Area= 14,716 sf Storage= 32,428 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=263.5$ min calculated for 0.575 af ( $49 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=175.7 \mathrm{~min}(982.2-806.5)$


Primary OutFlow Max=1.51 cfs @ 13.46 hrs HW=962.60' TW=960.56' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L1=Culvert (Passes 1.51 cfs of 10.41 cfs potential flow)
-2=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.60 cfs @ 6.88 fps)
$\square_{3=O r i f i c e / G r a t e ~(W e i r ~ C o n t r o l s ~} 0.91$ cfs @ 1.01 fps )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=960.00' TW=960.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\complement_{4=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}$ )

## Summary for Pond 5P: E Inf



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Peak Elev= 960.84' @ 15.15 hrs Surf.Area= 6,507 sf Storage= 4,730 cf

Plug-Flow detention time $=83.5 \mathrm{~min}$ calculated for 0.511 af ( $89 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=46.3 \mathrm{~min}(1,028.4-982.2)$

| Volume | Invert | Avail.Storage | Storage Description |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\# 1$ | 960.00 | $13,680 \mathrm{cf}$ | Custom Stage Data (Prismatic) Listed below (Recalc) |


| Elevation <br> (feet) | Surf.Area <br> (sq-ft) | Inc.Store <br> (cubic-feet) | Cum.Store <br> (cubic-feet) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 960.00 | 4,806 | 0 | 0 |
| 962.00 | 8,874 | 13,680 | 13,680 |


| Device | Routing | Invert | Outlet Devices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#1 | Discarded | 960.00' | $0.500 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ Exfiltration over Surface are |
|  |  |  | Conductivity to Groundwater Elevation $=-25.00$ |
| \#2 | Primary | $959.00{ }^{\prime}$ | 12.0" Round Culvert |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{L}=50.0^{\prime} \mathrm{RCP}$, end-section conforming to fill, $\mathrm{Ke}=0.500$ |
|  |  |  | Inlet / Outlet Invert=959.00' $958.50^{\prime} \quad \mathrm{S}=0.0100$ '// Cc= 0.900 $\mathrm{n}=0.013$, Flow Area $=0.79 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| \#3 | Device 2 | 960.00' | 6.0" Vert. Orifice/Grate $\quad \mathrm{C}=0.600$ Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#4 | Device 2 | 961.00 | 36.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate $\mathrm{C}=0.600$ |
|  |  |  | Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#5 | Secondary | 961.50' | 20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir |
|  |  |  | Head (feet) 0.200 .400 .600 .801 .001 .201 .401 .60 |
|  |  |  | Coef. (English) 2.492 .562 .702 .692 .682 .692 .672 .64 |

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.08 cfs @ 15.15 hrs HW=960.84' (Free Discharge)
_1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.08 cfs )
Primary OutFlow Max=0.72 cfs @ 15.15 hrs HW=960.84' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L2=Culvert (Passes 0.72 cfs of 4.16 cfs potential flow)

- $3=$ Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.72 cfs @ 3.69 fps)
-4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=960.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )


## Summary for Link 1L: OUT

Inflow Area $=21.000$ ac, $3.90 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth > 1.11" for 10 yr 24 hr event
Inflow $=8.20$ cfs @ 12.27 hrs, Volume= 1.939 af
Primary $=8.20 \mathrm{cfs} @ 12.27 \mathrm{hrs}$, Volume= 1.939 af , Atten= $0 \%$, Lag= 0.0 min Routed to nonexistent node 3L

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Reach 1R: Channel

Pond 2P: W Wet

Pond 3P: W Inf Discarded $=0.27$ cfs 0.216 af Primary= 5.88 cfs 2.328 af Secondary $=3.50$ cfs 0.149 af Outflow=9.65 cfs 2.694 af

Runoff Area=9.853 ac $5.22 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth>4.49" Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=82 Runoff=58.76 cfs 3.687 af

Runoff Area=6.541 ac $4.66 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>4.38$ " Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=81 Runoff=38.23 cfs 2.389 af

Runoff Area=4.606 ac $0.00 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>3.75^{\prime \prime}$ Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=75 Runoff=23.40 cfs 1.439 af

Avg. Flow Depth=0.88' Max Vel=1.70 fps Inflow=24.14 cfs 3.917 af $\mathrm{n}=0.035 \mathrm{~L}=700.0$ ' $\mathrm{S}=0.0026$ '/' Capacity=96.40 cfs Outflow=20.13 cfs 3.886 af

Peak Elev=965.02' Storage=53,321 cf Inflow=58.76 cfs 3.687 af Primary= 13.59 cfs 2.343 af Secondary=29.92 cfs 0.798 af Outflow= 43.42 cfs 3.142 af

Peak Elev=964.17' Storage=48,950 cf Inflow=43.42 cfs 3.142 af

Pond 4P: E Wet

Pond 5P: E Inf
Peak Elev=961.72' Storage=11,290 cf Inflow=12.73 cfs 1.697 af Discarded $=0.10$ cfs 0.079 af Primary=5.36 cfs 1.272 af Secondary=5.22 cfs 0.270 af Oufflow=10.68 cfs 1.621 af

## Link 1L: OUT

Inflow=23.07 cfs 5.428 af Primary $=23.07$ cfs 5.428 af

Total Runoff Area $=21.000$ ac Runoff Volume $=7.515$ af Average Runoff Depth $=4.29$ "
$96.10 \%$ Pervious $=20.181$ ac $3.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.819$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Runoff $=58.76$ cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume= $\quad 3.687$ af, Depth> 4.49"

Routed to Pond 2P : W Wet
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 100yr 24hr Rainfall=6.63"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 1.512 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 3.216 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 2.690 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 1.921 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.514 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 9.853 | 82 | Weighted Average |
|  | 9.339 |  | 94.78\% Pervious Area |
|  | 0.514 |  | $5.22 \%$ Impervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope <br> (ft/ft) | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet Range $n=0.130 \quad \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> $24.0^{\prime \prime}$ Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3'r=0.50' $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

10.1800 Total

## Summary for Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Runoff $=38.23$ cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume $=$
Routed to Pond 4P : E Wet
2.389 af, Depth> 4.38"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 100yr 24hr Rainfall=6.63"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 4.360 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.694 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 1.182 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.305 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 6.541 | 81 | Weighted Average |
|  | 6.236 |  | 95.34\% Pervious Area |
|  | 0.305 |  | $4.66 \%$ Impervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> 24.0" Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

10.1800 Total

## Summary for Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Runoff $=23.40$ cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume $=1.439$ af, Depth> 3.75"

Routed to Reach 1R : Channel
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 100yr 24hr Rainfall=6.63"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.365 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.890 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 2.402 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.000 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 0.949 | 68 | Undeveloped |
|  | 4.606 | 75 | Weighted Average |
|  | 4.606 |  | $100.00 \%$ Pervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (cfs) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet <br> Range $n=0.130 \quad \mathrm{P} 2=2.84^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> $24.0^{\prime \prime}$ Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' $\mathrm{r}=0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |
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## Summary for Reach 1R: Channel



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Max. Velocity= 1.70 fps , Min. Travel Time $=6.9 \mathrm{~min}$
Avg. Velocity $=0.79 \mathrm{fps}$, Avg. Travel Time $=14.8 \mathrm{~min}$
Peak Storage= 8,290 cf @ 12.25 hrs
Average Depth at Peak Storage=0.88' , Surface Width= 17.01'
Bank-Full Depth= 2.00' Flow Area= 36.0 sf, Capacity= 96.40 cfs
$10.00^{\prime} \times 2.00^{\prime}$ deep channel, $n=0.035$ Earth, dense weeds
Side Slope Z-value= 4.0 '/' Top Width= 26.00'
Length=700.0' Slope= 0.0026 '/'
Inlet Invert= 957.85', Outlet Invert= 956.00'

## $\ddagger$

## Summary for Pond 2P: W Wet

| Inflow Area = | 9.853 | 5.22\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 4.49" for 100yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow = | 58.76 cfs @ | 12.17 hrs , Volume= | 3.687 af |  |
| Outflow | 43.42 cfs @ | 12.26 hrs, Volume= | 3.142 af, Atten $=26 \%$, Lag= 5.4 min |  |
| Primary | 13.59 cfs @ | 12.24 hrs , Volume= | 2.343 af |  |
| Routed to P | d 3P : W Inf |  |  |  |
| Secondary = Routed to | $\begin{aligned} & 29.92 \text { cfs @ } \\ & \text { id 3P : W Inf } \end{aligned}$ | 12.27 hrs, Volume= | 0.798 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 965.02' @ 12.27 hrs Surf.Area= 22,071 sf Storage= 53,321 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=99.6$ min calculated for 3.142 af ( $85 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= $48.7 \mathrm{~min}(837.7-789.0)$


Primary OutFlow Max=13.26 cfs @ 12.24 hrs HW=965.00' TW=962.41' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L-1=Culvert (Outlet Controls 13.26 cfs @ 7.50 fps )
2-2=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 0.68 cfs potential flow)
$\square_{3=O r i f i c e / G r a t e}$ (Passes < 41.67 cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=28.70 cfs @ 12.27 hrs HW=965.01' TW=962.63' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-4=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 28.70 cfs @ 1.88 fps )

## Summary for Pond 3P: W Inf

| Inflow Area = | $\begin{gathered} 9.853 \mathrm{ac}, \\ 43.42 \mathrm{cfs} @ \end{gathered}$ | 5.22\% Impervous, | epth > 3.83' | for 100 yr 24 hr event |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 12.26 hrs , Volume= | 3.142 af |  |
| Outflow | 9.65 cfs @ | 12.75 hrs , Volume= | 2.694 af, A | Atten= 78\%, Lag= 29.3 min |
| Discarded = | 0.27 cfs @ | 12.75 hrs , Volume= | 0.216 af |  |
| Primary = Routed to | $5.88 \text { cfs @ }$ ch 1R : Chan | 12.75 hrs , Volume= nel | 2.328 af |  |
| Secondary = Routed to | $3.50 \text { cfs @ }$ | 12.75 hrs , Volume= | 0.149 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 964.17' @ 12.75 hrs Surf.Area= 19,610 sf Storage= 48,950 cf
Plug-Flow detention time= 127.2 min calculated for 2.694 af ( $86 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= 78.9 min (916.6-837.7)


Discarded OutFlow Max=0.27 cfs @ 12.75 hrs HW=964.17' (Free Discharge)
—1=Exfiltration ( Controls 0.27 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=5.88 cfs @ 12.75 hrs HW=964.17' TW=958.52' (Dynamic Tailwater)
—2=Culvert (Barrel Controls $5.88 \mathrm{cfs} @ 7.48 \mathrm{fps}$ )
-3=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 1.62 cfs potential flow)
-4=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 36.81 cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=3.49 cfs @ 12.75 hrs HW=964.17' TW=958.52' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 3.49 cfs @ 1.03 fps )

## Summary for Pond 4P: E Wet



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 963.49' @ 12.45 hrs Surf.Area= 16,361 sf Storage= 46,381 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=132.1$ min calculated for 1.697 af ( $71 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= 61.8 $\min$ ( 852.8-791.0)


Primary OutFlow Max=12.29 cfs @ 12.32 hrs HW=963.40' TW=961.18' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L-1=Culvert (Outlet Controls 12.29 cfs @ 6.95 fps )
-2=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 0.63 cfs potential flow)
$\square_{3=O r i f i c e / G r a t e ~(P a s s e s ~}^{<26.53}$ cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 2.00 hrs HW=960.00' TW=960.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\left\llcorner_{4=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}\right.$ )

## Summary for Pond 5P: E Inf

| Inflow Area = | $\begin{gathered} 6.541 \mathrm{ac}, \\ 12.73 \mathrm{cfs} @ \end{gathered}$ | 4.66\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 3.11" for 100yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow |  | 12.32 hrs , Volume= | 1.697 af |  |
| Outflow | 10.68 cfs @ | 12.63 hrs , Volume= | 1.621 af, A | Atten= 16\%, Lag= 18.8 min |
| Discarded = | 0.10 cfs @ | 12.63 hrs , Volume= | 0.079 af |  |
| Primary = Routed to | $\begin{aligned} & 5.36 \mathrm{cfs} @ \\ & 1 \mathrm{~L}: \text { OUT } \end{aligned}$ | 12.63 hrs , Volume= | 1.272 af |  |
| Secondary = | $5.22 \text { cfs @ }$ | 12.63 hrs, Volume= | 0.270 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 961.72' @ 12.63 hrs Surf.Area= 8,308 sf Storage= 11,290 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=47.6 \mathrm{~min}$ calculated for 1.621 af ( $96 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=27.8 \mathrm{~min}(880.6-852.8$ )

| Volume | Invert | Avail.Storage | Storage Description |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\# 1$ | 960.00 | $13,680 \mathrm{cf}$ | Custom Stage Data (Prismatic) Listed below (Recalc) |


| Elevation <br> (feet) | Surf.Area <br> (sq-ft) | Inc.Store <br> (cubic-feet) | Cum.Store <br> (cubic-feet) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 960.00 | 4,806 | 0 | 0 |
| 962.00 | 8,874 | 13,680 | 13,680 |


| Device | Routing | Invert | Outlet Devices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#1 | Discarded | 960.00' | $0.500 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ Exfiltration over Surface area |
|  |  |  | Conductivity to Groundwater Elevation $=-25.00$ |
| \#2 | Primary | 959.00 | 12.0" Round Culvert |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{L}=50.0{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{RCP}$, end-section conforming to fill, $\mathrm{Ke}=0.500$ |
|  |  |  | Inlet / Outlet Invert=959.00' / 958.50' S=0.0100 '/' Cc= 0.900 |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{n}=0.013$, Flow Area $=0.79 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| \#3 | Device 2 | 960.00' | 6.0" Vert. Orifice/Grate $\quad \mathrm{C}=0.600$ Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#4 | Device 2 | 961.00' | 36.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate $\mathrm{C}=0.600$ |
|  |  |  | Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#5 | Secondary | 961.50' | 20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir |
|  |  |  | Head (feet) 0.200 .400 .600 .801 .001 .201 .401 .60 |
|  |  |  | Coef. (English) 2.492 .562 .702 .692 .682 .692 .672 .64 |

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.10 cfs @ 12.63 hrs HW=961.72' (Free Discharge)
_1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.10 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=5.36 cfs @ 12.63 hrs HW=961.72' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
—2=Culvert (Barrel Controls 5.36 cfs @ 6.83 fps)
-3=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 1.15 cfs potential flow)
4=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 18.89 cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=5.21 cfs @ 12.63 hrs HW=961.72' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 5.21 cfs @ 1.18 fps)

## Summary for Link 1L: OUT

| Inflow Area $=$ | 21.000 ac, | $3.90 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth > 3.10" for 100 yr 24 hr event |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Inflow | $=$ | $23.07 \mathrm{cfs} @$ | 12.52 hrs , Volume= |
| Primary | $=$ | $23.07 \mathrm{cfs} @$ | 12.52 hrs , Volume $=$ | Routed to nonexistent node 3L

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

Time span=2.00-22.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 401 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Reach 1R: Channel

Pond 2P: W Wet

Pond 3P: W Inf Discarded $=0.29$ cfs 0.226 af Primary= 6.14 cfs 2.485 af Secondary $=13.77$ cfs 0.561 af Outflow=20.20 cfs 3.272 af

Pond 4P: E Wet

Pond 5P: E Inf Discarded $=0.10$ cfs 0.082 af Primary=5.57 cfs 1.405 af Secondary=12.82 cfs 0.525 af Outflow=18.49 cfs 2.012 af

## Link 1L: OUT

Runoff Area $=9.853$ ac $5.22 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>5.25{ }^{\prime \prime}$ Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=82 Runoff=68.16 cfs 4.309 af

Runoff Area=6.541 ac $4.66 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>5.13^{\prime \prime}$ Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=81 Runoff=44.47 cfs 2.799 af

Runoff Area=4.606 ac $0.00 \%$ Impervious Runoff Depth $>4.46^{\prime \prime}$ Flow Length=800' Tc=10.1 min CN=75 Runoff=27.70 cfs 1.713 af

Avg. Flow Depth=1.00' Max Vel=1.83 fps Inflow=28.46 cfs 4.759 af $\mathrm{n}=0.035 \mathrm{~L}=700.0$ ' $\mathrm{S}=0.0026$ '/' Capacity=96.40 cfs Outflow=25.54 cfs 4.726 af

Peak Elev=965.14' Storage=55,999 cf Inflow=68.16 cfs 4.309 af Primary=13.77 cfs 2.503 af Secondary=41.73 cfs 1.257 af Outflow=54.92 cfs 3.760 af

Peak Elev=964.42' Storage=53,844 cf Inflow=54.92 cfs 3.760 af

Peak Elev=963.75' Storage=50,559 cf Inflow=44.47 cfs 2.799 af Primary $=13.38$ cfs 1.924 af Secondary $=9.13$ cfs 0.172 af Outflow=22.23 cfs 2.095 af

Peak Elev=961.90' Storage=12,788 cf Inflow=22.23 cfs 2.095 af

Total Runoff Area $=21.000$ ac Runoff Volume $=8.820$ af Average Runoff Depth $=5.04$ " 96.10\% Pervious $=20.181$ ac $3.90 \%$ Impervious $=0.819$ ac

## Summary for Subcatchment 4S: Proposed SW

Runoff = 68.16 cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume= 4.309 af, Depth> 5.25"

Routed to Pond 2P : W Wet
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 200yr 24hr Rainfall=7.45"
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## Summary for Subcatchment 7S: Proposed NE

Runoff $=\quad 44.47$ cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume= $\quad 2.799$ af, Depth> 5.13"

Routed to Pond 4P : E Wet
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 200yr 24hr Rainfall=7.45"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 4.360 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.694 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 1.182 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.305 | 100 | Pond |
|  | 6.541 | 81 | Weighted Average |
|  | 6.236 |  | 95.34\% Pervious Area |
|  | 0.305 |  | $4.66 \%$ Impervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity $\qquad$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> 24.0" Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' r= $0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

[^10]
## Summary for Subcatchment 8S: Untreated

Runoff $=\quad 27.70$ cfs @ 12.18 hrs , Volume= 1.713 af, Depth> 4.46"

Routed to Reach 1R : Channel
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 200yr 24hr Rainfall=7.45"

|  | Area (ac) | CN | Description |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 0.000 | 88 | $60 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.365 | 82 | $40 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 0.890 | 81 | $30 \%$ Lots |
| $*$ | 2.402 | 74 | Open Space |
| $*$ | 0.000 | 100 | Pond |
| 0.949 | 68 | Undeveloped |  |
|  | 4.606 | 75 | Weighted Average |
|  | 4.606 |  | $100.00 \%$ Pervious Area |


| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (cfs) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.3 | 100 | 0.0200 | 0.18 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet <br> Range $n=0.130 \quad \mathrm{P} 2=2.84^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 0.3 | 100 | 0.0800 | 5.74 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Paved Kv= 20.3 fps |
| 0.5 | 600 | 0.0800 | 20.37 | 63.99 | Pipe Channel, Channel <br> $24.0^{\prime \prime}$ Round Area= 3.1 sf Perim=6.3' $\mathrm{r}=0.50^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{n}=0.013$ |

[^11]
## Summary for Reach 1R: Channel

Inflow Area $=14.459$ ac, $3.55 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth > 3.95" for 200yr 24hr event
Inflow = 28.46 cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= 4.759 af
Outflow = 25.54 cfs @ 12.56 hrs , Volume $=4.726 \mathrm{af}$, Atten= $10 \%$, Lag $=23.0 \mathrm{~min}$
Routed to Link 1L : OUT
Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Max. Velocity= 1.83 fps , Min. Travel Time $=6.4 \mathrm{~min}$
Avg. Velocity $=0.81 \mathrm{fps}$, Avg. Travel Time $=14.4$ min
Peak Storage= 9,781 cf @ 12.56 hrs
Average Depth at Peak Storage=1.00' , Surface Width= 17.99'
Bank-Full Depth= 2.00' Flow Area= 36.0 sf, Capacity= 96.40 cfs
$10.00^{\prime} \times 2.00^{\prime}$ deep channel, $n=0.035$ Earth, dense weeds
Side Slope Z-value= 4.0 '/' Top Width= 26.00'
Length= 700.0' Slope= 0.0026 '/'
Inlet Invert= 957.85', Outlet Invert= 956.00'


## Summary for Pond 2P: W Wet

| Inflow Area $=$ | 9.853 ac , | 5.22\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 5.25" for 200yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow = | 68.16 cfs @ | 12.17 hrs , Volume= | 4.309 af |  |
| Outflow | 54.92 cfs @ | 12.24 hrs , Volume= | 3.760 af, At | Atten= 19\%, Lag= 4.3 min |
| Primary | 13.77 cfs @ | 12.20 hrs , Volume= | 2.503 af |  |
| Routed to | d 3P : W Inf |  |  |  |
| Secondary = | 41.73 cfs @ | 12.25 hrs, Volume= | 1.257 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 965.14' @ 12.25 hrs Surf.Area= 22,435 sf Storage= $55,999 \mathrm{cf}$
Plug-Flow detention time= 90.7 min calculated for 3.750 af ( $87 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=45.1 \mathrm{~min}$ ( 830.7-785.6)


Primary OutFlow Max=13.03 cfs @ 12.20 hrs HW=965.08' TW=962.58' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-1=Culvert (Outlet Controls 13.03 cfs @ 7.37 fps)
2-2=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 0.66 cfs potential flow)
$\square_{3=O r i f i c e / G r a t e ~(P a s s e s ~}^{<} 42.79$ cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=41.72 cfs @ 12.25 hrs HW=965.14' TW=963.17' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-4=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 41.72 cfs @ 2.16 fps )

## Summary for Pond 3P: W Inf

| Inflow Area $=$Inflow | $9.853 \mathrm{ac}$ | 5.22\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 4.58" |  | " for 200yr 24hr event |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 12.24 hrs, Volume= | 3.760 af |  |
| Outflow | 20.20 cfs @ | 12.53 hrs , Volume= | 3.272 af, A | Atten= 63\%, Lag= 16.8 min |
| Discarded = | 0.29 cfs @ | 12.53 hrs , Volume= | 0.226 af |  |
| Primary = Routed to | $6.14 \text { cfs @ }$ <br> ch 1R : Chan | 12.53 hrs , Volume= nel | 2.485 af |  |
| Secondary = Routed to | $13.77 \text { cfs @ }$ | 12.53 hrs , Volume $=$ nel | 0.561 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 964.42' @ 12.53 hrs Surf.Area= 20,275 sf Storage= 53,844 cf
Plug-Flow detention time= 109.8 min calculated for 3.263 af ( $87 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= $65.2 \mathrm{~min}(895.9-830.7)$


Discarded OutFlow Max=0.29 cfs @ 12.53 hrs HW=964.41' (Free Discharge)
—1=Exfiltration ( Controls 0.29 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=6.14 cfs @ 12.53 hrs HW=964.41' TW=958.84' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$-2=$ Culvert (Barrel Controls $6.14 \mathrm{cfs} @ 7.82 \mathrm{fps}$ )
-3=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 1.68 cfs potential flow)
-4=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 40.46 cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=13.65 cfs @ 12.53 hrs HW=964.41' TW=958.84' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 13.65 cfs @ 1.65 fps )

## Summary for Pond 4P: E Wet

| Inflow Area = | 6.541 ac , | 4.66\% Impervious, | > 5.13 | for 200yr 24 hr event |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow | 44.47 cfs @ | 12.17 hrs, Volume= | 2.799 af |  |
| Outflow | 22.23 cfs @ | 12.32 hrs , Volume= | 2.095 af, Atten $=50 \%$, Lag= 8.9 min |  |
| Primary | 13.38 cfs @ | 12.27 hrs , Volume= | 1.924 af |  |
| Routed to Pond 5P : E Inf |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary = | 9.13 cfs @ | 12.34 hrs, Volume= | 0.172 af |  | Routed to Pond 5P : E Inf

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 963.75' @ 12.34 hrs Surf.Area= 16,822 sf Storage= $50,559 \mathrm{cf}$
Plug-Flow detention time $=119.4$ min calculated for 2.095 af ( $75 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=53.3 \mathrm{~min}(840.8-787.5$ )


Primary OutFlow Max=12.68 cfs @ 12.27 hrs HW=963.66' TW=961.29' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L1=Culvert (Outlet Controls 12.68 cfs @ 7.18 fps )
2-2=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 0.65 cfs potential flow)
$\square_{3=O r i f i c e / G r a t e ~(P a s s e s ~}^{<} 36.59$ cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=8.96 cfs @ 12.34 hrs HW=963.74' TW=961.73' (Dynamic Tailwater)
44=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 8.96 cfs @ 1.23 fps )

## Summary for Pond 5P: E Inf

| Inflow Area =Inflow = | $\begin{gathered} 6.541 \mathrm{ac} \\ 22.23 \mathrm{cfs} @ \end{gathered}$ | 4.66\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 3.84' |  | " for 200yr 24hr event |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 12.32 hrs , Volume= | 2.095 af |  |
| Outflow | 18.49 cfs @ | 12.42 hrs , Volume= | 2.012 af, A | Atten= 17\%, Lag= 6.2 min |
| Discarded = | 0.10 cfs @ | 12.42 hrs , Volume= | 0.082 af |  |
| Primary = Routed to | $\begin{aligned} & 5.57 \mathrm{cfs} @ \\ & 1 \mathrm{~L}: \text { OUT } \end{aligned}$ | 12.42 hrs , Volume= | 1.405 af |  |
| Secondary = Routed to | $12.82 \text { cfs @ }$ | 12.42 hrs, Volume= | 0.525 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs Peak Elev= 961.90' @ 12.42 hrs Surf.Area= 8,667 sf Storage= 12,788 cf

Plug-Flow detention time $=41.2$ min calculated for 2.007 af ( $96 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=23.7 \mathrm{~min}(864.5-840.8$ )

| Volume | Invert | Avail.Storage | Storage Description |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\# 1$ | 960.00 | $13,680 \mathrm{cf}$ | Custom Stage Data (Prismatic) Listed below (Recalc) |


| Elevation <br> (feet) | Surf.Area <br> (sq-ft) | Inc.Store <br> (cubic-feet) | Cum.Store <br> (cubic-feet) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 960.00 | 4,806 | 0 | 0 |
| 962.00 | 8,874 | 13,680 | 13,680 |


| Device | Routing | Invert | Outlet Devices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#1 | Discarded | 960.00' | $0.500 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ Exfiltration over Surface area |
|  |  |  | Conductivity to Groundwater Elevation $=-25.00$ |
| \#2 | Primary | 959.00 | 12.0" Round Culvert |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{L}=50.0{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{RCP}$, end-section conforming to fill, $\mathrm{Ke}=0.500$ |
|  |  |  | Inlet / Outlet Invert=959.00' / 958.50' S=0.0100 '/' Cc= 0.900 |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{n}=0.013$, Flow Area $=0.79 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| \#3 | Device 2 | 960.00' | 6.0" Vert. Orifice/Grate $\quad \mathrm{C}=0.600$ Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#4 | Device 2 | 961.00' | 36.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate $\mathrm{C}=0.600$ |
|  |  |  | Limited to weir flow at low heads |
| \#5 | Secondary | 961.50' | 20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir |
|  |  |  | Head (feet) 0.200 .400 .600 .801 .001 .201 .401 .60 |
|  |  |  | Coef. (English) 2.492 .562 .702 .692 .682 .692 .672 .64 |

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.10 cfs @ 12.42 hrs HW=961.89' (Free Discharge)
_1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.10 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=5.56 cfs @ 12.42 hrs HW=961.89' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
—2=Culvert (Barrel Controls 5.56 cfs @ 7.08 fps )
-3=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 1.21 cfs potential flow)
4=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 25.73 cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=12.28 cfs @ 12.42 hrs HW=961.89' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 12.28 cfs @ 1.59 fps )

## Summary for Link 1L: OUT

Inflow Area $=21.000$ ac, $3.90 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth > 3.80" for 200yr 24hr event
Inflow $=40.98$ cfs @ 12.49 hrs, Volume= 6.655 af
Primary $=40.98$ cfs @ 12.49 hrs , Volume $=6.655 \mathrm{af}$, Atten= $0 \%$, Lag $=0.0 \mathrm{~min}$ Routed to nonexistent node 3L

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 2.00-22.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

## APPENDIX E

## SOILS INFORMATION



## MAP LEGEND

| Area of Interest (AOI) | $\square$ | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area of Interest (AOI) | $\square$ | C/D |
| Soils | $\square$ | D |
| Soil Rating Polygons |  |  |
| A | $\square$ | Not rated or not available |
| A/D | Water Fe | ures |
|  | $\sim$ | Streams and Canals |
| B |  |  |
|  | Transportation |  |
| B/D | H+ | Rails |
| C | $\sim$ | Interstate Highways |
| C/D | (2) | US Routes |
| D | $\approx$ | Major Roads |
| Not rated or not available | $\cdots$ | Local Roads |
| Soil Rating Lines | Background |  |
| $\cdots$ A |  | Aerial Photography |
| $\cdots$ A/D |  |  |
| $\cdots \mathrm{B}$ |  |  |
| $\cdots$ B/D |  |  |
| $\cdots \mathrm{C}$ |  |  |
| $\cdots \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D}$ |  |  |
| $\cdots$ D |  |  |
| * Not rated or not available |  |  |
| Soil Rating Points |  |  |
| $\square \quad \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |
| $\square \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{D}$ |  |  |
| $\square \quad \mathrm{B}$ |  |  |
| - B/D |  |  |

## MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:15,800.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.
Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.
Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL:
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)
Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.
This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.
Soil Survey Area: Dane County, Wisconsin
Survey Area Data: Version 21, Sep 6, 2022
Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Jun 13, 2020—Ju 31, 2020

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident

## Hydrologic Soil Group

| Map unit symbol | Map unit name | Rating | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| BbB | Batavia silt loam, <br> gravelly substratum, 2 <br> to 6 percent slopes | B | 5.4 | $24.4 \%$ |
| BoC2 | Boyer sandy loam, 6 to <br> 12 percent slopes, <br> eroded | B | 2.4 | $10.8 \%$ |
| KdD2 | Kidder loam, 12 to 20 <br> percent slopes, <br> eroded | B | 2.9 | $13.0 \%$ |
| ScB | St. Charles silt loam, 2 <br> to 6 percent slopes | B | 0.5 | $2.3 \%$ |
| ScC2 | St. Charles silt loam, 6 <br> to 12 percent slopes, <br> eroded | B | 4.1 | $18.7 \%$ |
| TrB | Troxel silt loam, 0 to 3 <br> percent slopes | B | $\mathbf{6 . 8}$ |  |
| Totals for Area of Interest | $\mathbf{2 2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 8 \%}$ |  |  |

## 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

## APPENDIX F

## STORMWATER OPINON OF PROBABLE COST

# STORM WATER OPINION OF PROBABLE COST 

| ITEM |  | ESTIMATED <br> QUANTITY | UNIT | UNIT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO. | DESCRIPTION |  |  |  | AMOUNT |
| 1. |  | Unclassified Excavation (Detention) | 10,000 | CY | $\$ 2.00$ |
| 5. | Infiltration Basin | 12,000 | SQFT | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$ 20,000.00$ |
| 1. | Outlet Structure | 2 | EA | $\$ 2000.00$ | $\$ 4,000.00$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL |  | $\underline{\mathbf{\$ 1 4 4 , 0 0 0 . 0 0}}$ |

In providing Opinions of Probable Costs, it is understood that the Consultant has no control over the cost or availability of labor, equipment or materials, or over conditions or the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the Consultant's Opinions of Probable Construction Costs are made on the basis of the Consultant's professional judgment and experience. The Consultant makes no warranty, expressed or implied, that bids, quantities, or negotiated costs of the Work will not vary from the Consultant's Opinion of Probable Construction

## APPENDIX G

## DRAFT MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

Village will assume maintenance upon completion of all stormwater management devices. The Village will follow suggestions as outlined in the following maintenance provisions sheet.

## STORM WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT ("Agreement"), entered into this day of $\qquad$ , 2023 by and between Village of Oregon (the"Owner") and Village of Oregon, a Wisconsin Municipal Corporation (the "Village"), collectively, the "Parties."

## RECITALS

A. The Owner is developing certain real property located in the Village of Oregon legally described in paragraph 2 herein (the "Property").
B. The Parties desire to set forth their obligations for the maintenance of certain storm water management improvements on the Property.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants herein set forth and other good and valuable consideration the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the Parties hereby agree as follows.

Recording area (Dane Co. Register of Deeds)
Send To: Village Clerk
Village of Oregon
117 Spring Street
Oregon, WI 53575
TBD

Parcel Identification Number

1. Sole Agreement. This agreement is the sole applicable agreement pertaining to storm water management for the described Property.
2. Site Legal Description. The Property subject to this agreement is legally described as follows: Second Addition to Autumn Ridge plat, Village of Oregon, Dane County, Wisconsin.
3. Responsible Party.
a. CONSTRUCTION PHASE MAINTENANCE. The Owner is responsible for satisfying the provisions of this agreement throughout the Property for the duration of the construction and warranty period.
b. POST-CONSTRUCTION PERPETUAL MAINTENANCE. Upon completion of all construction phases and expiration of the warranty period, the Owner shall assume responsibility for maintaining the storm water management system in perpetuity.
4. Temporary Components of the Infiltration Basin.
a. The goal is to keep the infiltration basin offline to the extent possible. Draintile is installed to assist with the establishment of vegetation during the first 2-3 years. The 4" orifice in the wet pond release structure will be plugged and a separate 4 " diameter pipe will act as the low flow outlet that will allow runoff to bypass the infiltration basin temporarily. Once the vegetation is well established in the infiltration basin, the upstream and downstream ends of the $4 "$ pipe will be plugged and the 4 " orifice opened up to function as designed.
5. Permanent Components of The Storm Water Management System.
a. The storm water management system for the property consists of the following management practices or components:
i. Wet Pond
ii. Infiltration Basin
iii. Storm Sewer System
b. Storm water management practices components on this site include the proposed lots, streets, and outlots. See the Second Addition to Autumn Ridge Storm Water Management \& Erosion Control Report, initially dated December 8, 2022 written by D’Onofrio Kottke and Associates, Inc. for drainage area map (Exhibit 4 in Report).
6. Inspection and Maintenance Schedule.
a. All components of the storm water management system shall be inspected by the Responsible Party:
i. At least semiannually in early Spring and early Autumn; and
ii. Within 72 hours following any major storm or flood event of sufficient intensity or duration to pose significant risk of damage to the system.
b. In particular, the following components shall be inspected by the Responsible Party:
i. The Owner shall visually inspect basins and outlet structures by checking for potential problems such as: subsidence, erosion, tree growth in and around the embankment and outfall structure, sediment accumulation, clogging of outfall structure, and damage to the emergency spillway.
ii. The surface water retained in the infiltration basin areas shall have a maximum drawdown time of 24 hours following cessation of rainfall. The standard test for failure of the infiltration system is the presence of surface water retained beyond said 24 -hour period. In the event a failure condition is observed (excluding times of winter diversion), the infiltration system shall be inspected and correction action taken to meet said maximum 24-hour drawdown time.
c. The Responsible Party shall make the appropriate repairs whenever the performance of a storm water management practice or component is compromised due to sediment or debris.
7. Regulations.
a. Mowing in buffer areas, pond banks and drainage ways shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible in order to maximize filtration of runoff. If occasional mowing is necessary, the mowing height shall be no shorter than six inches.
b. Applications of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticide or other chemical applications are prohibited in buffer areas, on pond banks and along drainage ways, unless specifically authorized by the Village Engineer on an individual event basis, and provided that the application is performed by professional personnel certified for that purpose.
8. Maintenance of Inspection Records and Reporting.
a. The Owner shall maintain records of the results of all site inspections and any enforcement actions, correction actions or other documented contacts and any follow-up actions taken by or at the direction of Owner or Responsible Party for seven years after such action.
b. The Owner shall submit to the Village Engineer periodic reports certifying that the storm water controls are functioning as designed. The reports shall conform to the following requirements. The reports shall be:
i. Submitted each of the first two years following completion of the construction of the storm water management system covered by this Agreement, and every even numbered year thereafter.
ii. Submitted in PDF format using the Village's report template, or in other format approved by the Village Engineer, as may be amended from time to time.
iii. Submitted by June 30 of each reporting year.
iv. Certified and sealed by a Professional Engineer or Professional Hydrologist.
c. If failures are noted in any report, Owner shall include with the report a plan and schedule for repair of the failed components of the storm water management system to its design condition, for review and approval by the Village.
d. The Village Engineer shall maintain public records of the results of all Village inspections of the site, shall inform the Owner of the inspection results, and shall indicate any specific corrective actions required to bring the storm water management practice or component into accordance with this Agreement.
9. Default by Responsible Party. In the event that the Village determines that Responsible Party has failed to comply with any of the responsibilities as set forth in this Agreement, the Village shall give written notice to Owner identifying any said default and requiring compliance within five working days of receipt of the notice or such longer period of time as specified by the Village in the notice. In the event Owner fails to complete any actions required to remedy the default within said five day period, unless extended by the Village in writing, Owner consents that Village may enter the property on which private storm water management systems and practices are located, correct the default and charge the cost of such corrective action to Owner. If Owner fails to pay for said costs of corrective action, then Village shall be entitled to place the cost of the corrective action on the tax roll for the Owner's property as a special charge pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 66.0627.
10. Severability. All provisions of this Agreement are severable, and if any one or more provision is deemed unenforceable for any reason, the remaining provisions shall remain in full force and effect.
11. Binding Agreement. All provisions of this Agreement, including the benefits and burdens hereunder, run with the property and are binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their successors and assigns.
12. Amendment; Termination. This Agreement may be amended or terminated by a document signed by the Owner and the Village.
13. Requirement to Record. This Agreement and any subsequent amendments thereto shall be recorded at the Dane County Register of Deeds.
14. Governing Law. This Agreement at all times shall be enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Wisconsin.
15. Assignment. A Responsible Party's obligations may not be assigned to another party without the prior written consent of Village except that such consent is not required when a Responsible Party as property owner transfers fee simple title to a buyer who will assume the maintenance responsibilities of the owner / responsible party. In either case, the Owner, or alternatively the Responsible Party acting on behalf of the Owner, shall notify the Village in writing of the name and contact information of any new Responsible Party.
16. Notices. All notices to be given under the terms of this Agreement shall be in writing and signed by the person serving the notice and shall be sent registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, or hand delivered to the addresses of the parties listed below:

FOR THE VILLAGE:
Office of the Public Works Department Village of Oregon
ATTN: Director of Public Works
117 Spring Street
Oregon, WI 53575
608-835-6290

## FOR THE OWNER:

Office of the Public Works Department Village of Oregon
ATTN: Director of Public Works
117 Spring Street
Oregon, WI 53575
608-835-6290

## DRAFTED BY:

Thomas C. Fahl
D'Onofrio Kottke \& Assoc., Inc.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement as of the date first written above.

## FOR THE OWNER:

By: $\qquad$
Name: $\qquad$
Title: $\qquad$

Date: $\qquad$
STATE OF WISCONSIN
COUNTY OF__, to me known to be the person who executed the foregoing and acknowledged the
same.

Notary Public, State of Wisconsin
Print Name
My Commission: $\qquad$

VILLAGE OF OREGON

By: $\qquad$ By: $\qquad$
Name: Randy Glysch
Name: Candi Jones

Title: Village President
Title:_Village Clerk
$=$
Date: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$

## STATE OF WISCONSIN ) <br> COUNTY OF <br> $\qquad$ ) Ss.

Personally came before me this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ $20 \ldots$, the above-named Martin Shanks and Candi Jones, to me known to be the persons who executed the foregoing and acknowledged the same.

Notary Public, State of Wisconsin
Print Name
My Commission: $\qquad$

Attachment I: Sewer Capacity Study, 2023

# SCOPE OF SERVICES <br> MEMORANDUM 

Date: $\quad$ July 6, 2023<br>To: Jeff Rau, Director of Public Works - Village of Oregon

From: Brian Berquist, P.E., President - Town and Country Engineering
Subject: $\quad$ Sewer System Analysis Results for Park Street Interceptor

The Village of Oregon has planned a residential development on the southeast side of the Village; Autumn's Ridge Phase 3, 4, and 5. In order to ensure the existing sanitary sewer had adequate capacity, Town and Country Engineering conducted a sanitary sewer analysis at the request of the Village. This area was originally studied in 2021, but the current effort reflects the most recent concept plans and sewer routing.

## Sewer Area

Collector and interceptor sewers for the Park Street interceptor were modeled to confirm adequate capacity exists for the planned development. The Park Street interceptor will be experiencing additional flow from the Autumn Ridge Phase 3, 4, and 5 developments, which includes residential sewer flows. Sewer flows from these areas travel the Park Street interceptor prior to being discharged into the pumping station at the WWTP. A map of the Sewer Area being analyzed is included as Attachment A.

## Sewersheds

A key step in modeling and analyzing the existing sewer system is quantifying the flowrate being conveyed to each manhole. This was accomplished by creating a "sewershed" for each manhole. A sewershed is an area of land where all the sewers flow to a single endpoint, or in this case, a manhole. Once the sewershed was determined, the number of homes, businesses, etc. was totaled so that a total flow for this area could be calculated.

## Sewer Drainage Information

In order to properly analyze the sanitary sewer that will be affected by the planned developments, the manhole elevations and pipe inverts had to be determined. The Village of Oregon currently has manhole rim and invert elevations for the majority of the sewer system location in their GIS mapping system, obtained by using a handheld GPS device. As the vertical accuracy of the GPS unit can vary by up to 3 feet, it was necessary that the accurate manhole rims and pipe inverts were collected. 26 of the 30 manhole rims within the sewershed were surveyed by Town and Country with precise survey equipment, with an accuracy of 0.02 ft . The 4 remaining rim elevations were found using contours from the Village of Oregon GIS mapping system and estimated to the nearest 0.25 ft . The pipe inverts were calculated using the surveyed/contour rim elevations and the depth provided in the Village of Oregon GIS mapping system.

## Existing Flow

To quantify the existing sanitary flows in the sewer, sewer sales records were obtained from the Village and broken down by billing category (Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Public Authority.) The residential flows were summarized for an annual daily usage, per meter. For 20182020, the annual daily flow rate per residential meter was 130 gallons per day. For the multi-family developments multiple methods were applied for estimating flow. Where applicable individual sewer bills were requested and summarized. If sewer bills were not requested an average daily usage of 80 gallons per day was applied to each unit except for the Oregon Apartments. For the Oregon Apartments a flow per square feet of rooftop conversion factor was found using the 20182020 average sewer bills of 218 Wolfe St. and 101 Elliot St. and an aerial measurement in the

Oregon GIS mapping system of the rooftops. This conversion factor was 0.161 gallon per day per square foot of rooftop. The multi-family usage is on average less than the residential to reflect the variety of unit sizes (i.e. studio, 3-bedroom.) For commercial lots, 2018-2020 sewer bills were requested and then averaged. An average of 241 gallons per day per commercial meter resulted and was applied. In addition, individual sewer bills from the Oregon Hotel were obtained, as they also are a contributor to the sanitary system being analyzed. To calculate peak flows, a peaking factor of 4 was applied to the average daily flows, in accordance with NR 110. Based on existing information, the peak flow rate at the furthest downstream manhole (Manhole 698) is estimated to be approximately 482 gpm .

## Future Flows

Future flows for the planned development were determined by taking the number of residential housing units, and applying the average daily flow rate of 130 gpm per unit. When the future flows were added to the existing flows, Manhole 698 had a peak flow rate of approximately 540 gpm . A table of existing and future flows is included as Attachment B.

## Modeling

Once the flows and sewer information was obtained and verified, a model of the existing system was creating using AutoCAD Storm and Sanitary Analysis. GIS data, as well as CAD survey information was imported into the program to model the existing system. Flows were added at each manhole to represent the sewersheds contributing to each manhole.

## Results

Modeling of the sanitary system indicated that the sanitary sewer interceptors do have adequate capacity for the planned developments and associated flows. The sewer capacity was compared to a "full pipe" condition, the level of water equal to, but not exceeding, the diameter of the pipe. A full pipe is considered to be at $100 \%$ capacity. Actual capacity varies from segment to segment based upon pipe diameter and slope.

The anticipated capacity utilized ratios varied in the system from $8 \%$ to $70 \%$, and can be viewed in the sanitary sewer analysis results, located in Attachment C. A map of the Park Street sewershed was created to graphically display the various flows through the system, and is included as Attachment D. Profile sections of the sanitary model are included as Attachment E.

In addition to the pipe capacity, the manholes were also analyzed to determine if they would experience surcharging during peak flows. Surcharging occurs in a manhole when the rate of water entering is greater that the capacity of the outlet pipe. A manhole is determined to be surcharged when the water level in the manhole rises about the top of the outlet pipe. Based on the model, none of the manholes within this analysis will surcharge.


## Attachment B

| Existing Sewershed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Future Sewershed |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MH ID | Residential homes (\#) | Residential <br> Daily Flow (gal/day) | Multi-family Daily Flow (gal/day) | Industrial Daily Flow (gal/day) | Commercial <br> Daily Flow (gal/day) | Public Authority Daily Flow (gal/day) | Total Daily Flow (gal/day) | Total Cumulative Flow (gpm) | Peak Flow (gpm) | Residential homes (\#) | Residential <br> Daily Flow (gal/day) | Commercial Daily Flow (gpd) | Total Daily <br> Flow (gpd) | Future Peak Flow (gpm) | Future <br> Cumulative <br> Flow (gpm) | Future Peak Cumulative Flow (gpm) |
| 698 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 121 | 482 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 135 | 540 |
| 106 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 121 | 482 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 135 | 540 |
| 107 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 642 | 642 | 121 | 482 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 135 | 540 |
| 108 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 120 | 481 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 135 | 538 |
| 502 | 74 | 9,694 |  |  |  |  | 9,768 | 120 | 481 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 135 | 538 |
| 109 | 1 | 131 |  |  |  |  | 132 | 113 | 453 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 128 | 511 |
| 110 | 572 | 74,932 | 17,244 | 2,542 | 2,050 |  | 97,339 | 113 | 453 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 128 | 511 |
| 111 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 46 | 183 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 60 | 240 |
| 112 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 46 | 183 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 60 | 240 |
| 113 | 12 | 1,572 | 3,765 |  |  |  | 5,349 | 46 | 183 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 60 | 240 |
| 114 | 12 | 1,572 | 1,970 |  |  |  | 3,554 | 42 | 168 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 56 | 225 |
| 115 | 9 | 1,179 |  |  |  |  | 1,188 | 39 | 158 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 54 | 216 |
| 116 | 124 | 16,244 | 1975 |  | 2650 |  | 20,993 | 39 | 155 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 53 | 212 |
| 117 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 24 | 96 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 38 | 154 |
| 289 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 24 | 96 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 38 | 154 |
| 1172 | 88 | 11,528 | 5,202 |  | 964 |  | 17,782 | 24 | 96 | 12 | 1,572 |  | 1,572 | 4 | 38 | 154 |
| 119 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 12 | 47 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 25 | 100 |
| 681 | 7 | 917 | 3497 | 3,065 | 964 |  | 8,450 | 12 | 47 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 25 | 100 |
| 688 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 6 | 23 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 19 | 77 |
| 654 | 49 | 6,419 |  |  |  |  | 6,468 | 6 | 23 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 19 | 77 |
| 690 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 15 | 59 |
| 738 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 15 | 59 |
| 739 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 15 | 59 |
| 740 | 15 | 1,965 |  |  |  |  | 1,980 | 1 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 15 | 59 |
| 741 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 742 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 743 | 36 | 4,716 |  |  |  |  | 4,752 | 4 | 16 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 13 | 13 | 53 |
| 744 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 10 | 40 |
| 745 | 7 | 917 |  |  |  |  | 924 | 1 | 3 | 103 | 13,493 |  | 13,493 | 40 | 10 | 40 |
| Stub |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Oregon Sanitary Sewer Analysis
Village of Oregon
7/6/2023

## Attachment C

Future Flow Conditions

| Element ID | From (Inlet) Node | To (Outlet) Node | Length <br> (ft) | Inlet <br> Invert <br> Elevation <br> (ft) | Outlet Invert Elevation <br> (ft) | Total <br> Drop <br>  <br>  <br> (ft) | Average Slope | Pipe Diameter or Height (inches) | Peak <br> Flow <br> (gpm) |  | Design Flow Capacity (gpm) | Max Flow / Design Flow Ratio | Max <br> Flow Depth / <br> Total Depth Ratio | Max <br> Flow <br> Depth <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pipe - (928) | STUB | SANMH 745 | 35 | 949.34 | 949.06 | 0.28 | 0.80 | 8.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 525 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Pipe - (929) | SANMH 745 | SANMH 744 | 409 | 949.04 | 946.37 | 2.67 | 0.65 | 8.0 | 40 | 1.84 | 475 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.13 |
| Pipe - (930) | SANMH 744 | SANMH 743 | 322 | 946.21 | 942.76 | 3.45 | 1.07 | 8.0 | 40 | 2.18 | 608 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.12 |
| Pipe - (931) | SANMH 743 | SANMH 740 | 360 | 942.75 | 941.05 | 1.70 | 0.47 | 8.0 | 53 | 1.78 | 404 | 0.13 | 0.24 | 0.16 |
| Pipe - (903) | SANMH 742 | SANMH 741 | 401 | 955.78 | 950.57 | 5.21 | 1.30 | 8.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 670 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Pipe - (904) | SANMH 741 | SANMH 740 | 313 | 950.57 | 941.01 | 9.56 | 3.05 | 8.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 1027 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Pipe - (905) | SANMH 740 | SANMH 739 | 165 | 941.00 | 940.09 | 0.91 | 0.55 | 8.0 | 59 | 1.94 | 436 | 0.14 | 0.25 | 0.17 |
| Pipe - (906) | SANMH 739 | SANMH 738 | 292 | 940.09 | 938.86 | 1.23 | 0.42 | 8.0 | 59 | 1.77 | 381 | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.18 |
| Pipe - (907) | SANMH 738 | SANMH 690 | 220 | 938.85 | 936.62 | 2.23 | 1.01 | 8.0 | 59 | 2.41 | 591 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.14 |
| Pipe - (908) | SANMH 690 | SANMH 654 | 197 | 936.28 | 935.12 | 1.16 | 0.59 | 8.0 | 59 | 1.99 | 451 | 0.13 | 0.24 | 0.16 |
| Pipe - (909) | SANMH 654 | SANMH 688 | 296 | 935.10 | 933.65 | 1.45 | 0.49 | 8.0 | 76 | 2.00 | 411 | 0.18 | 0.29 | 0.19 |
| Pipe - (910) | SANMH 688 | SANMH 681 | 246 | 933.65 | 932.22 | 1.43 | 0.58 | 8.0 | 76 | 2.13 | 448 | 0.17 | 0.28 | 0.19 |
| Pipe - (911) | SANMH 681 | SANMH 119 | 276 | 931.62 | 927.86 | 3.76 | 1.36 | 8.0 | 100 | 3.12 | 686 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.17 |
| Pipe - (912) | SANMH 119 | SANMH 1172 | 403 | 927.80 | 926.13 | 1.67 | 0.41 | 8.0 | 100 | 2.04 | 378 | 0.26 | 0.35 | 0.23 |
| Pipe - (913) | SANMH 1172 | SANMH 289 | 41 | 926.03 | 925.93 | 0.10 | 0.24 | 8.0 | 154 | 1.88 | 291 | 0.53 | 0.52 | 0.35 |
| Pipe - (914) | SANMH 289 | SANMH 117 | 112 | 925.90 | 925.09 | 0.81 | 0.73 | 10.0 | 154 | 2.76 | 908 | 0.17 | 0.28 | 0.23 |
| Pipe - (915) | SANMH 117 | SANMH 116 | 116 | 925.09 | 924.78 | 0.31 | 0.27 | 10.0 | 154 | 1.93 | 551 | 0.28 | 0.36 | 0.30 |
| Pipe - (916) | SANMH 116 | SANMH 115 | 345 | 924.76 | 923.70 | 1.06 | 0.31 | 10.0 | 213 | 2.22 | 591 | 0.36 | 0.42 | 0.35 |
| Pipe - (917) | SANMH 115 | SANMH 114 | 317 | 923.70 | 923.32 | 0.38 | 0.12 | 10.0 | 216 | 1.90 | 476 | 0.45 | 0.47 | 0.39 |
| Pipe - (918) | SANMH 114 | SANMH 113 | 323 | 923.31 | 922.23 | 1.08 | 0.33 | 10.0 | 226 | 2.32 | 616 | 0.37 | 0.42 | 0.35 |
| Pipe - (919) | SANMH 113 | SANMH 112 | 333 | 922.21 | 921.71 | 0.50 | 0.15 | 10.0 | 241 | 1.95 | 476 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.42 |
| Pipe - (920) | SANMH 112 | SANMH 111 | 362 | 921.65 | 920.75 | 0.90 | 0.25 | 10.0 | 241 | 2.12 | 531 | 0.45 | 0.47 | 0.39 |
| Pipe - (921) | SANMH 111 | SANMH 110 | 371 | 920.71 | 919.93 | 0.78 | 0.21 | 12.0 | 241 | 1.97 | 794 | 0.30 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| Pipe - (922) | SANMH 110 | SANMH 109 | 371 | 919.83 | 919.09 | 0.74 | 0.20 | 12.0 | 511 | 2.35 | 775 | 0.66 | 0.59 | 0.59 |
| Pipe - (923) | SANMH 109 | SANMH 502 | 181 | 919.09 | 918.68 | 0.41 | 0.23 | 12.0 | 511 | 2.46 | 825 | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| Pipe - (924) | SANMH 502 | SANMH 108 | 142 | 918.68 | 918.42 | 0.26 | 0.18 | 12.0 | 539 | 2.37 | 775 | 0.70 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Pipe - (925) | SANMH 108 | SANMH 107 | 300 | 918.40 | 917.65 | 0.75 | 0.25 | 12.0 | 539 | 2.59 | 867 | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| Pipe - (926) | SANMH 107 | SANMH 106 | 399 | 917.65 | 916.61 | 1.04 | 0.26 | 12.0 | 539 | 2.63 | 885 | 0.61 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| Pipe - (927) | SANMH 106 | Out-1Pipe - (927) | 222 | 916.50 | 916.10 | 0.40 | 0.18 | 12.0 | 539 | 2.37 | 775 | 0.70 | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Highlighted pipes are above $50 \%$ of full capacity during peak flow
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Attachment J: CTH MM Traffic Study, 2023

June 7, 2023

Mr. Jeffrey Rau
Village of Oregon
101 Alpine Parkway
Oregon, WI 53575
Re: Intersection Control Evaluation-Wolfe Street and Foxfield Road Village of Oregon, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Rau:
Enclosed is one copy of the final Intersection Control Evaluation for the intersection of Wolfe Street and Foxfield Road.

The evaluation concluded that Phases 3, 4, and 5 of the Autumn Ridge Development will not negatively impact traffic operations on the County Highway MM corridor. The intersection is anticipated to operate acceptably through the horizon year 2033.

Please call 608-251-4843 with questions.
Sincerely,
STRAND ASSOCIATES, INC. ${ }^{\circledR}$


Kyle R. Henderson, P.E.
Enclosure: Report

## Report for Village of Oregon, Wisconsin

Intersection Control Evaluation-Wolfe Street and Foxfield Road


Prepared by:
STRAND ASSOCIATES, INC. ${ }^{\circledR}$
910 West Wingra Drive
Madison, WI 53715
www.strand.com
June 2023
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## INTRODUCTION

Strand Associates, Inc. ${ }^{\circledR}$ (Strand) was hired by the Village of Oregon (Village) to prepare an Intersection Control Evaluation for the intersection of County Highway (CTH) MM (Wolfe Street) and Foxfield Road due to the construction of Phases 3, 4, and 5 of the Autumn Ridge Development (Development). Phases 3, 4, and 5 are located east of Wolfe Street require the construction of an east leg to the intersection. The Village is investigating the required intersection geometry to accommodate the construction of the east leg.

This analysis includes the following:

1. Evaluates the impact of new trips generated by the Development in the existing 2023 and horizon year 2033 traffic conditions for weekday AM and PM peak hours.
2. Evaluates traffic signal warrants.
3. Evaluates traffic operations at the intersection in both 2023 and 2033.

The project site location is shown in Figure 1.


Figure 1 Project Location

## TRAFFIC DATA

Strand performed an 8 -hour traffic count on Thursday, May 18, 2023, between the hours of 6 and 10 A.M. and 2 and 6 P.M. Figure 2 shows the 2023 existing peak hour traffic volumes at the intersection.


Figure 22023 Existing Traffic Summary

## TRIP GENERATION AND ASSIGNMENT

## A. Trip Generation

The trip generation for the Development Phases 3, 4, and 5 used rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE's) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition. The proposed Development includes single-family detached housing; therefore, the weekday AM and PM peak hours were selected for analysis. Table 1 shows the weekday AM and PM peak hour trip generation. Full trip generation calculations are shown in Appendix A.

| New Automobile Trips Breakdown |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM |  | PM |  |  |
|  | Total <br> Entering | Total <br> Leaving | Total <br> Entering | Total <br> Leaving |  |
|  | Single-Family <br> Detached Housing | 20 | 61 | 69 | 40 |

Table 1 Trip Generation

## B. Trip Distribution and Assignment

Vehicle trips were assigned assuming 75 percent of all traffic approaches and departs the Development from the north. The assumed trip assignment is shown in Figure 3. The 2023 total traffic summary is shown in Figure 4. The background growth and total traffic summary for 2033 are shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively.


Figure 3 Trip Assignment


Figure 42023 Total Traffic Summary


Figure 52033 Background Traffic Growth


Figure 62033 Total Traffic Summary

## SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS

Traffic signal warrants for the intersection were analyzed following the guidelines from the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Warrants 1, 2, and 3 were evaluated for Eight-Hour, Four-Hour, and Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume, respectively. Traffic Signal Warrants 1, 2, and 3 were not satisfied. Plots of the evaluated Traffic Signal Warrants are located in Appendix B.

## SYNCHRO ANALYSIS

The evaluation used Synchro/SimTraffic 11 software to analyze current and future traffic conditions in the study area. Results following the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition procedures are reported for this analysis and available in full in Appendix C. Motor vehicle traffic operations are evaluated based on a Level of Service (LOS) scale. Intersections and turning movements that operate with very low delay and backups are considered to operate at LOS A. When an intersection or individual turning movement has volumes that exceed its capacity, the operations are LOS F. LOS values of B, C, D, and E represent the conditions in between the two ends of the scale.

## A. Existing 2023

The Existing 2023 Model evaluates 2023 existing traffic volumes with no improvements to roadway geometry before construction of the east leg of Foxfield Road. All movements at the intersection operate at LOS B or better in the Existing 2023 Model in both the AM and PM peaks.

## B. Future No-Build 2033

The Future No-Build 2033 Model evaluates 2033 background traffic growth volumes with no improvements to roadway geometry before construction of the east leg of Foxfield Road. All movements at the intersection operate at LOS C or better in the Future No-Build 2033 model in both the AM and PM peaks.

## C. Improved 2023

The Improved 2023 Model evaluates 2023 total traffic volumes after construction of the east leg of Foxfield Road. All movements at the intersection operate at LOS C or better in the Improved 2023 Model in both the AM and PM peaks.

## D. Future Improved 2033

The Future Improved 2033 model evaluates 2033 total traffic volumes after construction of the east leg of Foxfield Road. All movements at the intersection operate at LOS C or better in the Future Improved 2033 Model in both the AM and PM peaks.

## CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the warehouse development yielded the following conclusions:

1. The Development will not negatively impact traffic operations on the CTH MM corridor.
2. The intersection is anticipated to operate acceptably through 2033. The intersection should have stop control on the eastbound and westbound approaches and the following geometry:
a. Northbound-One Left/Through lane, one 200-foot, right-turn lane
b. Southbound-One Left/Through lane, one 200-foot, right-turn lane
c. Eastbound-One Left/Through/Right lane
d. Westbound-One Left/Through/Right lane

Village of Oregon, Wisconsin
Intersection Control Evaluation-Wolfe Street and Foxfield Road
Appendix A-Traffic Distribution Calculations


Table A-1 New Automobile Trips

| Land Use |  | Land Use No. | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Entering | \% Leaving | Total Entering | Total Leaving | \% Entering |  | Total Entering | Total Leaving |
| 2023 and 2033 | Single Family Detached Housing |  | 210 | 25\% | 75\% | 20 | 61 | 63\% | 37\% | 69 | 40 |

Table A-2 New Automobile Trips Breakdown

APPENDIX B
TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## Wisconsin Department of Transportation Traffic Signal Warrant Summary Worksheet

The Worksheet(s) attached are provided as an attachment to the Engineering Investigation Study for:

Intersection: Wolfe Street and Foxfield Road
County: Dane
Village: Oregon

| Major Street: Wolfe Street (CTH M M ) | Minor Street: Foxfield Road |
| :--- | :---: |
| Critical Approach Speed: 45 mph | Critical Approach Speed: 25 mph |
| Lanes: | 2 or more lanes |
|  | Lanes: 1 lane |
| \% Right Turns Included | In built-up area of isolated community of <10,000 population? Yes |
| From North (SB) $0 \%$ | Total number of approaches at intersection? 4 or more |
| From East (WB) $0 \%$ | If it is a "T" intersection, inflate minor threshold to $150 \%$ ? No |
| From South (NB) $0 \%$ | Manually set volume level? 70\% |

Analysis based on EXISTING volume data.

| Date | Day of the Week | Time $(\mathrm{HH}: \mathrm{MM})$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From | $\mathrm{AM} / \mathrm{PM}$ | To | $\mathrm{AM} / \mathrm{PM}$ |
| $5 / 18 / 2023$ | Thursday | $6: 00$ | AM | $10: 00$ | AM |
| $5 / 18 / 2023$ | Thursday | $2: 00$ | PM | $6: 00$ | PM |


| Warrant Evaluation Summary | Warrant Met: |
| :--- | :---: |
| Warrant 1: Eight - Hour Vehicular Volume | No |
| Condition A: M inimum Vehicular Volume | No |
| Condition B: Interruption of Continuous Traffic |  |
| Condition C: Combination: $80 \%$ of A and B | No |
| Warrant 2: Four-Hour Volume | No |
| Warrant 3: Peak Hour Volume | No |
| Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume | No |
| Criterion A: Four-Hour | N/A |
| Criterion B: Peak-Hour |  |
| Warrant 5: School Crossing | N/A |
| Warrant 6: Coordinated Signal System | N/A |
| Warrant 7: Crash Experience | N/A |
| Warrant 8: Roadway Network | N/A |
| Warrant 9: Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | N/A |

## Warrant Analysis Conducted By:

Name: Kurt Walker
Agency: Strand Associates, Inc.
Date: 5/30/2023

| Warrant Evaluated? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition A : |  |  |
| Min. Veh. Volume |  |  |
| Volume Level | 70\% | 56\% |
| M ajor Rd. Req | 420 | 336 |
| M inor Rd. Req | 105 | 84 |
| Number of Hours | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | tisfied? |


| Condition B: |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Interruption of Continuous Traffic |  |  |
| Volume Level | $70 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| M ajor Rd. Req | 630 | 504 |
| M inor Rd. Req | 53 | 42 |
| Number of Hours | 0 | 3 |

Satisfied? No

## Condition C :

Combination of $A \& B$ at $56 \%$
Satisfied? No

Warrant Evaluated? Yes

| Hour Start | $16: 00$ | $7: 00$ | $15: 00$ | $17: 00$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M ajor Road Vol. | 708 | 534 | 541 | 527 |
| M inor Road Vol. | 47 | 63 | 45 | 34 |

Manually Set To:

| 6:00 AM |  |  | Enter Start Time (M ilitary Time) (HH:M M) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time <br> Period | From | To | Major Road: Both <br> App. (VPH) | Minor Road: <br> High App. (VPH) |
| 1 | $6: 00$ | $7: 00$ | 414 | 28 |
| 2 | $7: 00$ | $8: 00$ | 534 | 63 |
| 3 | $8: 00$ | $9: 00$ | 413 | 48 |
| 4 | $9: 00$ | $10: 00$ | 297 | 24 |
| 5 | $10: 00$ | $11: 00$ | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | $11: 00$ | $12: 00$ | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | $12: 00$ | $13: 00$ | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | $13: 00$ | $14: 00$ | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | $14: 00$ | $15: 00$ | 398 | 16 |
| 10 | $15: 00$ | $16: 00$ | 541 | 45 |
| 11 | $16: 00$ | $17: 00$ | 708 | 47 |
| 12 | $17: 00$ | $18: 00$ | 527 | 34 |
| 13 | $18: 00$ | $19: 00$ | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | $19: 00$ | $20: 00$ | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | $20: 00$ | $21: 00$ | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | $21: 00$ | $22: 00$ | 0 | 0 |

Total

# Warrant 2: Four-Hour Volume 

Warrant Satisfied? No Manually Set To:


Warrant Evaluated? Yes
Condition justifying use of warrant:

| Criteria |  | Met? |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Delay on M inor Approach | 4 |  |
| Volume on M inor Approach | 100 | No |
| Total Entering Volume (veh/h) | 800 |  |

Manually Set Peak Hour?

| Peak Hour | Major Road Vol. <br> (Both App.) | Minor Road Vol. <br> (High App.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 00$ | 708 | 47 |

Warrant Satisfied? No
Manually Set To:


Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume

## Warrant Evaluated?

Criterion A: Four Hour

| Hour <br> (Start) | Pedestrian <br> Volume | M ajor <br> Road Vol. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0 |
|  |  | 0 |
|  |  | 0 |
|  |  | 0 |

Manually Set Major Rd Vol?
Avg. walk speed less than $3.5 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ ?

## Criterion A Satisfied?

Criterion B: Peak Hour

| Peak Hour | Pedestrian <br> Vol. | M ajor <br> Road Vol. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0: 00$ | 0 | 0 |

## Criterion B Satisfied?

Warrant Satisfied? N/A
M anually Set To:


## APPENDIX C

 SYNCHRO RESULTS| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 698 | 407 | 462 | 0 | - |
| Stage 1 | 407 | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 291 | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.5 | 6.3 | 4.17 | - | - |

HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1073 | -451 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.014 | -0.166 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.4 | -14.6 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | 0.6 | - |
| H | - |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{Y}$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 85 | 24 | 14 | 455 | 129 | 20 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 85 | 24 | 14 | 455 | 129 | 20 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | 130 | - | - | 120 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 18 | 18 |
| Mvmt Flow | 90 | 26 | 15 | 484 | 137 | 21 |









| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1073 | - | -319 | 510 | 1284 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.014 | - | -0.235 | 0.085 | 0.044 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.4 | 0 | - | 19.7 | 12.7 | 7.9 | 0 |






Attachment K: 2020 Village Facilities Plan

Village of Oregon 2020 Facilities Plan
https://www.vil.oregon.wi.us/vertical/sites/\{3631401E-89E6-4B18-B72B-
25DC241CC205\%7D/uploads/Village of Oregon WWTP Facility Plan(1).pdf

Attachment L: Autumn Ridge 1st Addition Stormwater Report

# FIRST ADDITION TO AUTUMN RIDGE VILLAGE OF OREGON DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN 

## STORM WATER MANAGEMENT REPORT

## OWNER

Glenn \& Michelle Hofer Living Trust
610 Ondossagon Way
Madison, WI 53719

June 10, 2021

PREPARED BY
D'Onofrio, Kottke \& Associates, Inc.
7530 Westward Way
Madison, Wisconsin 53717
608.833.7530

FN: 20-05-162
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## INTRODUCTION

The intent of this report is to provide details on how the proposed "First Addition to Autumn Ridge" residential plat will be developed so that it is constructed in accordance with applicable storm water management standards.

The proposed development is approximately a 19-acre plat located in the Village of Oregon. The site is located just to the West of County Hwy MM (Wolfe St.), and South of Foxfield Road in the NW $1 / 4$ of the SE $1 / 4$, Section 13, Township 05N, Range 09E. More specifically parcel number 0509-134-8500-0 Village of Oregon, Dane County, Wisconsin. A project location map can be found in Exhibit \#1.

The existing layout of the site consists of predominantly agricultural tilled land with surface water generally draining from north and west to the southeast corner of the site. The surface water eventually drains out of the southeast corner of the plat. In developed conditions the site will create approximately 31 single family lots and 2 Outlots. The residential plat area will predominantly be routed to a proposed wet detention/infiltration basin system for treatment. The soil conditions on site consist of hydrologic soil group type B soils. A site soils map can be found in Exhibit \#2.

The proposed improvements for this plat requires land disturbing activity in excess of one acre and the future cumulative addition of 20,000 square feet of impervious surface area. Therefore, according to the Village of Oregon and State of Wisconsin ordinances, the site requires storm water management approvals and permits.

## STANDARDS \& RESULTS

The proposed development requires the following storm water management performance standards.

## Sediment Control

Standard: Reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, total suspended solids load leaving the site by eighty percent ( $80 \%$ ) based on the average annual rainfall.

Design Results: Sediment from the site will be reduced by $80 \%$ by routing the site runoff to a wet detention basin in the Southeast corner of the plat. WinSLAMM was used for modeling the sediment load reduction. See appendix B for sediment reduction calculations. Water leaving the site to the southeast will be clean runoff mostly from yards and roofs.

## Temperature Control

Standard: For development of sites within thermally sensitive areas, provisions and practices to reduce the temperature of the storm water runoff shall be included.

Design Results: The proposed site does not fall within a defined thermally sensitive area.

## Runoff Rate Control

Standard: For new developments, storm water management practices shall be designed and implemented to maintain post-development peak runoff discharge rates at predevelopment rates for the 1 yr and $2 \mathrm{yr}-24$ hour design storm event. Reduce the peak runoff rates for the $10 \mathrm{yr}-24 \mathrm{hr}$ storm event to the $2 \mathrm{yr}-24$ hour predevelopment peak flow rate. Reduce the $100 \mathrm{yr}-24 \mathrm{hr}$ storm event to the $10 \mathrm{yr}-24 \mathrm{hr}$ predevelopment peak flow rate.

Design Results: The basin system will maintain the required peak runoff rates for the $1,2,10$, and 100 year- 24 hour storm events. The peak flow comparison chart for site can be found in the stormwater management measures section of this report and the HydroCAD output can be found within Appendix D. The disturbed areas will be deep tilled prior to restoration to maintain existing soils classes.

## Infiltration

Standard: For new developments, design practices to infiltrate sufficient runoff volume so the post-development infiltration volume shall be at least $90 \%$ of the predevelopment infiltration volume.

Design Results: The proposed development was designed to meet the $90 \%$ stayon requirement through an infiltration basin. The infiltration basin was sized using WinSLAMM modeling software. A minimum of $60 \%$ sediment reduction will occur in the proposed wet detention basin cell prior to entering the designed infiltration basin. Along with meeting the $90 \%$ stayon requirement, the basin was also designed to match the existing volume runoff for the 50 year storm event. The infiltration design calculations can be found in Appendix C.

## STORM WATER MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The site generally drains to the southeast corner of the plat in existing and proposed conditions. The stormwater from the site will be treated by routing runoff to a wet detention/infiltration basin systems located at the southeast side of the plat. Peak flow, sediment reduction, and stayon requirements will be met for the entire plat within this system.

HydroCAD Stormwater Modeling software has been used to analyze the stormwater runoff characteristics for the development. HydroCAD uses the TR-55 methodology for determining peak discharge rates. The model output shows the runoff leaving the site in existing and proposed conditions. The site was designed to utilize a combination wet detention basin and infiltration basin system prior to leaving the site in proposed conditions. In this system, the wet detention chamber in will limit flow into the infiltration basin chamber for the 1yr-24hr storm event to remove sediment before entering the infiltration basin. During larger storms, the two chambers in the basin systems will act as one basin to limit peak flow from the site (see basin details in Appendix A).The detention and infiltration basins were modeled dynamically to better represent the elevations of the two chambers working together. The peak flow results from the stormwater modeling and basin design are shown in the chart on the next page. The chart shows the proposed results from the drainage area along with a comparison of the runoff volume leaving the site through the 50 yr storm event. The detention basin system will maintain the peak runoff rates leaving the plat per the Village's requirements.

WinSLAMM was used to perform the sediment reduction calculations for the proposed site. Appendix B contains the calculation results. The stormwater management system will provide $80 \%$ sediment removal. The peak flow results from stormwater modeling and detention basin design are shown in the chart on the next page. This chart shows a comparison of the drainage area in existing conditions and in post construction conditions. Infiltration modeling for the site was calculated using WinSLAMM software and meets the $90 \%$ predevelopment standard per the ordinance. The infiltration basins will be implemented when at a minimum $75 \%$ of the plat area draining to the basin is complete. The infiltration calculations can be found in Appendix C.

## PEAK FLOW COMPARISION CHART First Addition to Autumn Ridge

| First Add to Autumn Ridge - 24-HR STORM EVENT (PEAK FLOW IN CFS)-PEAK FLOW COMPARISION |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10YR | 50YR | 100YR |  |  |
| PHASE 2 DRAINAGE AREA | 2YR | 1YR |  |  |  |
| Existing Flow |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Total Treated Flow | 0.7 | 1.7 | 9.0 | 24.9 | 34.4 |
| Proposed Total Untreated Flow | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 5.5 |
| PHASE 2 RUNOFF VOLUME (ACFT) | 10.3 | 15.2 | 35.8 | 68.5 | 56.1 |
| Existing Runoff Volume (ACFT) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Runoff Volume Treated (ACFT) | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 3.5 |
| Proposed Runoff Volume Untreated (ACFT) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 2.6 | 3.6 |
| PHASE 2 BASIN DESIGN | 0.8 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 4.4 | 5.5 |
| Routed Detention Basin to Infiltration Basin |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elevation (Top =991, Outlet =986) | 0.5 | 0.6 | 7.6 | 47.2 | 71.5 |
| Routed Infiltration Basin to Offsite | 987.41 | 987.98 | 988.87 | 989.53 | 989.77 |
| Elevation (Top =982, Bottom=977) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 5.5 |

## CONCLUSIONS

As the results indicate, the storm water management system for the proposed development meets the Village of Oregon and State of Wisconsin Ordinances. The peak flow, sediment control and infiltration requirements have been addressed and met for this site.

EXHIBITS


## D'ONOFRIO KOTTKE AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

7530 Westward Way, Madison, WI 53717 Phone: 608.833.7530 - Fax: 608.833.1089
YOUR NATURAL RESOURCE FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT

## LOCATION MAP <br> AUTUMN RIDGE - PHASE II

VILLAGE OF OREGON, DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN






## AUTUMN RIDGE - PHASE II



NOTE: NO WETLAND INDICATORS LOCATED ON SITE

| $\checkmark$ | WETLAND INDICATOR MAP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D'ONOFRIO KOTTKE AND ASSOCIATES, INC. | AUTUMN RIDGE - PHASE II |  |
| 7530 Westward Way, Madison, WI 53717 <br> Phone: 608.833.7530 - Fax: 608.833.1089 |  |  |
| Your natural resource for land development | VILLAGE OF OREGON, DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN |  |
|  |  | EXHIBIT 7 |

APPENDIX A

## DETENTION POND \& INFLITRATION BASIN DETAIL



## APPENDIX B

## SEDIMENT REDUCTION CALCULATIONS

# DETENTION BASIN SEDIMENTATION REDUCTION CALCULATIONS (SLAMM) 

WinSlamm Design

The following Slamm design shows that $80 \%$ of sediment is being removed from the proposed site

## Model Schematic:



## Model Input Information:

[^12]```
1-Roofs 1: 1.790 ac. Pitched Disconnected Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
2-Roofs 2: 0.920 ac. Pitched Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
25-Driveways 1:1.190 ac. Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
37-Streets 1: 1.520 ac. Intermediate Street Length = 1.045 curb-mi Street Width (assuming two curb-mi per street mile) = 24 ft
    Default St. Dirt Accum. Annual Winter Load = 2500 lbs Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
45-Large Landscaped Areas 1: 12.880 ac. Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
70 - Water Body Areas: 0.800 ac. Source Area PSD File
```

Control Practice 1: Wet Detention Pond CP\# 1 (DS) - Ph 2 Wet Detention
Particle Size Distribution file name: Not needed - calculated by program
Initial stage elevation (ft): 6
Peak to Average Flow Ratio: 3.8
Maximum flow allowed into pond (cfs): No maximum value entered
Outlet Characteristics:
Outlet type: Orifice 1
1. Orifice diameter (ft): 0.33
2. Number of orifices: 1
3. Invert elevation above datum (ft): 6
Outlet type: Broad Crested Weir
1. Weir crest length (ft): 30
2. Weir crest width (ft): 10
3. Height from datum to bottom of weir opening: 9
Outlet type: Vertical Stand Pipe
1. Stand pipe diameter (ft): 3
2. Stand pipe height above datum (ft): 8.5
Pond stage and surface area

| Entry <br> Number | Stage <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Pond Area <br> (acres) | Natural Seepage <br> $(\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Other Outflow <br> $(\mathrm{cfs})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.00 | 0.0000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | 0.10 | 0.0500 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 1.00 | 0.0700 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | 2.00 | 0.0800 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 3.00 | 0.1000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 | 4.00 | 0.1200 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 | 5.00 | 0.1400 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | 6.00 | 0.3300 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 | 7.00 | 0.3900 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 9 | 8.00 | 0.4500 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10 | 9.00 | 0.5200 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 11 | 10.00 | 0.5800 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Control Practice 2: Biofilter CP\# 1 (DS) - Ph2 Infiltration Basin
1. Top area (square feet) $=38225$
2. Bottom aea (square feet) $=23860$
3. Depth (ft): 5
4. Biofilter width (ft) - for Cost Purposes Only: 10
5. Infiltration rate $(\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr})=0.5$
6. Random infiltration rate generation? No
7. Infiltration rate fraction (side): 0.01
8. Infiltration rate fraction (bottom): 1
9. Depth of biofilter that is rock filled (ft) 0
10. Porosity of rock filled volume $=0$
11. Engineered soil infiltration rate: 0
12. Engineered soil depth $(\mathrm{ft})=0$
13. Engineered soil porosity $=0$
14. Percent solids reduction due to flow through engineered soil $=0$
15. Biofilter peak to average flow ratio $=3.8$
16. Number of biofiltration control devices $=1$
17. Particle size distribution file: Not needed - calculated by program
18. Initial water surface elevation (ft): 0
Soil Data Soil Type Fraction in Eng. Soil
Biofilter Outlet/Discharge Characteristics:
Outlet type: Broad Crested Weir
1. Weir crest length (ft): 10
2. Weir crest width (ft): 10
3. Height of datum to bottom of weir opening: 4
Outlet type: Vertical Stand Pipe
1. Stand pipe diameter ( ft ): 3
2. Stand pipe height above datum (ft): 3.5
Outlet type: Surface Discharge Pipe
1. Surface discharge pipe outlet diameter (ft): 0.5
2. Pipe invert elevation above datum (ft): 1
3. Number of surface pipe outlets: 1

## Output Sediment Reduction:

```
File Name:
U:\User\2005162\Engineering\SW/MP\Phase 2 SW/ Design\pro ph2 slamm.mdb
```

| Outfall Output Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Runoff Volume (cu. ft.) | Percent Runoff Reduction | Runoff Coefficient (Rv) |  | Particulate Solids Conc. ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) | Particulate Solids Yield (lbs) | Percent Particulate Solids <br> Reduction |
| Total of All Land Uses without Controls | 486470 |  | 0.22 |  | 137.2 | 4167 |  |
| Outfall Total with Controls | 3071 | 99.37\% | 0.00 |  | 33.89 | 6.498 | 99.84\% |
| Current File Output: Annualized Total After Outtall Controls | 3079 | Years in Mo | Run: | 1.00 |  | 6.516 |  |


| Print Output Summary to .csv File |
| :---: |
| Print Output Summary to Text File |
| Print Output Summary to Printer |

Total Area Modeled (ac)

$$
19.100
$$

## Total Control Practice Costs



Total site sediment reduction in developed conditions $=\underline{99.84 \%}$


The chart above shows that over $60 \%$ sediment reduction will occur prior to the infiltration basins.

## APPENDIX C

INFILTRATION DESIGN

## INFILTRATION SIZING FOR THE PROPOSED PLAT

Methodology: To meet infiltration requirements, the following will show that the infiltration design will meet stayon requirements for the site. To establish the infiltration requirements, the site was modeled using WinSLAMM in existing conditions to establish an existing stayon value first. A target stayon value was established as $90 \%$ of the existing value per the ordinance. As shown in the following calculations; The site will meet the required infiltration performance standard in developed conditions

## WinSLAMM Model to Establish Stayon Requirements

## Model Schematic:



## Model Input Information:

[^13]Output Existing Stayon From Plat:

| Data File: U:\User\2005162\Engineering\SWMP\Phase 2 SW Design\Ph2 ex slar |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rain File: WisReg-Madison W/ 1981.RAN |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date: 04-12-21 Time: 3:18:47 PM |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Description: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Runoff Volume Total (cf) at the Outfall |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rain Number | Start Date | Rain Total (in) | Outfall Total (cf) | Rv | Total Losses (in.) |
| 73 | 08/28/81 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.04 |
| 74 | 08/31/81 | 0.03 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.03 |
| 75 | 08/31/81 | 1.52 | 5662 | 0.054 | 1.44 |
| 76 | 09/07/81 | 0.89 | 2656 | 0.043 | 0.85 |
| 77 | 09/11/81 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.08 |
| 78 | 09/16/81 | 0.03 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.03 |
| 79 | 09/21/81 | 0.45 | 735.5 | 0.024 | 0.44 |
| 80 | 09/24/81 | 0.90 | 2692 | 0.043 | 0.86 |
| 81 | 09/26/81 | 0.12 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.12 |
| 82 | 09/28/81 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.10 |
| 83 | 09/29/81 | 0.16 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.16 |
| 84 | 09/30/81 | 0.36 | 434.4 | 0.017 | 0.35 |
| 85 | 10/01/81 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| 86 | 10/04/81 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.15 |
| 87 | 10/05/81 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.04 |
| 88 | 10/05/81 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.02 |
| 89 | 10/09/81 | 0.14 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.14 |
| 90 | 10/13/81 | 1.20 | 4334 | 0.052 | 1.14 |
| 91 | 10/15/81 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.02 |
| 92 | 10/17/81 | 0.95 | 2875 | 0.044 | 0.91 |
| 93 | 10/18/81 | 0.06 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.06 |
| 94 | 10/21/81 | 0.06 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.06 |
| 95 | 10/21/81 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| 96 | 10/24/81 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| 97 | 10/31/81 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| 98 | 11/05/81 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.04 |
| 99 | 11/15/81 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.07 |
| 100 | 11/18/81 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.05 |
| 101 | 11/19/81 | 0.26 | 121.4 | 0.007 | 0.26 |
| 102 | 11/23/81 | 0.18 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.18 |
| 103 | 11/25/81 | 0.89 | 2656 | 0.043 | 0.85 |
| 104 | 11/30/81 | 0.37 | 473.9 | 0.018 | 0.36 |
| 105 | 12/03/81 |  | . | . | . |
| 106 | 12/14/81 |  | - | - | - |
| 107 | 12/20/81 |  | - | - | - |
| 108 | 12/26/81 | - | - | - | - |
| 109 | 12/31/81 | - | - | - | $\cdot$ |
| Minimum: |  | 0.00 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| Maximum: |  | 2.59 | 35914 | 0.200 | 2.07 |
| Average: |  | 0.26 | 1100 | 0.012 | 0.25 |
| Total ${ }_{\sim}$ |  | 28.81 | 119892 |  | 27.09 |
|  | , | , | +: 1 | . |  |

The plat has $\underline{\mathbf{2 7 . 0 9}}$ inches of stayon in existing conditions. $90 \%$ of 27.09 inches $=\underline{\mathbf{2 4 . 4}} \mathbf{\text { inches of stayon required }}$ to meet stayon requirements for the plat.

## Proposed Infiltration Design:

Proposed Site Infiltration Design:
Stayon Required $=24.4$ inches
Note: Assume $0.5 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ infiltration can be attained

## WinSlamm Design

## Model Schematic:



## Model Input Information:

Data file name: U: \User $\backslash 2005162 \backslash$ Engineering $\backslash$ SWMP $\backslash$ Phase 2 SW Design $\backslash$ pro ph2 slamm.mdb WinSLAMM Version 10.4.1
Rain file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ Rain Files $\backslash$ WisReg - Madison WI 1981.RAN
Particulate Solids Concentration file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash v 10.1$ WI_AVG01.pscx Runoff Coefficient file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_SL06 Dec06.rsvx
Residential Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ WI_Res and Other Urban Dec06.std Institutional Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std Commercial Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std Industrial Street Delivery file name: C: $\backslash$ WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std Other Urban Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_Res and Other Urban Dec06.std Freeway Street Delivery file name: C: $\backslash$ WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ Freeway Dec06.std
Apply Street Delivery Files to Adjust the After Event Load Street Dirt Mass Balance: False
Pollutant Relative Concentration file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ WI_GEO03.ppdx
Source Area PSD and Peak to Average Flow Ratio File: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP Source Area PSD Files.csv
Cost Data file name:

If Other Device Pollutant Load Reduction Values = 1, Off-site Pollutant Loads are Removed from Pollutant Load \% Reduction calculations
Seed for random number generator: -42
Study period starting date: 01/01/81 Study period ending date: 12/31/81
Start of Winter Season: 12/02 End of Winter Season: 03/12
Date: 04-12-2021
Time: 15:13:07
Site information:

```
LU# 1- Residential: Pro Ph 2 Site Total area (ac): 19.100
    1-Roofs 1: 1.790 ac. Pitched Disconnected Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
    2-Roofs 2: 0.920 ac. Pitched Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files \NURP.cpz
    25-Driveways 1: 1.190 ac. Connected Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
    37-Streets 1: 1.520 ac. Intermediate Street Length = 1.045 curb-mi Street Width (assuming two curb-mi per street mile) = 24 ft
        Default St. Dirt Accum. Annual Winter Load = 2500 lbs Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
    45-Large Landscaped Areas 1: 12.880 ac. Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C:\WinSLAMM Files\NURP.cpz
    70 - Water Body Areas: 0.800 ac. Source Area PSD File:
```

    Control Practice 1: Wet Detention Pond CP\# 1 (DS) - Ph 2 Wet Detention
        Particle Size Distribution file name: Not needed - calculated by program
        Initial stage elevation (ft): 6
        Peak to Average Flow Ratio: 3.8
        Maximum flow allowed into pond (cfs): No maximum value entered
        Outlet Characteristics:
            Outlet type: Orifice 1
                            1. Orifice diameter (ft): 0.33
                            2. Number of orifices: 1
                            3. Invert elevation above datum (ft): 6
            Outlet type: Broad Crested Weir
                1. Weir crest length (ft): 30
                            2. Weir crest width (ft): 10
                3. Height from datum to bottom of weir opening: 9
            Outlet type: Vertical Stand Pipe
            1. Stand pipe diameter ( ft ): 3
            2. Stand pipe height above datum (ft): 8.5
        Pond stage and surface area
    | Entry <br> Number | Stage <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Pond Area <br> (acres) | Natural Seepage <br> $(\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Other Outflow <br> $(\mathrm{cfs})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.00 | 0.0000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | 0.10 | 0.0500 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 1.00 | 0.0700 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | 2.00 | 0.0800 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 3.00 | 0.1000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 | 4.00 | 0.1200 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 | 5.00 | 0.1400 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | 6.00 | 0.3300 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 | 7.00 | 0.3900 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 9 | 8.00 | 0.4500 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10 | 9.00 | 0.5200 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 11 | 10.00 | 0.5800 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

    Control Practice 2: Biofilter CP\# 1 (DS) - Ph2 Infiltration Basin
        1. Top area (square feet) \(=38225\)
        2. Bottom aea \((\) square feet \()=23860\)
        3. Depth (ft): 5
        4. Biofilter width (ft) - for Cost Purposes Only: 10
        5. Infiltration rate \((\mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr})=0.5\)
        6. Random infiltration rate generation? No
        7. Infiltration rate fraction (side): 0.01
        8. Infiltration rate fraction (bottom): 1
        9. Depth of biofilter that is rock filled (ft) 0
        10. Porosity of rock filled volume \(=0\)
        11. Engineered soil infiltration rate: 0
        12. Engineered soil depth \((\mathrm{ft})=0\)
        13. Engineered soil porosity \(=0\)
        14. Percent solids reduction due to flow through engineered soil \(=0\)
        15. Biofilter peak to average flow ratio \(=3.8\)
    16. Number of biofiltration control devices \(=1\)
    17. Particle size distribution file: Not needed - calculated by program
    18. Initial water surface elevation (ft): 0
    Soil Data Soil Type Fraction in Eng. Soil
    Biofilter Outlet/Discharge Characteristics:
        Outlet type: Broad Crested Weir
    1. Weir crest length (ft): 10
2. Weir crest width ( ft ): 10
3. Height of datum to bottom of weir opening: 4

Outlet type: Vertical Stand Pipe

1. Stand pipe diameter (ft): 3
2. Stand pipe height above datum (ft): 3.5

Outlet type: Surface Discharge Pipe

1. Surface discharge pipe outlet diameter (ft): 0.5
2. Pipe invert elevation above datum (ft): 1
3. Number of surface pipe outlets: 1

## Proposed Infiltration Design:

| Data File: U: UUser\2005162\Engineering\SW/MP\Phase 2 SW Design\pro ph2 sla |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rain File: WisReg-Madison W/ 1981.RAN |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date: 04-12-21 Time: 3:21:38 PM |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Description: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Runoff Volume Total (cf) at the Outfall |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rain Number | Start Date | Rain Total (in) | Outfall Total (cf) | Rvo | Total Losses (in.) |
| 73 | 08/28/81 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.04 |
| 74 | 08/31/81 | 0.03 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.03 |
| 75 | 08/31/81 | 1.52 | 0 | 0.000 | 1.52 |
| 76 | 09/07/81 | 0.89 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.89 |
| 77 | 09/11/81 | 0.08 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.08 |
| 78 | 09/16/81 | 0.03 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.03 |
| 79 | 09/21/81 | 0.45 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.45 |
| 80 | 09/24/81 | 0.90 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.90 |
| 81 | 09/26/81 | 0.12 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.12 |
| 82 | 09/28/81 | 0.10 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.10 |
| 83 | 09/29/81 | 0.16 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.16 |
| 84 | 09/30/81 | 0.36 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.36 |
| 85 | 10/01/81 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| 86 | 10/04/81 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.15 |
| 87 | 10/05/81 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.04 |
| 88 | 10/05/81 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.02 |
| 89 | 10/09/81 | 0.14 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.14 |
| 90 | 10/13/81 | 1.20 | 0 | 0.000 | 1.20 |
| 91 | 10/15/81 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.02 |
| 92 | 10/17/81 | 0.95 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.95 |
| 93 | 10/18/81 | 0.06 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.06 |
| 94 | 10/21/81 | 0.06 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.06 |
| 95 | 10/21/81 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| 96 | 10/24/81 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| 97 | 10/31/81 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| 98 | 11/05/81 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.04 |
| 99 | 11/15/81 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.07 |
| 100 | 11/18/81 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.05 |
| 101 | 11/19/81 | 0.26 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.26 |
| 102 | 11/23/81 | 0.18 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.18 |
| 103 | 11/25/81 | 0.89 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.89 |
| 104 | 11/30/81 | 0.37 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.37 |
| 105 | 12/03/81 |  | . |  |  |
| 106 | 12/14/81 | - | - | - |  |
| 107 | 12/20/81 | - | - |  |  |
| 108 | 12/26/81 | - | - | - |  |
| 109 | 12/31/81 | - | - | - |  |
| Minimum: |  | 0.00 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.01 |
| Maximum: |  | 2.59 | 3071 | 0.017 | 2.55 |
| Average: |  | 0.26 | 28.17 | 0.000 | 0.26 |
| Total: |  | 28.81 | 3071 |  | 28.77 |

28.77 inches of stayon attained on the site in proposed conditions. This exceeds 24.4 inches required in developed conditions

## APPENDIX D

 HYDROCAD OUTPUT

## Existing PH2 AR Site



PH2 Wet Detention


## Proposed PH2 Ouflow

## Summary for Subcatchment 1S: Existing PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=0.70$ cfs @ 12.71 hrs, Volume $=0.209$ af, Depth= $0.13^{\prime \prime}$

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 1yr 24hr Rainfall=2.49"


## Summary for Subcatchment 2S: Proposed PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=\quad 10.33$ cfs @ 12.21 hrs, Volume= $\quad 0.774$ af, Depth= $0.49{ }^{\prime \prime}$
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 1yr 24hr Rainfall=2.49"


### 10.7 1,100 Total

## Summary for Pond 1P: PH2 Wet Detention

| Inflow Area = | 19.100 ac , | 4.19\% Impervious, Inflow Depth = 0.49" for 1yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow | 10.33 cfs @ | 12.21 hrs, Volume= | 0.774 af |  |
| Outflow | 0.47 cfs @ | 15.68 hrs , Volume= | 0.750 af , | Atten= 95\%, Lag= 208.1 min |
| Primary | 0.47 cfs @ | 15.68 hrs, Volume= | 0.750 af |  |
| Secondary = | 0.00 cfs @ | 0.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 987.41' @ 15.68 hrs Surf.Area= 15,493 sf Storage= 19,375 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=545.1$ min calculated for 0.750 af ( $97 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=530.3 \mathrm{~min}(1,404.3-874.0)$


Primary OutFlow Max=0.47 cfs @ 15.68 hrs HW=987.41' TW=977.08' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L-1=Culvert (Passes 0.47 cfs of 10.98 cfs potential flow)
-2=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.47 cfs @ 5.38 fps )
$-3=$ Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=986.00' TW=977.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
〔4=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )

## Summary for Pond 2P: PH2 Infiltration Basin

| Inflow Area = | 19.100 | 4.19\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 0.47" for 1yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow | 0.47 cfs @ | 15.68 hrs, Volume= | 0.750 af |  |
| Outflow | 0.29 cfs @ | 29.40 hrs , Volume= | 0.751 af, A | Atten $=39 \%$, Lag $=823.5 \mathrm{~min}$ |
| Discarded = | 0.29 cfs @ | 29.40 hrs , Volume= | 0.751 af |  |
| Primary | 0.00 cfs @ | 0.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |
| Secondary = | 0.00 cfs @ | 0.00 hrs , Volume $=$ | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 977.34' @ 29.40 hrs Surf.Area= 24,756 sf Storage= 8,160 cf
Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=293.2 \mathrm{~min}(1,697.4-1,404.3$ )


Discarded OutFlow Max=0.29 cfs @ 29.40 hrs HW=977.34' (Free Discharge)
L1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.29 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=977.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$L_{2}=$ Culvert (Controls 0.00 cfs )

- $3=$ Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
-4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=977.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\complement_{5=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}$ )


## Summary for Link 1L: Proposed PH2 Ouflow

Inflow Area $=19.100 \mathrm{ac}, 4.19 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth $=0.00$ for 1 yr 24 hr event Inflow $=0.00 \mathrm{cfs} @ 0.00 \mathrm{hrs}$, Volume $=0.000 \mathrm{af}$ Primary $=0.00 \mathrm{cfs} @ 0.00 \mathrm{hrs}$, Volume= 0.000 af , Atten= $0 \%$, Lag $=0.0 \mathrm{~min}$

Primary outflow $=$ Inflow, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

## Summary for Subcatchment 1S: Existing PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=1.69$ cfs @ 12.58 hrs, Volume $=0.357$ af, Depth= $0.22{ }^{\prime \prime}$

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 2yr 24hr Rainfall=2.84"


## Summary for Subcatchment 2S: Proposed PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=15.21$ cfs @ 12.20 hrs, Volume= $\quad 1.067$ af, Depth= $0.67^{\prime \prime}$
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 2yr 24hr Rainfall=2.84"


### 10.7 1,100 Total

## Summary for Pond 1P: PH2 Wet Detention



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 987.98' @ 16.51 hrs Surf.Area= 16,944 sf Storage= 28,489 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=640.6$ min calculated for 1.033 af ( $97 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=623.9 \mathrm{~min}(1,487.8-863.9)$


Primary OutFlow Max=0.57 cfs @ 16.51 hrs HW=987.98' TW=977.16' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L-1=Culvert (Passes 0.57 cfs of 12.69 cfs potential flow)
-2=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.57 cfs @ 6.48 fps )
3=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs)
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=986.00' TW=977.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
④=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )

## Summary for Pond 2P: PH2 Infiltration Basin

| Inflow Area = | 19.100 | 4.19\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 0.65" for 2yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow | 0.57 cfs @ | 16.51 hrs , Volume= | 1.033 af |  |
| Outflow | 0.30 cfs @ | 34.15 hrs , Volume= | 0.859 af, A | Atten $=48 \%, L a g=1,058.7 \mathrm{~min}$ |
| Discarded | 0.30 cfs @ | 34.15 hrs , Volume= | 0.859 af |  |
| Primary | 0.00 cfs @ | 0.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |
| Secondary = | 0.00 cfs @ | 0.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 977.62' @ 34.15 hrs Surf.Area= 25,502 sf Storage= 15,181 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=488.6$ min calculated for 0.859 af ( $83 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=323.9 \mathrm{~min}(1,811.7-1,487.8)$


Discarded OutFlow Max=0.30 cfs @ 34.15 hrs HW=977.62' (Free Discharge)
L1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.30 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=977.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$L_{2}=$ Culvert (Controls 0.00 cfs )

- $3=$ Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
-4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=977.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
$\complement_{5=B r o a d-C r e s t e d ~ R e c t a n g u l a r ~ W e i r ~(C o n t r o l s ~} 0.00 \mathrm{cfs}$ )


## Summary for Link 1L: Proposed PH2 Ouflow

Inflow Area $=19.100$ ac, $4.19 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth $=0.00$ " for $2 y r 24 \mathrm{hr}$ event Inflow $=0.00$ cfs @ 0.00 hrs , Volume= 0.000 af Primary $=0.00 \mathrm{cfs} @ 0.00 \mathrm{hrs}$, Volume= 0.000 af , Atten= $0 \%$, Lag= 0.0 min

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

## Summary for Subcatchment 1S: Existing PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=9.00$ cfs @ 12.45 hrs, Volume $=1.124$ af, Depth= $0.71^{\prime \prime}$

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 10yr 24hr Rainfall=4.09"

| Area (ac) CN Description |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19.100 |  | Type B Soils |  |  |  |
| 19.100 |  | 100.00\% Pervious Area |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| 18.3 | 300 | 0.0330 | 0.27 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet |
|  |  |  |  |  | Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 7.6 | 800 | 0.0625 | 1.75 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Short Grass Pasture Kv=7.0 fps |

## Summary for Subcatchment 2S: Proposed PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=35.77$ cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume $=2.318$ af, Depth= 1.46
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 10yr 24hr Rainfall=4.09"


### 10.7 1,100 Total

## Summary for Pond 1P: PH2 Wet Detention



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 988.87' @ 12.64 hrs Surf.Area= 19,339 sf Storage= 44,703 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=464.5$ min calculated for 2.255 af ( $97 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=449.8 \mathrm{~min}(1,292.3-842.5)$


Primary OutFlow Max=7.59 cfs @ 12.64 hrs HW=988.87' TW=977.22' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L- $=$ Culvert (Passes 7.59 cfs of 15.03 cfs potential flow)
-2=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.69 cfs @ 7.91 fps )
3=Orifice/Grate (Weir Controls 6.90 cfs @ 1.99 fps )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=986.00' TW=977.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)


## Summary for Pond 2P: PH2 Infiltration Basin

| Inflow Area = | .100 ac, | 4.19\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 1.42" for 10yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow | 7.62 cfs @ | 12.64 hrs, Volume= | 2.255 af |  |
| Outflow | 0.80 cfs @ | 19.49 hrs , Volume= | 1.660 af, A | Atten $=90 \%, L a g=411.3 \mathrm{~min}$ |
| Discarded = | 0.32 cfs @ | 19.49 hrs , Volume= | 0.945 af |  |
| Primary | 0.48 cfs @ | 19.49 hrs , Volume= | 0.715 af |  |
| Secondary = | 0.00 cfs @ | 0.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 978.50' @ 19.49 hrs Surf.Area= 27,925 sf Storage= 38,889 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=693.5$ min calculated for 1.658 af ( $74 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=399.2 \mathrm{~min}(1,691.5-1,292.3)$


Discarded OutFlow Max=0.32 cfs @ 19.49 hrs HW=978.50' (Free Discharge)
L-1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.32 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=0.48 cfs @ 19.49 hrs HW=978.50' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L2=Culvert (Passes 0.48 cfs of 3.79 cfs potential flow)

- $3=$ Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 0.48 cfs @ 2.42 fps)
-4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=977.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )


## Summary for Link 1L: Proposed PH2 Ouflow

Inflow Area $=\quad 19.100$ ac, $4.19 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth $>0.45^{\prime \prime}$ for 10yr 24hr event
Inflow $=\quad 0.48$ cfs @ 19.49 hrs , Volume $=0.715$ af
Primary $=0.48$ cfs @ 19.49 hrs , Volume $=0.715 \mathrm{af}$, Atten= $0 \%$, Lag= 0.0 min
Primary outflow $=$ Inflow, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

## Summary for Subcatchment 1S: Existing PH2 AR Site

Runoff = 24.93 cfs @ 12.41 hrs, Volume= 2.600 af, Depth= 1.63"
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 50yr 24hr Rainfall=5.80"

| Area (ac) CN Description |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19.100 |  | Type B Soils |  |  |  |
| 19.100 |  | 100.00\% Pervious Area |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| 18.3 | 300 | 0.0330 | 0.27 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet |
|  |  |  |  |  | Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 7.6 | 800 | 0.0625 | 1.75 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Short Grass Pasture Kv=7.0 fps |

## Summary for Subcatchment 2S: Proposed PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=68.54$ cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 4.359 af, Depth= $2.74{ }^{\prime \prime}$
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 50yr 24hr Rainfall=5.80"


### 10.7 1,100 Total

## Summary for Pond 1P: PH2 Wet Detention



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 989.53' @ 12.30 hrs Surf.Area= 21,162 sf Storage= $58,059 \mathrm{cf}$
Plug-Flow detention time= 261.6 min calculated for 4.288 af ( $98 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=252.3 \mathrm{~min}(1,079.1-826.8)$


Primary OutFlow Max=16.54 cfs @ 12.30 hrs HW=989.53' TW=977.69' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L-1=Culvert (Inlet Controls 16.54 cfs @ 9.36 fps )
-2=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 0.77 cfs potential flow)
3=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 32.17 cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=30.59 cfs @ 12.30 hrs HW=989.53' TW=977.69' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-4=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 30.59 cfs @ 1.93 fps )

## Summary for Pond 2P: PH2 Infiltration Basin

| Inflow Area = | .100 ac, | 4.19\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.69" for 50yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow = | 47.16 cfs @ | 12.30 hrs , Volume= | 4.288 af |  |
| Outflow | 1.76 cfs @ | 16.73 hrs , Volume= | 3.617 af, | Atten= 96\%, Lag= 265.9 min |
| Discarded = | 0.39 cfs @ | 16.73 hrs , Volume= | 1.057 af |  |
| Primary | 1.38 cfs @ | 16.73 hrs , Volume= | 2.560 af |  |
| Secondary $=$ | 0.00 cfs @ | 0.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 980.37' @ 16.73 hrs Surf.Area= 33,282 sf Storage= 96,009 cf
Plug-Flow detention time= 702.0 min calculated for 3.614 af ( $84 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=514.7 \mathrm{~min}(1,593.8-1,079.1)$


Discarded OutFlow Max=0.39 cfs @ 16.73 hrs HW=980.37' (Free Discharge)
L1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.39 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=1.38 cfs @ 16.73 hrs HW=980.37' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-2=Culvert (Passes 1.38 cfs of 6.41 cfs potential flow)
-3=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 1.38 cfs @ 7.01 fps)
-4=Orifice/Grate (Controls 0.00 cfs )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=977.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )

## Summary for Link 1L: Proposed PH2 Ouflow

Inflow Area $=19.100$ ac, $4.19 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth > 1.61" for 50yr 24hr event
Inflow $=1.38$ cfs @ 16.73 hrs , Volume= $\quad 2.560 \mathrm{af}$
Primary $=1.38$ cfs @ 16.73 hrs , Volume= $\quad 2.560 \mathrm{af}$, Atten= $0 \%$, Lag= 0.0 min
Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

## Summary for Subcatchment 1S: Existing PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=34.39$ cfs @ 12.40 hrs, Volume= $\quad 3.472$ af, Depth= 2.18"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= $0.00-48.00 \mathrm{hrs}$, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 100yr 24hr Rainfall=6.66"

| Area (ac) CN Description |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19.100 |  | Type B Soils |  |  |  |
| 19.100 |  | 100.00\% Pervious Area |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Tc} \\ (\mathrm{~min}) \end{array}$ | Length (feet) | Slope $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})$ | Velocity (ft/sec) | Capacity (cfs) | Description |
| 18.3 | 300 | 0.0330 | 0.27 |  | Sheet Flow, Sheet |
|  |  |  |  |  | Range $\mathrm{n}=0.130 \mathrm{P} 2=2.84{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 7.6 | 800 | 0.0625 | 1.75 |  | Shallow Concentrated Flow, Shallow Short Grass Pasture Kv=7.0 fps |

## Summary for Subcatchment 2S: Proposed PH2 AR Site

Runoff $=86.10$ cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= $\quad 5.474$ af, Depth= $3.44{ }^{\prime \prime}$
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs MSE 24-hr 4 100yr 24hr Rainfall=6.66"


### 10.7 1,100 Total

## Summary for Pond 1P: PH2 Wet Detention



Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 989.77' @ 12.26 hrs Surf.Area= 21,830 sf Storage= 63,222 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=212.6$ min calculated for 5.401 af ( $99 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=204.8 \mathrm{~min}(1,026.2-821.4$ )


Primary OutFlow Max=17.03 cfs @ 12.26 hrs HW=989.76' TW=978.06' (Dynamic Tailwater)
L-1=Culvert (Inlet Controls 17.03 cfs @ 9.64 fps )
-2=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 0.80 cfs potential flow)
-3=Orifice/Grate (Passes < 38.18 cfs potential flow)
Secondary OutFlow Max=53.33 cfs @ 12.26 hrs HW=989.76' TW=978.06' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-4=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 53.33 cfs @ 2.34 fps )

## Summary for Pond 2P: PH2 Infiltration Basin

| Inflow Area = | . 100 | 4.19\% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 3.39" for 100yr 24hr event |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inflow | 71.54 cfs @ | 12.26 hrs, Volume= | 5.401 af |  |
| Outflow | 6.80 cfs @ | 13.67 hrs, Volume= | 4.710 af, A | Atten= $91 \%$ Lag= 84.8 min |
| Discarded = | 0.40 cfs @ | 13.67 hrs, Volume= | 1.086 af |  |
| Primary | 6.40 cfs @ | 13.67 hrs, Volume= | 3.624 af |  |
| Secondary = | 0.00 cfs @ | 0.00 hrs , Volume= | 0.000 af |  |

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 980.79' @ 13.67 hrs Surf.Area= 34,535 sf Storage= 110,303 cf
Plug-Flow detention time $=602.1$ min calculated for 4.705 af ( $87 \%$ of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time $=447.5 \mathrm{~min}(1,473.7-1,026.2)$


Discarded OutFlow Max=0.40 cfs @ 13.67 hrs HW=980.79' (Free Discharge)
L1=Exfiltration (Controls 0.40 cfs)
Primary OutFlow Max=6.39 cfs @ 13.67 hrs HW=980.79' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-2=Culvert (Passes 6.39 cfs of 6.86 cfs potential flow)
——3=Orifice/Grate (Orifice Controls 1.51 cfs @ 7.68 fps)
—4=Orifice/Grate (Weir Controls 4.88 cfs @ 1.77 fps )
Secondary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=977.00' TW=0.00' (Dynamic Tailwater)
-5=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Controls 0.00 cfs )

## Summary for Link 1L: Proposed PH2 Ouflow

Inflow Area = 19.100 ac, $4.19 \%$ Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.28" for 100yr 24hr event
Inflow $=\quad 6.40$ cfs @ 13.67 hrs, Volume= 3.624 af
Primary $=6.40$ cfs @ 13.67 hrs, Volume $=3.624 \mathrm{af}$, Atten= $0 \%$, Lag $=0.0 \mathrm{~min}$
Primary outflow $=$ Inflow, Time Span= 0.00-48.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

## APPENDIX E

 SOILS INFORMATIONAttach a complete site plan on paper not less than $81 / 2 \times 11$ inches in size. Plan must include, but not limited to: vertical and horizontal reference point (BM), direction and percent of slope, scale or dimensions, north arrow, and BM referenced to nearest road

Please print all information
Personal information you provide may be used for secondary purposes [Privacy Law, s. 15.04(1)(m)]

|  | Page | $\mathbf{1}$ of |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |



| SP | OBS. | X Pit $\quad \square$ Boring | Ground surface elevation 982 |  |  | Elevation of limiting factor |  | < 968.4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Horizon | Depth in. | Dominant Color Munsell | Redox Description Qu. Sz. Cont. Color | Texture | Structure Gr. Sz. Sh. | Consistence | Boundary | \% Rock Frags. | \% Fines (P200) | Hydraulic App Rate Inches/Hr |
| 1 | 0-7 | 10YR 4/2 | None | SIL | 1 msbk | mvfi | gw | $<5$ |  | 0.13 |
| 2 | 7-48 | 10YR 5/4 | None | SICL | 1 msbk | mvfi | gw | < 5 |  | 0.04 |
| 3 | 48-58 | 10YR 4/6 | None | SCL | 1 fsbk | mfi | gw | < 5 |  | 0.11 |
| 4 | 58-72 | 10YR 5/4 | None | FS | Osg | ml | gw | < 5 |  | 0.5 |
| 5 | 72-108 | 10YR 6/4; 6/6 | None | GRSL/FS/SIL | Osg | ml | gw | 10-20 |  | $0.13-0.5^{(1)}$ |
| 6 | 108-168 | 10YR 7/8 | None | FS | Osg | ml |  | 10-20 | 5.9 | 0.5 |

Comments: Groundwater was not encountered during or upon completion of excavation. Extensive sloughing/caving of sidewalls experienced, limiting the depth of test pit. ${ }^{(1)}$ Presence of silt loam seams will limit infiltration potential within horizon, unless removed or properly deep-tilled to break-up the lower permeability seams.

SP2 \#OBS. $\quad \mathrm{X}$ Pit $\quad \square$ Boring Ground surface elevation $\quad 980.8 \quad \mathrm{ft}$ Elevation of limiting factor <965.8_ft.

| Horizon | Depth in. | Dominant Color <br> Munsell | Redox Description Qu. <br> Sz. Cont. Color | Texture | Structure Gr. <br> Sz. Sh. | Consistence | Boundary | \% Rock <br> Frags. | \% Fines <br> (P200) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $0-9$ | 10 YR 4/2 | None | SIL | 1 fsbk | mvfi | gw | $<5$ |  |
| 2 | $9-42$ | 10 YR $5 / 4$ | None | SICL | 1 mabk | mvfi | gw | $<5$ | 0.13 |
| 3 | $42-62$ | 10 YR $5 / 6$ | None | SL | 0 sg | ml | gw | $<5$ | 0.04 |
| 4 | $62-100$ | 10 YR $6 / 4$ | None | LFS/SIL | 0 sg | ml | gw | $5-15$ | $39.6^{(2)}$ |
| 5 | $100-180$ | $10 Y R 6 / 6$ | None | FS/SIL | $0.13-0.5^{(1)}$ |  |  |  |  |

Comments: Stratigraphy of test pit was extremely variable in all directions. Above profile obtained from south sidewall of excavation. Groundwater was not encountered during or upon completion of excavation. ${ }^{(1)}$ Presence of silt loam seams will limit infiltration potential within horizon, unless removed or properly deep tilled to break-up the lower permeability seams. Thicker deposits of silt loam ( $>2 \mathrm{in}$.) will require removal. ${ }^{(2)}$ Results from mixed representative sample of horizon.


| SP3 | \#OBS. $\quad$ X Pit $\quad \square$ Boring |  | Ground surface elevation |  | 976.3 ft . | Elevation of limiting factor |  | $<961.3 \mathrm{ft}$. Page $\mathbf{2}^{\text {a }}$ of $\underline{\mathbf{2}}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Horizon | Depth in. | Dominant Color Munsell | Redox Description Qu. Sz. Cont. Color | Texture | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Structure Gr. } \\ \mathrm{Sz} . \mathrm{Sh} . \end{array}$ | Consistence | Boundary | \% Rock Frags. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \% \text { Fines } \\ (\text { P200 } \end{array}$ | Hydraulic App Rate Inches/Hr |
| 1 | 0-30 | 10YR 4/2 | None | SIL | 1fsbk | mvfi | gw | < 5 |  | 0.13 |
| 2 | 30-82 | 10YR 5/4 | None | SICL | 1mabk | mvfi | gw | < 5 |  | 0.04 |
| 3 | 82-96 | 10YR 5/4 | None | L | Osg | ml | gw | < 5 |  | 0.24 |
| 4 | 96-132 | 10YR 5/6; 5/8 | None | LFS/SIL | 0sg | ml |  | 5-15 | $17.3^{(2)}$ | 0.13-0.5 ${ }^{(1)}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments: Groundwater was not encountered during or upon completion of excavation. Extensive sloughing/caving of sidewalls experienced, limiting the depth of test pit. ${ }^{(1)}$ Presence of silt loam seams will limit infiltration potential within horizon, unless removed or properly deep-tilled to break-up the lower permeability seams. ${ }^{(2)}$ Results from mixed representative sample of horizon.

|  | OBS. | $\square$ Pit $\square$ Boring | Ground surface eleva |  | ft . | Elevation of | iting factor |  | ft . |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Horizon | Depth in. | Dominant Color Munsell | Redox Description Qu. Sz. Cont. Color | Texture | $\begin{gathered} \text { Structure Gr. } \\ \text { Sz. Sh. } \end{gathered}$ | Consistence | Boundary | \% Rock Frags. | \% Fines | Hydraulic App Rate Inches/Hr |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | \#OBS. $\square$ Pit $\quad \square$ Boring |  | Ground surface elevation |  | ft . | Elevation of limiting factor |  | ft . |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Horizon | Depth in. | Dominant Color Munsell | Redox Description Qu. Sz. Cont. Color | Texture | Structure Gr. Sz. Sh. | Consistence | Boundary | \% Rock Frags. | \% Fines | Hydraulic App Rate Inches/Hr |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Overall Site Comments: See text in related report.

## APPENDIX F

## STORMWATER OPINON OF PROBABLE COST

## STORM WATER OPINION OF PROBABLE COST

| ITEM |  | ESTIMATED |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO. | DESCRIPTION | QUANTITY | UNIT | PNIT |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | PRICE | AMOUNT

In providing Opinions of Probable Costs, it is understood that the Consultant has no control over the cost or availability of labor, equipment or materials, or over conditions or the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the Consultant's Opinions of Probable Construction Costs are made on the basis of the Consultant's professional judgment and experience. The Consultant makes no warranty, expressed or implied, that bids, quantities, or negotiated costs of the Work will not vary from the Consultant's Opinion of Probable Construction
APPENDIX G

## DRAFT MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

## Maintenance provisions:

## Detention Basin

Visual inspection of the detention basin and outlet structure shall be performed, at a minimum annually. The inspections shall include checking for potential problems such as: subsidence, erosion, tree growth in and around the embankment and outfall structure, sediment accumulation, clogging of outfall structure, and damage to the emergency spillway. Problems identified by the inspections shall be repaired as soon as practicable.

Sediment accumulations shall be removed by dredging when two (2) foot of siltation has occurred or as directed by the Village of Waunakee. The dredged material shall be removed and disposed of in accordance with NR 347.

The detention basin shall be mowed a minimum of twice per year. Mowing shall maintain a minimum grass height of 6 to 8 inches. Areas of sparse vegetation shall be reseeded. Additional fertilizer shall be applied as needed, per the results of a soil test.

Separate and distinct records shall be maintained by the owner to record the specific activities and costs thereof for the maintenance plan implementation. The records shall include the dates of maintenance visits and the specific work performed. Records shall be kept as required by local, state or federal law.

## Infiltration Basin

Visual Inspection of the Infiltration Basin shall be performed, at a minimum, annually.
Maintenance shall be required when system shows standing water beyond 24 hours of rain event. Cleaning shall consist of removal of sediment, two (2) foot undercut, undercut replacement with material consisting of $15-30 \%$ compost and $70-85 \%$ sand and restoration in-kind.

Restoration of plant material shall be with native plugs or seed mixture tolerant of fluctuating water conditions. If a seed mixture is used steps shall be taken to assure vegetation establishes
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[^12]:    Data file name: U: \User $\backslash 2005162 \backslash$ Engineering $\backslash$ SWMP $\backslash$ Phase 2 SW Design $\backslash$ pro ph2 slamm.mdb WinSLAMM Version 10.4.1
    Rain file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ Rain Files $\backslash$ WisReg - Madison WI 1981.RAN
    Particulate Solids Concentration file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash v 10.1$ WI_AVG01.pscx
    Runoff Coefficient file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_SL06 Dec06.rsvx
    Residential Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_Res and Other Urban Dec06.std
    Institutional Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
    Commercial Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
    Industrial Street Delivery file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files \WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
    Other Urban Street Delivery file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash W I \_$Res and Other Urban Dec06.std
    Freeway Street Delivery file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ Freeway Dec06.std
    Apply Street Delivery Files to Adjust the After Event Load Street Dirt Mass Balance: False
    Pollutant Relative Concentration file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash W I \_G E O 03 . p p d x$
    Source Area PSD and Peak to Average Flow Ratio File: C: \WinSLAMM Files \NURP Source Area PSD Files.csv
    Cost Data file name:
    If Other Device Pollutant Load Reduction Values = 1, Off-site Pollutant Loads are Removed from Pollutant Load \% Reduction calculations
    Seed for random number generator: -42
    Study period starting date: 01/01/81 Study period ending date: 12/31/81
    Start of Winter Season: 12/02 End of Winter Season: 03/12
    Date: 04-12-2021
    Time: 15:13:07
    Site information:

[^13]:    Data file name: U: \User $\backslash 2005162 \backslash$ Engineering $\backslash$ SWMP $\backslash$ Phase 2 SW Design $\backslash$ Ph2 ex slamm.mdb WinSLAMM Version 10.4.1
    Rain file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ Rain Files $\backslash$ WisReg - Madison WI 1981.RAN
    Particulate Solids Concentration file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash v 10.1$ WI_AVG01.pscx
    Runoff Coefficient file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_SL06 Dec06.rsvx
    Residential Street Delivery file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ WI_Res and Other Urban Dec06.std
    Institutional Street Delivery file name: C:\WinSLAMM Files \WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
    Commercial Street Delivery file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash W I \quad$ Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
    Industrial Street Delivery file name: C: $\backslash$ WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ WI_Com Inst Indust Dec06.std
    Other Urban Street Delivery file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash W I \_$Res and Other Urban Dec06.std
    Freeway Street Delivery file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ Freeway Dec06.std
    Apply Street Delivery Files to Adjust the After Event Load Street Dirt Mass Balance: False
    Pollutant Relative Concentration file name: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash W I \_G E O 03 . p p d x$
    Source Area PSD and Peak to Average Flow Ratio File: C: \WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP Source Area PSD Files.csv
    Cost Data file name:
    If Other Device Pollutant Load Reduction Values $=1$, Off-site Pollutant Loads are Removed from Pollutant Load \% Reduction calculations
    Seed for random number generator: -42
    Study period starting date: 01/01/81 Study period ending date: 12/31/81
    Start of Winter Season: 12/02 End of Winter Season: 03/12
    Date: 04-12-2021
    Time: 15:17:55
    Site information:
    LU\# 1 - Residential: Ex Ph2 Site Total area (ac): 19.100
    45 - Large Landscaped Areas 1: 19.100 ac. Normal Silty Source Area PSD File: C: $\backslash$ WinSLAMM Files $\backslash$ NURP.cpz

