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### 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Shady Grove area of Grand Prairie, TX has experienced significant development in recent years. New commercial, residential, and major transportation infrastructure have been built in this area since the citywide StormCAD storm drain model was developed by Halff \& Associates in 2015 and since the last Master Plan was performed in 2003 by Knowlton-English-Flowers, Inc. (KEF). In the study area a comprehensive storm drain model was developed based on the Halff \& Associates StormCAD model but was then updated by adding all new stormwater infrastructure items which were built after the StormCAD model was developed. The new model was built using InfoWorks ICM software and utilizes rainfall-on-mesh two-dimensional (2D) surface flow capabilities to model rainfall runoff as it flows across the terrain. This model was then used to evaluate the KEF Master Plan recommended storm drain improvements to determine which recommendations would provide useful and viable Capital Improvement Projects (CIP). The study applies the scoring system developed by Halff \& Associates in the 2010 City-Wide Drainage Master Plan Road Map and the cost estimating and CIP scoring Excel calculators developed by Burton Johnson Engineering under a separate task of this contract.

The 2D modeling technology adds a surface flow visualization component to the KEF Master Plan. This provides a more comprehensive and enriched Master Plan and also generates input parameters for the City's scoring calculations. This allows the KEF recommendations to be evaluated and scored consistently with the City's other potential stormwater CIPs.

The Shady Grove Master Plan Study area is shown on Exhibit 1 and can be roughly described as being about a 3 square mile area located south of Rock Island Rd., east of Roy Orr Blvd., north of Trinity Blvd., and west of Belt Line Rd. in Grand Prairie, TX. President George Bush Turnpike, Bear Creek, and Dry Creek all run through the study area. There is FEMA floodplain in this area from these sources and others, however, this study is focused on the performance of local storm drain infrastructure and does not address FEMA floodplain issues. The overall area was divided into two distinct models, an East and a West area, divided along Bear Creek. This was done to reduce model run times, output dataset size, and node count limits of the software.

This analysis includes both existing conditions hydrology as well as future developed hydrology. Land use data for each of these scenarios was developed or used in GIS to calculate composite NRCS CNs. Storm events modeled were the $2-\mathrm{Yr}, 10-\mathrm{Yr}, 25-\mathrm{Yr}$, and $100-\mathrm{Yr}$ rainfall events. These various storms were modeled by developing a balanced rainfall hyetograph which accounts for runoff losses using the calculated composite CNs.

The existing storm drain model network was developed from record drawings, the City's GIS inventory, the City's 2015 StormCAD model, LIDAR, and limited survey data. The 2D model surface was developed from the 2016 Citywide LIDAR dataset developed by McKim \& Creed. In total, the models contain more than 400 inlets, 82,000 linear feet (LF) of pipe, and 2,000 nodes.

The proposed storm drain model network is based on the 2003 KEF Master Plan, as modified to account for current 2017 system infrastructure. These modifications were made for any of
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several reasons, including that the pipes may have been built since then or a different system was built in the same location (i.e. Commercial/Residential development or SH 161 systems were built). Additionally three areas of proposed grading were modeled to simulate potential regional surface water storage features. These can be found in Basins F, X, and Manana. Across the entire study area the whole updated master plan removes 103 structures from potential flooding of $0.5^{\prime}$ deep or greater. Since the 2003 KEF master plan was developed without the aid of a detailed 2D surface flow model, there still remains a significant amount of surface/runoff flooding. A new analysis aimed at identifying, quantifying, and solving those surface flow issues is beyond this scope, but this model and report can be used as the starting point for that analysis. From the modified KEF Master Plan improvements, nine potential Capital Projects were identified. These were identified based on a brief analysis of 2D rain on mesh model results and GIS data. Improvements which benefited nearby buildings, addressed complaints, addressed hydraulic grade line issues in the network, and/or provided an obvious reduction in surface flooding were selected as potential Capital Project candidates. These nine candidate projects were then priced using the Cost Estimate and CIP Scoring calculators developed by Burton Johnson Engineering, Inc. under a separate task of this contract. The following tables summarize the estimated costs and CIP scoring of each of the nine candidate projects.

Table 1: Summary of Conceptual Estimated Candidate Project Costs

| Basin ID | Project Name | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X | Gilbert Drainage Improvements - All | \$4,627,823.87 |
| U | Shady Grove Rd., Gilbert Rd., Wright Rd. Storm Drain Improvements - All | \$2,174,464.13 |
| V | Shady Grove - Jones Storm Drain Improvements | \$1,298,792.92 |
| Y | Thousand Oaks Storm Drain Improvements | \$649,150.78 |
| B | River Ridge Blvd. Storm Drain Improvements | \$5,083,439.29 |
| C | Shady Grove Storm Drain Improvements | \$4,849,204.70 |
| F | Parker Rd - Hardrock Rd Storm Drain Improvements | \$4,257,437.56 |
| K-L | Jelmak Rd - Hardrock Rd Storm Drain Improvements | \$3,845,517.64 |
| MANANA | Manana Channel Improvements | \$757,321.25 |
| Total \$26,785,830.88 |  |  |

Table 2: Overall Ranking of Candidate Projects within City's CIP

| Storm Drain Projects |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Final CIP Rank | Final Score | Project Name |  |  |
| 2 | 26.35 | Shady Grove - Jones Storm Drain Improvements |  |  |
| 10 | 32 | Thousand Oaks Storm Drain Improvements |  |  |
| 16 | 39.19 | Gilbert Drainage Improvements - All |  |  |
| 23 | 45 | Jelmak Rd - Hardrock Rd Storm Drain Improvements |  |  |
| 25 | 48 | Parker Rd - Hardrock Rd Storm Drain Improvements |  |  |
| 28 | 52.29 | Shady Grove Rd., Gilbert Rd., Wright Rd. Storm Drain Improvements - All |  |  |
| 32 | 59.26 | Shady Grove Storm Drain Improvements |  |  |
| 33 | 59.3 | River Ridge Blvd. Storm Drain Improvements |  |  |
| Open Channel Projects <br> 10$\quad 31$ |  |  |  | Manana Channel Improvements |
|  |  |  |  |  |

### 2.0 INTRODUCTION \& BACKGROUND

### 2.1. Purpose \& Scope

The goal of the Shady Grove Study is to evaluate the 2003 KEF Master Plan using a 2D rainfall-on-mesh model, to modify the KEF plan based on current site conditions, where applicable, and to determine if any of the KEF recommendations are viable City CIPs. The existing conditions model is based on the 2015 Citywide StormCAD model developed by Halff \& Associates and includes recently constructed storm drain systems. The proposed model is based on the modified 2003 KEF Master Plan. This study maps surface flooding for the 2-Yr, $10-\mathrm{Yr}, 25-\mathrm{Yr}$, and $100-\mathrm{Yr}$ storms and recommends CIPs based on these evaluation results and cost estimates.

### 2.2. Project Area Description

As shown on Exhibit 1, the study area is bounded by Rock Island Rd. on the north, Roy Orr Blvd on the west, Oakdale Rd (west of TX161) and Trinity Blvd. (east of TX161) on the on the south and Dry Creek (Belt Line Rd.) on the east.

### 2.3. Project Criteria

The project model and technical analysis were prepared using methods consistent with the City of Grand Prairie's Drainage Design Manual (DDM), Volumes 1\&2, January 2017 and the City of Grand Prairie Technical Modeling Standards for Watershed Wide Storm Drain Master Plans Using InfoWorks SD, December 2012 by LAN, Inc., (TMS) where applicable.

### 2.4. Software Used

This project was produced and delivered using ESRI's ArcGIS 10.3, HEC-HMS 3.5, and Innnovyze's InfoWorks ICM 7.0 2D modeling software.

### 2.5. Floodplain Information

This study area is located within FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) panels 48113C0285K, 48113C0305K, 48113C0295K, and 48113C0315K. There is FEMA floodplain present within the study area from both Bear Creek and Dry Creek. Floodplain was not modeled or modified in any way, since this study focuses only on local storm drain performance and overland runoff getting to these drainage ways. The interaction of the storm drain with the major receiving streams was accounted for by using the Coincidental Tailwater frequencies found in Table 7.6 "Receiving Stream Coincident Frequency Flood" from Volume 1 of the DDM.

### 2.6. Split Model Approach

This study model uses two separate InfoWorks ICM models to analyze the total project area. The project area was divided into an East and a West area along Bear Creek. This was done in order to reduce model size to control model run times, output data size, and node count limits of the software. The results of each individual side can also be shown together on exhibits for planning and analysis purposes. See Exhibit 2a and $\mathbf{2 b}$ for further details of the existing system and study boundaries.
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### 3.0 DATA COLLECTION

Necessary data required to build the model was collected from various sources. Table 3 shows data which was collected, its source and its application on this project. Completeness of each dataset varied from one dataset to the next. Where data was incomplete or discrepancies were found, values were interpolated or inferred based on adjacent storm drain network geometry, field observation, LIDAR/aerial data or other engineering judgement.

Table 3: Data Collected for Study

| Data Type | Source | Application |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Record Drawings | Provided by City | Used to determine connectivity of storm <br> drains, develop/append storm drain <br> network, and determine storm drain <br> feature technical details and parameters. |
| Citywide <br> StormCAD model | Provided by City, developed by <br> Halff \& Associates | Imported network and model parameters <br> into GIS as basis of this project model |
| Shady Grove <br> Drainage MP | Provided by City, developed by <br> Knowlton-English-Flowers, Inc. | Reference document to determine what <br> has developed since last master plan |
| Soils GIS Data | USDA/SSURGO Soils Data <br> Mart | Used to develop hydrology |
| Storm Drain GIS <br> inventory | Provided by City | Used to supplement StormCAD and <br> record drawing data to build out project <br> model network. |
| Future Land Use <br> GIS Data | Provided by City as of <br> 06/15/2017 | Used to determine future/ultimate <br> developed conditions hydrology. |
| Various GIS <br> background data | Provided by City | Used as basemap data in maps and <br> exhibits |
| 2016 LIDAR Data | McKim \& Creed | Used as basis for 2D model surface |
| 2003 KEF Master <br> Plan | Provided by City | Used as basis for proposed model <br> network |

### 4.0 HYDROLOGY

For this rainfall-on-mesh 2D study, the only required hydrologic input to the 2D model is a rainfall intensity hyetograph. This rainfall hyetograph is then applied uniformly across the 2D mesh, where it is routed and accumulates as runoff. Due to this configuration, drainage area size and Time of Concentration (Tc) are not required parameters for this approach. However, infiltration losses are still necessary to account for. This model uses Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Curve Number (CN) methodology to estimate infiltration losses. HEC-HMS 3.5 was used to generate Frequency Storm (balanced hyetograph) rainfall hyetographs (with NRCS CN losses removed) which were then input into the 2D model. Both existing conditions and future developed conditions hydrology were produced for each of the 2D areas. See Exhibits 3-5.

### 4.1. Balanced Hyetograph Development

A balanced rainfall hyetograph was created in HEC-HMS using rainfall depths provided in the City's DDM. Table 4 shows the partial duration rainfall depths used for this model. The 24 hour frequency storm hyetograph uses a timestep of 5 minutes with the peak intensity position located at the middle (50\%) time ordinate.

Table 4: Partial Duration Rainfall Depths (in) for Balanced Hyetograph

| Storm Event | $\mathbf{5} \mathbf{~ m i n}$ | $\mathbf{1 5} \mathbf{~ m i n}$ | $\mathbf{1} \mathbf{~ h r}$ | $\mathbf{2} \mathbf{~ h r}$ | $\mathbf{3} \mathbf{~ h r}$ | $\mathbf{6} \mathbf{~ h r}$ | $\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ h r}$ | $24 \mathbf{~ h r}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2-\mathrm{Yr}$ | 0.49 | 1.04 | 1.85 | 2.22 | 2.45 | 2.91 | 3.45 | 3.95 |
| $10-\mathrm{Yr}$ | 0.63 | 1.36 | 2.86 | 3.55 | 3.85 | 4.65 | 5.50 | 6.40 |
| $25-\mathrm{Yr}$ | 0.73 | 1.56 | 3.35 | 4.15 | 4.55 | 5.45 | 6.50 | 7.50 |
| $100-\mathrm{Yr}$ | 0.87 | 1.87 | 4.25 | 5.20 | 5.70 | 6.92 | 8.40 | 9.55 |

### 4.2. NRCS Curve Numbers

NRCS CNs were determined for each of the two model areas, East and West. Each 2D area is modeled by using one single composite CN value representing land use specific to it. Composite CNs for the existing hydrology scenario were calculated based on current/observed land use and impervious cover. Composite CNs for the future developed hydrology was calculated based on the City's Future Land Use GIS data. Soils were assumed to remain the same for both scenarios. CNs were then calculated in GIS using area weighted averages of each land use type located within each respective area. Table 5 shows the calculated composite CNs.

Table 5: Calculated CN's for Existing and Future Land Use Scenarios

| Scenario | West | East |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Land Use Composite CN | 77.06 | 80.81 |
| Future Land Use Composite CN | 85.83 | 85.84 |

### 5.0 HYDRAULICS

The hydraulic model for this study consists of 1D links and nodes and a 2D surface. The 1D links and nodes represent the storm drain pipes, manholes, culverts, curb \& grate inlets, and other storm drain infrastructure. The 2D surface represents the ground surface in the area.

### 5.1. Storm Drain Network

The storm drain network in this model was developed from the City's StormCAD model and GIS inventory. Record drawings were used to draw new system configurations where development and roadways have been built since these datasets were developed. These updated GIS datasets were populated with invert elevations, pipe sizes, and other information relevant to the model. Only pipes larger than $18^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter or which were necessary to drain a sump in the 2D surface were modeled. All curb and grate inlets were modeled by using a configuration of a 2D node connected to a weir which is connected to a pipe. This allows for the weir to control flow transfers between the 2D surface and the pipe network (or the reverse)
using the standard weir and orifice flow equations. Table 6 summarizes quantities of each model's 1D network.

Table 6: 1D Existing Model Network Summary

|  | Inlets <br> (count) | Pipe <br> $(L F)$ | Total Model Nodes <br> (Count) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East | 77 | 21,775 | 452 |
| West | 273 | 81,715 | 927 |
| Total | 350 | 103,490 | 1,379 |

For this study, outfall nodes were defined to be the outlet of a storm drain pipe system which discharges from the system into a receiving channel outside the extents of the 2D mesh area. There are a total of 10 outfalls for the East area and 12 outfalls for the West area. For this model, it was necessary to perform a Coincidental Occurrence analysis using Table 7.6 "Receiving Stream Coincident Frequency Flood" from Volume 1 of the DDM. This analysis uses the Basin Area Ratio (B.A.R.) between the receiving stream and local storm drain watershed areas to estimate an appropriate receiving stream tailwater event and water level. Where applicable, outfall nodes use tailwater elevations taken from the City's updated Bear Creek and Dry Creek Citywide Drainage Master Plan report (Bear \& Dry Creek Report) and HEC-RAS hydraulic models. In some cases, the top of pipe elevation was used for the tailwater level, either as a substitute for a 1 YR coincidental storm or where the outfalls are not impacted by either creek.

Table 7: Summary of Bear Creek Coincidental Occurrence Analysis

|  | Bear Creek <br> Drainage Area <br> (SQ MI) | Shady Grove Area <br> to Bear Creek <br> (SQ MI) | Ratio <br> (Calculated) | Ratio <br> (Used) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SG East | 85.19 | 0.66 | 129.1 | $>50: 1$ B.A.R. |
| SG West | 85.19 | 0.94 | 90.6 | $>50: 1$ B.A.R. |

Table 8: Summary of Dry Creek Coincidental Occurrence Analysis

|  | Dry Creek <br> Drainage Area <br> (SQ MI) | Shady Grove Area <br> to Dry Creek <br> (SQ MI) | Ratio <br> (Calculated) | Ratio <br> (Used) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SG East | 3.49 | 0.42 | 8.3 | $>3: 1$ B.A.R. |
| SG West | 3.49 | -- N/A-- | -- N/A-- | -- N/A-- |

Table 9: Coincidental Occurrence Events Used (East Model)

| Shady Grove East Model | 2YR | 10YR | 25YR | 100YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dry Creek | Top Pipe | 5 | 10 | 50 |
| Bear Creek | Top Pipe | 5 | 10 | 25 |

Table 10: Coincidental Occurrence Events Used (West Model)

| Shady Grove East Model | 2 YR | 10 YR | 25 YR | 100 YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bear Creek | Top Pipe | 5 | 10 | 25 |
| Other Outfall | Top Pipe | Top Pipe | Top Pipe | Top Pipe |

### 5.2. 2D Surface

Each of the model areas has its own 2D surface. The surface is a Triangular Irregular Network (TIN) generated within InfoWorks ICM. Elevation data is imported from GIS into ICM as a ground model and then ICM generates a TIN within the specified 2D Zone polygon. Minimum and maximum element sizes are then specified. The option to limit vertical variation from the ground model was used. This prevents the ICM generated TIN from triangulating an element which meets size requirements but may be off vertically from the ground model. The maximum allowable vertical departure was set to 0.25 feet. The default boundary condition for the surface was set to Normal. This provides for a normal depth calculation as flow on the edges of the surface exits the model. Table 11 summarizes parameters used on each 2D mesh.

Table 11: 2D Model Surface Parameter Summary

| 2D Mesh Parameter | West | East |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total 2D Area (Ac) | 985.4 | 694.8 |
| Min. Element Area (SF) | 100 | 100 |
| Max Triangle Area (SF) | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Max Height Variation from |  |  |
| Ground Model (FT) | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Minimum Angle (Degree) | 15 | 15 |
| Boundary Condition | Normal | Normal |
| Default Roughness Value (n) | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Total Number of 2D Elements | 221,508 | 163,641 |

Since the 2D mesh for each model runs adjacent to Bear Creek and Dry Creek, tailwater conditions must be applied to the mesh in the same way as the outfall nodes. 2D boundary lines were drawn along edges which are adjacent to either Bear Creek or Dry Creek. The 2D boundary lines were then assigned tailwater elevations from the same Bear Creek \& Dry Creek report that was used for the outfall nodes. On edges of the 2D surface which are adjacent to either creek, the boundary condition is the tailwater elevation. On edges that don't have a tailwater assigned, the boundary condition is Normal Depth. Flow is allowed to leave the mesh.

Roughness polygons were also imported in order to provide a better approximation of overland flow across various surfaces such as concrete, grass, and brushy woods. The City's DDM and Table 4.5B of the City's DDM was used to determine 2D roughness values.

Table 12: Summary of 2D Surface Roughness Values

| Surface Type | Roughness Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Short Dense Grass (default) | 0.24 |
| Concrete (Per City directive) | 0.016 |
| Woods with Light Underbrush | 0.40 |

### 6.0 EXISTING SYSTEM RESULTS

### 6.1. Existing Network, Existing Hydrology

This scenario models the existing storm drain pipe network with rainfall runoff based on existing/observed land use (existing hydrology). This scenario represents the condition of the area as it exists today, as closely as possible based on the data provided for this study and identifies potential deficiencies which may be an issue today, with no further development. InfoWorks ICM output for flood depth, pipe flow, pipe surcharge state, and 2D results lines were used to perform review and analysis of these results. Maximum values for flood depth and pipe flow results are output automatically by InfoWorks ICM into node results and pipe results file respectively. Maximum pipe surcharge state is also output automatically to a pipe results layer. Surcharging in this application means that a pipe's capacity is exceeded. There are three possible values (classes) for "surcharge state", as defined by InfoWorks ICM:

- (Class: <1) Not surcharged
- Both hydraulic head and flow are contained in pipe
- ( Class: 1 ) Head surcharged
- Hydraulic head, or hydraulic grade line (HGL), is above the top of pipe
- However, flow rate through the pipe is less than the calculated maximum full flow capacity of the pipe.
- Indicative of tailwater or adverse grade issues.
- Example: outlet tailwater is above top of pipe, but pipe still has conveyance capacity.
- ( Class: 2 ) Flow and head surcharged
- HGL is above the top of pipe
- AND flow rate through pipe exceeds the calculated full flow capacity of pipe
- Indicative of undersized pipe
- Example: A small pipe exceeding its flow capacity with downstream backwater causing submerged tailwater/pipe conditions, so the resulting HGL is above the pipe.

Table 13: InfoWorks ICM Surcharge State Classes

| Surcharge Value | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| $<1$ | No surcharging. |
| 1 | Head surcharged due to tailwater |
| 2 | Head and flow surcharged |

This output provides an evaluation of pipe capacity/performance in each individual scenario. This data provides easy insight into pipe network capacity deficiencies.

2D results lines are polylines which can be drawn across any 2D surface in the model and will provide feedback for flow rate across the line, maximum depth along the line, or average velocity normal to the line. These were used in this study to determine flow and depth at certain
points of interest in each scenario. These results are summarized in the following sections, with more detailed output attached in Appendix A.

### 6.1.1. East Model

On the East side of the study, the existing conditions analysis shows some minor localized flooding as runoff flows from lot to lot towards a storm drain and/or City right-of-way (ROW). This will always occur during rainfall runoff events. The storm drain in this model area experiences node flooding and surcharging in all events. Node flooding is defined as any 1D pipe node (end point/junction of a pipe) where the HGL is above ground level. Table 14 and Table 15 summarize 1D link and node results. These results can be seen in Exhibits 6a - 6d.

Table 14: Total Flooded Nodes, East Model (Existing/Existing)

|  | 2 YR | 10 YR | 25 YR | 100 YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Flooded Nodes <br> (WSEL > Ground Elevation) | 2 | 29 | 27 | 98 |
| Average Depth of Node Flooding (FT) | 0.42 | 0.69 | 0.89 | 1.00 |

Table 15: Total Surcharged Pipes, East Model (Existing/Existing)

|  | 2YR | 10YR | 25 YR | 100YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 1) | 49 | 103 | 123 | 136 |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 2) | 2 | 18 | 23 | 35 |

In addition to the 1D network results above, several locations were selected to measure 2D surface flow. Surface flow is measured within InfoWorks ICM by using Results Lines or Polygon items. The line or polygon measures flow across the line, generated by summing 2D results for each individual 2D mesh triangle underneath the Results Line or Polygon. Table 16 provides a summary of surface flows for selected 2D flow locations. Refer to Exhibits 6a - 6d.

Table 16: Summary of Existing Peak 2D Surface Flows, East Model

| Results Line ID | 2YR Q <br> (CFS) | $10 Y R ~ Q$ <br> (CFS) | 25YR Q <br> (CFS) | $100 Y R ~ Q ~$ <br> (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1a | 11.58 | 37.92 | 50.7 | 72.44 |
| E1b | 5.94 | 23.96 | 57.24 | 118.28 |
| E1e | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| E1f | 2.72 | 4.33 | 4.95 | 5.32 |
| E2 | 2.78 | 4.21 | 3.71 | 23.59 |
| E3 | 8.32 | 22.04 | 30.56 | 48.07 |
| E5 | 22.4 | 44.53 | 56.33 | 75.61 |
| E5b | 47.79 | 87.84 | 108.29 | 140.68 |

### 6.1.2. West Model

The West side of the study also shows there are some flooded nodes and surcharged pipes in each of the modeled storms. There is also "lot to lot" runoff present, as there was in the East model. Table 17 and Table 18 summarize the overall 1D model results for the West model. Selected locations to measure 2D surface flow were evaluated using the same method as described in 6.1.1 above. Table 19 below provides a summary of surface flow in each of these locations. These results can be seen in Exhibits 6a-6d.

Table 17: Total Flooded Nodes, West Model (Existing/Existing)

|  | 2 YR | 10 YR | 25 YR | 100 YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Flooded Nodes <br> (WSEL > Ground Elevation) | 11 | 18 | 23 | 52 |
| Average Depth of Node Flooding (FT) | 0.87 | 1.11 | 1.07 | 1.00 |

Table 18: Total Surcharged Pipes, West Model (Existing/Existing)

|  | 2YR | 10YR | 25YR | 100YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 1) | 44 | 95 | 131 | 232 |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 2) | 2 | 9 | 18 | 39 |

Table 19: Summary of Existing Peak 2D Surface Flows, West Model

| Results Line ID | 2 YR Q <br> (CFS) | 10 YR Q <br> (CFS) | 25 YR Q <br> (CFS) | 100 YR Q <br> (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W1 | 37.18 | 112.83 | 154.96 | 239.13 |
| W3 | 15.00 | 45.29 | 73.47 | 121.45 |
| W4 | 81.68 | 273.86 | 362.79 | 521.99 |
| W5 | 84.41 | 227.52 | 294.92 | 419.18 |
| W6 | 5.86 | 27.04 | 36.49 | 51.06 |
| W7 | 8.88 | 29.27 | 39.79 | 55.90 |

### 6.2. Existing Network, Fully Developed Hydrology

This model scenario represents how the existing drainage network in this area, as it exists today, according to data provided for this study, may perform if all parcels in this area were to fully build out to their designated zoning land use and were allowed to discharge runoff uncontrolled. This also assumes that no additional storm drain infrastructure is built as this hypothetical development occurs. Designated land use for fully developed conditions was provided by the City for this evaluation.

### 6.2.1. East Model

The East model results indicate that under fully developed conditions this area will experience more widespread and severe flooding than it experiences in the existing condition. This is due to the additional runoff generated by the increase in impervious surface, compared to existing conditions. Table 20 and Table 21 summarize the 1D results of this scenario. The same selected
locations to measure 2D flow in the existing scenario were evaluated again in this scenario.
Table 22 provides a summary of the surface flows in these locations. These results can be seen in Exhibits 7a-d.

Table 20: Total Flooded Nodes, East Model (Existing/Fully Developed)

|  | 2YR | 10 YR | 25YR | 100 YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Flooded Nodes <br> (WSEL > Ground Elevation) | 2 | 31 | 40 | 101 |
| Average Depth of Node Flooding (FT) | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 1.90 |

Table 21: Total Surcharged Pipes, East Model (Existing/Fully Developed)

|  | 2YR | 10YR | 25YR | 100YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 1) | 62 | 115 | 130 | 137 |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 2) | 3 | 21 | 24 | 35 |

Table 22: Summary of Fully Developed Peak 2D Surface Flows, East Model

| Results Line ID | 2YR Q <br> (CFS) | 10YR Q <br> (CFS) | 25YR Q <br> (CFS) | 100YR Q <br> (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1a | 17.09 | 45.72 | 58.75 | 79.08 |
| E1b | 12.01 | 43.75 | 76.22 | 136.78 |
| E1e | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.04 |
| E1f | 3.31 | 4.63 | 5.28 | 5.61 |
| E2 | 2.65 | 4.32 | 3.78 | 32.42 |
| E3 | 11.89 | 25.94 | 36.71 | 52.88 |
| E5 | 28.78 | 50.78 | 62.37 | 81.34 |
| E5b | 59.38 | 98.21 | 118.11 | 149.9 |

### 6.2.2. West Model

The West model results indicate that under fully developed conditions this area will experience more widespread and severe flooding than it experiences in the existing condition. This is due to the additional runoff generated by the increase in impervious surface, compared to existing conditions. Table 23 and Table 24 summarize the 1D results of this scenario. The same selected locations to measure 2D flow in the existing scenario were evaluated again in this scenario.
Table 25 provides a summary of the surface flows in these locations. These results can be seen in Exhibits 7a-d.

Table 23: Total Flooded Nodes, West Model (Existing/Fully Developed)

|  | 2 YR | 10 YR | 25 YR | 100 YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Flooded Nodes <br> (WSEL > Ground Elevation) | 12 | 23 | 35 | 65 |
| Average Depth of Node Flooding (FT) | 1.21 | 1.06 | 0.91 | 1.03 |

Table 24: Total Surcharged Pipes, West Model (Existing/Fully Developed)

|  | 2YR | 10YR | 25YR | 100YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 1) | 53 | 130 | 154 | 258 |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 2) | 6 | 18 | 29 | 44 |

Table 25: Summary of Fully Developed Peak 2D Surface Flows, West Model

| Results Line ID | 2 YR Q <br> (CFS) | 10 YR Q <br> (CFS) | 25 YR Q <br> (CFS) | 100 YR Q <br> (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W1 | 72.13 | 153.66 | 199.13 | 277.57 |
| W3 | 26.75 | 72.07 | 100.08 | 140.66 |
| W4 | 162.78 | 360.37 | 452.81 | 587.33 |
| W5 | 147.2 | 290.32 | 360.53 | 479.41 |
| W6 | 16.89 | 36.26 | 45.09 | 57.97 |
| W7 | 17.27 | 39.63 | 48.78 | 62.28 |

### 6.3. Comparison Tables

This section provides a comparison of the surface flow results, comparing existing hydrology results with fully developed hydrology results at the specified 2D surface flow location.

Table 26: Comparison of East Model Surface Flow

| Results <br> Line ID | 2YR <br> $\Delta \mathbf{Q}$ (CFS) | 10 YR <br> $\Delta \mathbf{Q}(\mathrm{CFS})$ | 25 YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{CFS})$ | 100 YR <br> $\Delta \mathbf{Q}$ (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1a | 5.51 | 7.8 | 8.05 | 6.64 |
| E1b | 6.07 | 19.79 | 18.98 | 18.5 |
| E1e | 0 | 0 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| E1f | 0.59 | 0.3 | 0.33 | 0.29 |
| E2 | -0.13 | 0.11 | 0.07 | 8.83 |
| E3 | 3.57 | 3.9 | 6.15 | 4.81 |
| E5 | 6.38 | 6.25 | 6.04 | 5.73 |
| E5b | 11.59 | 10.37 | 9.82 | 9.22 |

Table 27: Comparison of West Model Surface Flows

| Results <br> Line ID | 2YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) | 10 YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{CFS})$ | 25YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) | 100 YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W1 | 34.95 | 40.83 | 44.17 | 38.44 |
| W3 | 11.75 | 26.78 | 26.61 | 19.21 |
| W4 | 81.1 | 86.51 | 90.02 | 65.34 |
| W5 | 62.79 | 62.8 | 65.61 | 60.23 |
| W6 | 11.03 | 9.22 | 8.6 | 6.91 |
| W7 | 8.39 | 10.36 | 8.99 | 6.38 |

## $7.0 \quad$ PROPOSED SYSTEM RESULTS

This study used the same rain on mesh approach as the existing and fully developed conditions models above to evaluate the 2003 KEF Master Plan proposed improvements, extract any feasible potential stormwater CIPs from them for the City to consider implementing. Proposed pipes from the KEF Master Plan were evaluated and assessed to develop an updated/final proposed pipe dataset to evaluate for feasible CIPs. Undeveloped areas were not evaluated for future development needs; refer back to the 2003 KEF Master Plan for this, if needed.

This analysis evaluated the relevance of the 2003 proposed pipes based on current (2017) study area conditions. When the KEF Master Plan was developed in 2003, the study area was much less developed than at the time of this study. Several new commercial developments and SH161 were built. Therefore it was not feasible to model all of the KEF proposed pipes as they were originally configured. The KEF proposed pipes were modified based on the 2017 current infrastructure conditions in the watershed. See Exhibit 8a for a map showing the original "asproposed" 2003 KEF Master Plan pipes plus the 2017 existing pipe network. See Exhibit 8b for a comparison map showing the original KEF recommended pipes versus the final updated proposed pipe configuration used in the model. See Exhibit 8c for a map showing only the final updated proposed pipe configuration which was evaluated for viable City CIP projects.

Table 28: 1D Proposed Model Network Summary

|  | Inlets <br> (count) | Pipe <br> (LF) | Total Model Nodes <br> (Count) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East | 181 | 39,916 | 655 |
| West | 475 | 102,347 | 1,214 |
| Total | 656 | 142,263 | 1,869 |

At the request of the City, potential areas for regional surface water storage features were conceptually considered. Due to the complex nature of these storage systems, they were not modeled in detail and will require more detailed evaluation prior to implementation. This study takes the previous master plan another step farther by recommending efficient locations for these features based on the 2D surface flow patterns. These areas are discussed in detail below.

Also at the request of the City, one specific repeat "Hot Spot" problem area was conceptually evaluated. This area is located at Greater Allen Temple AME Church located on Gilbert Rd at Gilbert Circle. The evaluated Master Plan improvements do address this issue. However, due to the magnitude of improvements to completely construct the Master Plan in this area, other "interim" solutions are discussed below. The next step for this area would be to perform a "hot spot" concept design evaluation similar to the other Hot Spot concept designs performed under other tasks of this contract. A detailed 2D model may be a beneficial tool for the design process.

### 7.1. Proposed System, Fully Developed Hydrology

This scenario models the proposed Master Plan network with fully developed hydrology. This scenario simulates the performance of this proposed network configuration with a fully built
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out watershed. Sections 7.1.1 and 7.1.2 discuss this simulation configuration. This simulation identifies areas which benefit from the proposed improvements as well as areas where more detailed analysis may be required. Exhibits 9 a - d map the results of these scenarios.

### 7.1.1. $\quad$ East Model

The proposed Master Plan East model includes adding new storm drain lines in areas with none now (basins P, Q, R, BC1, BC2, BC3, V, W, X, Y2, Z, Z6, Z7, Z8, Z9, Z10, Z11, Z12, Z13) or increasing storm drain sizes of existing lines $(\mathrm{Y})$. These basins were evaluated for potential CIPs. Undeveloped areas were not evaluated for CIPs. In addition to these pipes, two areas of proposed grading were conceptually modeled to determine if these could provide any flood reduction benefits. First, a conceptual expansion to the Manana channel was modeled to determine potential benefits of additional storage and conveyance capacity. The other area is the upland areas of Gilbert Branch in Basin X. This area was digitally graded into a better defined channel upstream of Gilbert Rd. and widened to provide storage between Gilbert Rd and Enchanted Ct. All of these improvements were run and the results are summarized below.
Table 29 and
Table 30 summarize the 1D model results. The same selected locations used to measure 2D flow in the existing scenarios were evaluated again in this scenario. Table 31 provides a summary of the surface flows in these locations. These results can be seen on Exhibits 9a-d.

Table 29: Total Flooded Nodes, West Model (Master Plan/Fully Developed)

|  | 2 YR | 10 YR | 25 YR | 100 YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Flooded Nodes <br> (WSEL > Ground Elevation) | 13 | 52 | 63 | 120 |
| Average Depth of Node Flooding (FT) | 3.19 | 1.90 | 2.20 | 2.55 |

Table 30: Total Surcharged Pipes, East Model (Master Plan/Fully Developed)

|  | 2YR | 10YR | 25YR | 100YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 1) | 109 | 146 | 168 | 190 |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 2) | 5 | 17 | 22 | 38 |

Table 31: Summary of Master Plan/Fully Developed Peak 2D Surface Flows, East Model

| Results Line ID | 2YR Q <br> (CFS) | 10YR Q <br> (CFS) | 25YR Q <br> (CFS) | 100YR Q <br> (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1a | 5.14 | 9.12 | 14.48 | 33.25 |
| E1b | 0.46 | 0.59 | 0.68 | 0.76 |
| E1e | 4.51 | 7.71 | 9.19 | 11.41 |
| E1f | 4.44 | 6.91 | 7.65 | 8.21 |
| E2 | 2.55 | 5.32 | 5.91 | 6.86 |
| E3 | 6.25 | 9.71 | 11.7 | 14.6 |
| E5 | 13.23 | 24.78 | 31.82 | 43.57 |
| E5b | 24.15 | 40.86 | 49.98 | 64.02 |

Using these results, a difference in 2D surface flow can be calculated to indicate the reduction in surface flow provided by the proposed improvements. In other words, the proposed Master Plan improvements convey more water underground thereby reducing the flow on the surface. This calculation is tabulated in Table 32.

Table 32: Summary of Reduction, East Model

| Results Line ID | 2YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) | 10YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) | 25YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) | 100 YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1a | -11.95 | -36.6 | -44.27 | -45.83 |
| E1b | -11.55 | -43.16 | -75.54 | -136.02 |
| E1e | 4.49 | 7.7 | 9.17 | 11.37 |
| E1f | 1.13 | 2.28 | 2.37 | 2.6 |
| E2 | -0.1 | 1 | 2.13 | -25.56 |
| E3 | -5.64 | -16.23 | -25.01 | -38.28 |
| E5 | -15.55 | -26 | -30.55 | -37.77 |
| E5b | -35.23 | -57.35 | -68.13 | -85.88 |

Using the Master Plan 2D surface flow results in GIS, it is possible to determine which buildings are removed from flooding due to the proposed improvements. For this exercise, a minimum depth threshold of $0.5^{\prime}$ was used. This means that buildings which have a 2 D depth of at least $0.5^{\prime}$ adjacent to them were defined as "at risk" of flooding. This is a planning level estimate for use as a prioritization aid only, and actual results will vary based on more detailed analysis and actual field conditions during a rainfall event. Table 33 shows the number of these "at risk" buildings which are potentially removed from flooding of at least $0.5^{\prime}$, per each basin.

Table 33: Summary of "At Risk" Buildings Potentially Removed from Flooding, Depth >0.5 FT, East Model

|  | Buildings Removed From Flooding |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basin <br> ID | 2YR | 10YR | 25 YR | $\mathbf{1 0 0 Y R}$ |
| BC1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BC2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BC3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Q | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| U | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| V | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| W | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| X | 7 | 14 | 16 | 13 |
| Y | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Z | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  | Buildings Removed From Flooding |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basin <br> ID | $\mathbf{2 Y R}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 Y R}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 Y R}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 Y R}$ |
| Z13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z6 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Z7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Z8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### 7.1.2. West Model

The West Master Plan model includes adding several new storm drain closed conduit lines were there currently are none (B, D, E, K-L ) or extending/upsizing existing systems (A, C, F, N). As with the East model, some proposed pipes from the KEF Master Plan were removed from this analysis. In the West model, the removed pipes primarily are those which now conflict with SH161. At the time of the 2003 KEF Master Plan, SH161 had not been constructed in its entirety in this area. Now that this construction is complete, this is a major highway facility complete with its own storm drain system, drainage channels, underground utilities, bridge piers through the elevated mainlane bridge areas, embankments and other obstacles. Therefore, it is not feasible to cross under this facility 4 different times, as the 2003 KEF Master Plan indicated. However, the proposed pipes west of SH161 from the 2003 KEF Master Plan provide significant benefit. Therefore, a new proposed configuration was developed to retain the 2003 KEF Master Plan systems to the west of SH161 but which also reduces the number of highway crossings from 4 down to 2 . In addition to these improvements, a conceptual surface storage feature was modeled running along the western edge of Hardrock Rd. All these improvements were run and results were documents. Table 34 and Table 35 summarize the 1D model results. The same selected locations used to measure 2D flow in the existing scenarios were evaluated again in this scenario. Table 36 provides a summary of the surface flows in these locations. These results can be seen in Exhibits 9a-d.

Table 34: Total Flooded Nodes, West Model (Master Plan/Fully Developed)

|  | 2 YR | 10 YR | 25 YR | 100 YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Flooded Nodes <br> (WSEL > Ground Elevation) | 12 | 26 | 29 | 54 |
| Average Depth of Node Flooding (FT) | 1.04 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.99 |

Table 35: Total Surcharged Pipes, East Model (Master Plan/Fully Developed)

|  | 2YR | 10YR | 25YR | 100YR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 1) | 54 | 126 | 157 | 279 |
| Number of Surcharged Pipes (Class 2) | 4 | 10 | 20 | 44 |

Table 36: Summary of Fully Developed Peak 2D Surface Flows, West Model

| Results Line ID | 2YR Q <br> (CFS) | 10YR Q <br> (CFS) | 25YR Q <br> (CFS) | 100YR Q <br> (CFS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W1 | 63.94 | 126.43 | 157.4 | 215.5 |
| W3 | 10.46 | 24.59 | 31.65 | 82.52 |
| W4 | 48.88 | 98.25 | 127.76 | 183.11 |
| W5 | 9.51 | 18.58 | 24.77 | 51.14 |
| W6 | 1.73 | 2.43 | 2.5 | 5.42 |
| W7 | 6.18 | 16.15 | 20.73 | 28.46 |

Using these results, a difference in 2D surface flow can be calculated to indicate the reduction in surface flow provided by the proposed improvements. In other words, the proposed Master Plan improvements convey more water underground thereby reducing the flow on the surface. This calculation is tabulated in Table 37.

Table 37: Summary of Reduction, West Model

| Results Line ID | 2 YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) | 10 YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}$ (CFS) | 25 YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{CFS})$ | 100 YR <br> $\Delta \mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{CFS})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W1 | -8.19 | -27.23 | -41.73 | -62.07 |
| W3 | -16.29 | -47.48 | -68.43 | -58.14 |
| W4 | -113.9 | -262.12 | -325.05 | -404.22 |
| W5 | -137.69 | -271.74 | -335.76 | -428.27 |
| W6 | -15.16 | -33.83 | -42.59 | -52.55 |
| W7 | -11.09 | -23.48 | -28.05 | -33.82 |

Using the Master Plan 2D surface flow results in GIS, the same analysis as described in 7.1.1 was used to estimate how many buildings are potentially removed from flooding of at least $0.5^{\prime}$ due to the proposed improvements. Table 38 shows the number of these "at risk" buildings which are potentially removed from flooding of at least $0.5^{\prime}$, per each basin.

Table 38: Summary of Buildings Removed from Flooding, Depth > 0.5 FT, West Model Buildings Removed From Flooding

| Basin <br> ID | 2 YR | 10 YR | 25 YR | 100 YR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| A4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B | 3 | 10 | 24 | 45 |
| C | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| E | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| F | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| K-L | 2 | 9 | 10 | 9 |
| N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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### 8.0 Capital Project Prioritization \& Master Plan Update

After all the above modeling was run, the results showed that benefits of the proposed Master Plan infrastructure varied greatly. Some areas saw large numbers of buildings removed from flooding while other areas saw none. Some areas experienced massive reductions in surface flow and others saw none. In an effort to merge all benefits together, the following scoring system was implemented utilizing the results from the modeling.

### 8.1. Project Scoring \& Capital Project Selection

Table 39 below presents a basic scoring system, derived from model results and GIS data, which was used to screen only those proposed Master Plan improvements which provide significant benefits. The highest scored improvements will then be evaluated in more detail. Table 41 and Table 42 show the results of this scoring and are presented in order of scoring.

Table 39: Prioritization Scoring Summary

| Scoring Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Building Score | Number of buildings removed from 100YR flooding, depth $>0.5 \mathrm{Ft}$. |
| Complaint Score | Number of complaints within the basin |
| Node Score | Count of nodes with 100YR HGL above ground within the basin |
| 2D Score | Based on reduction in surface flow measured at given location. |
| Total Score | Sum of all scores. |

Table 40: Scoring Matrix Summary

|  | Count Range |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Score <br> Component | >20 | 10-20 | 5-10 | 1-5 | 0 |
| Building Score | 20 | 15 | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| Complaint Score | 20 | 15 | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| Node Score | 10 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  | Percent | eduction |  |  |
|  | >70\% | 50\%-70\% | 25\%-50\% | <25\% |  |
| 2D Score | 10 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  |

Table 41: East Area Project Prioritization

| Basin ID | Building <br> Score | Complaints | Node <br> Score | 2D <br> Scoring | Total <br> Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X | 15 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 50 |
| U | 7 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 42 |
| Y | 3 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 33 |
| V | 3 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 30 |
| Z5 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 21 |
| Manana | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 20 |
| Z6 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 15 |


| Basin ID | Building <br> Score | Complaints | Node <br> Score | 2D <br> Scoring | Total <br> Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Z7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| Z4 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 10 |
| Z | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 |
| Z3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Z8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Z9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| W | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Q | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| BC1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BC2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BC3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 42: West Area Project Prioritization

| Basin <br> ID | Building <br> Score | Complaints <br> Score | Node <br> Score | 2D <br> Scoring | Total <br> Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 20 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 45 |
| C | 3 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 33 |
| K-L | 7 | 15 | 0 | 5 | 27 |
| F | 7 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 25 |
| E | 3 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 16 |
| D | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 14 |
| A | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| A4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### 8.2. Candidate Capital Project Descriptions and Costs

Projects scoring 20 or higher were then selected to be evaluated for cost estimates and CIP scoring using the Project Cost Estimate and CIP Ranking calculators developed by Burton Johnson Engineering under a separate scope item of this contract. This results in 9 potential Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs) to be evaluated. Table 43 indicates which 9 basins qualified for further evaluation and the preliminary CIP name for each. The following sections describe these 9 projects and provide a conceptual opinion of construction cost as well as a conceptual CIP score. Detailed cost estimates are provided in Appendix B. See Exhibits 11 (1-9).

Table 43: Relationship between Basins ID, CIP Name, and Excel Tab Name

| Basin ID | CIP Name | Cost Estimate <br> Tab Name |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| B | River Ridge Blvd. Storm Drain Improvements | ShadyGrove5 |
| C | Shady Grove Storm Drain Improvements | ShadyGrove6 |
| F | Parker Rd - Hardrock Rd Storm Drain Improvements | ShadyGrove7 |
| K-L | Jelmak Rd - Hardrock Rd Storm Drain Improvements | ShadyGrove8 |
| MANANA | Manana Channel Improvements | ShadyGrove9 |
| U | Gilbert West Storm Drain Improvements | ShadyGrove2 |
| V | Shady Grove - Jones Storm Drain Improvements | ShadyGrove3 |
| X | Gilbert Drainage Improvements - All | ShadyGrove1 |
| Y | Thousand Oaks Storm Drain Improvements | ShadyGrove4 |
| Z5 | Not evaluated. See below | - |

### 8.2.1. Basin B - River Ridge Blvd Storm Drain Improvements

The 2003 Kef Master Plan recommends installing approximately 7,100 LF of closed conduit ranging in size from $27^{\prime \prime}$ to $84^{\prime \prime}$ to replace the existing concrete lined channel which drains the Grand Place mobile home park and replacing the dual $24^{\prime \prime}$ RCP between Trinity Blvd. and Big Bend Dr. with a single $60^{\prime \prime}$ RCP. These recommended improvements were tweaked to fit current site conditions or were extended to the west to aid in draining areas of local surface flooding identified by the 2D model to the west of the mobile home park. In total approximately 7,100 LF of conduit ranging in size from $18^{\prime \prime}$ to $84^{\prime \prime}$ as well as approximately $81 \sim 10^{\prime}$ curb inlets and $5 \sim$ Type Y inlets This is a large scale project with a large cost. As shown in the scoring, this area would benefit from these improvements. In addition to the main trunkline improvements along the existing channel, there are four lateral lines. The laterals along Farmer, Oak Knoll, Big Bend and Blackberry all provide benefits in their immediate vicinity. Table 44 shows peak outflows.

Table 44: Summary of Peak System Discharge - Basin B

| $*$ <br> Scenario | Peak Discharge at Outlet Pipe: |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing/FD <br> (CFS) | Proposed <br> (CFS) |
| 10 YR | 125 | 232 |
| 100 YR | 150 | 347 |

All of the existing drainage system components in the mobile home park are privately owned. The channel, bridges, pipes, etc. are located on private property and are not owned or maintained by the City. Therefore, in order to implement $t$ these improvements the City must purchase or acquire easements or ROW to perform this work. Since there are no storm drain easement here currently, a 15' wide (minimum) easement should be purchased for the entire length of all recommended conduit. See Exhibit 11W-1.

## Estimated Cost = \$5.0 MM

### 8.2.2. Basin C - Shady Grove Storm Drain Improvements

The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommends constructing or replacing (enlarging) the system along W Shady Grove Rd. from Ellis Dr. to Bear Creek. Currently, portions of the W Shady Grove Rd. system match the recommended sizes from the KEF Master Plan. Therefore these portions were not modified. Other portions of this system were modified (enlarged) to match the 2003 KEF pipe size recommendation. Two major developments have occurred in this area since the 2003 KEF Master Plan was initially developed. One is the construction of the SH161 mainlanes and the other is the office building complex south of W Shady Grove Rd. along Trinity Blvd. Each of these developments include storm drain systems which alter the drainage patterns from what they were, presumably, when the 2003 KEF Master Plan was developed. The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommendations are still relevant because the system along W Shady Grove Rd. is a major drainage artery conveying stormwater west of SH161 under SH161 to the east over to Bear Creek. The SH161 system ties into the Shady Grove system, so the recommended enlargement still provides benefit. The final size and configuration of the enlarged Shady Grove system should be analyzed in more detail during design efforts. The updated 2003 KEF Master Plan improvements were modeled, analyzed, and priced to develop a CIP. These improvements include converting approximately 3,200 LF of Shady Grove Rd. and 700 LF of Ellis Dr. to a concrete curb and gutter road way, adding approximately 13~ 10' curb inlets and $5 \sim 15^{\prime}$ curb inlets as well as increasing 3,600 LF of trunkline conduit ranging in size from $36^{\prime \prime}$ to $8^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}$ RCBs. The trunk line enlargement would provide more conveyance/outlet capacity for all systems from the west of SH161 tying into this trunkline. This results in a reduction of surface flow in the area. The reduced surface flow benefits a nearby business as well as reducing the street flooding along Shady Grove Rd. Since most of these improvements are located within City ROW, there is not much ROW to purchase. The downstream most 400' of the existing tunkline, near the outfall to Bear Creek appears to cross private property. It is recommended that the City investigate this in more detail and acquire any necessary ROW. See Exhibit 11W-2. A summary of peak system outflows is provided in Table 45.

Table 45: Summary of Peak System Discharge - Basin C

|  Peak Discharge at Outlet Pipe:  <br>  Scenario Existing/FD <br> (CFS) | Proposed <br> (CFS) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 173 | 97 |
| 100 YR | 205 | 150 |

## Estimated Cost $=\mathbf{\$ 4 . 8} \mathbf{~ M M}$

### 8.2.3. Basin F - Parker Rd - Hardrock Rd Storm Drain Improvements

The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommends 3 separate systems in this area totaling approximately 5,700 LF of pipe ranging from $36^{\prime \prime}$ to $90^{\prime \prime}$. Each of the proposed systems crosses SH161 and individually outfall into Bear Creek. At the time that the 2003 KEF Master Plan was developed, SH161 was not completed in this area. Current conditions now include SH161 main lanes, frontage road, and multiple storm sewers servicing the roadway. Due to this major change in conditions, the 2003 KEF Master Plan recommendations were modified. Systems F, G, and J
from the 2003 KEF Master Plan were modified by creating one new merged system and outfall called Basin F. All the area served by the 3 KEF proposed systems are now served by either the existing SH161 system or the proposed Basin F system. The updated Basin F system consists of approximately $4,900 \mathrm{LF}$ of new conduit ranging in size from $36^{\prime \prime}$ to $90^{\prime \prime}$. These improvements include converting approximately 1,300 LF of Parker Rd. (from current end point of curb and gutter section east to Hardrock Rd.) and approximately 2,600 LF of Hardrock Rd. (from just north of Jelmak Rd. north to Rock Island Rd.) to curb and gutter roadways and adding 27~ 10' curb inlets and $3 \sim 15^{\prime}$ curb inlets. Lowering the road profile along Hardrock Rd. to create a curb and gutter section is not enough to capture all the sheet flow crossing the roadway. Therefore, a regional interceptor swale on the west side of Hardrock Rd. is recommended. The interceptor swale is approximately 1,500 LF and runs from Parker Rd. north to Rock Island Rd. This swale should contain approximately $6 \sim$ Type $Y$ inlets to drain the swale and connect to the new proposed storm drain along Hardrock Rd. The swale was modeled with a depth of $5^{\prime}$ to test the concept. Due to potential design constraints such as ROW, existing grades, required capacity, etc. it is recommended that the final configuration should be evaluated in more detail during design. Currently runoff sheet flows from west to east across Hardrock Rd. This sheet flow contributes to flooding issues east of Hardrock Rd. The proposed new roadway, drainage system, and interceptor swale should be designed to catch all this sheet flow and re-route it through the proposed underground system.

Currently the Parker Rd. system discharges into a road side ditch just east of High Prairie Rd. Part of the updated Basin F system includes connecting to the Parker Rd. system using closed conduit instead of utilizing the current roadside ditch. Conceptually, it is anticipated that the new alignment for the City's system could cross SH161 near TXDOT's current outlet pipe to Bear Creek and possibly share the same easement. This could possibly save cost in acquiring a new easement east of SH161. Additionally, it should be noted that SH161 is elevated in this area, which with careful alignment planning, could potentially mean this crossing could be open cut instead of bored. The future design team will have to evaluate this option at that time and under those current conditions. Table 46 compares peak surface flow across Hardrock Rd.

Table 46: Summary of Peak System Discharge - Basin F

|   <br> Scenario  | Peak 2D flow across Hardrock Rd. <br> Existing/FD <br> (CFS) | Proposed <br> (CFS) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 41 | 9 |
| 100 YR | 73 | 23 |

Approximately $20^{\prime}-30^{\prime}$ wide ROW will need to be purchased along Hardrock Rd. to accommodate the interceptor swale. A 15 ' wide (minimum) easement will also need to be purchased east of Hardrock Rd. along the outfall pipe alignment all the way to Bear Creek. Exact location and size of purchased easements will have to be evaluated in more detail during design. Conceptual locations and sizes are shown on Exhibit 11W-3.

## Estimated Cost = \$4.2 MM

### 8.2.4. Basin K-L - Jelmak Rd - Hardrock Rd Storm Drain Improvements

The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommends 2 separate systems in this area totaling approximately 6,850 LF of pipe ranging from $24^{\prime \prime}$ to $90^{\prime \prime}$. Each of the KEF proposed systems cross SH161 and individually outfall into Bear Creek. At the time that the 2003 KEF Master Plan was developed, SH161 was not completed in this area. Current conditions now include SH161 main lanes, frontage road, and multiple storm sewers servicing the roadway. Due to this major change in conditions, the 2003 KEF Master Plan recommendations were modified. Systems K and L from the 2003 KEF Master Plan were modified by creating one new merged system and outfall called Basin K-L. All the area served by the 2 KEF proposed systems are now served by either the existing SH161 system or the proposed Basin K-L system. The updated Basin K-L system consists of approximately 5,200 LF of new conduit ranging in size from $36^{\prime \prime}$ to $90^{\prime \prime}$. These improvements include converting approximately 1,300 LF of Jelmak Rd. (all of it) and approximately 2,000 LF of Hardrock Rd. (from W Shady Grove Rd. to approximately 200 LF north of Jelmak Rd.) to curb and gutter roadways and adding 29~10' curb inlets and 6~15' curb inlets. Lowering the road profile along Hardrock Rd. to create a curb and gutter section is not enough to capture all the sheet flow crossing the roadway. Therefore, a regional interceptor swale on the west side of Hardrock Rd. is recommended. The interceptor swale is approximately 1,700 LF and runs approximately 200 LF north of Jelmak Rd. and 1,500 LF south of Jelmak Rd. This swale should contain approximately 1~ Type Y inlet (or more depending on design) to drain the swale and connect to the new proposed storm drain along Hardrock Rd. The swale was modeled in concept only. Due to potential design constraints such as ROW, existing grades, required capacity, etc. it is recommended that the final configuration should be evaluated in more detail during design.

Currently this area has no storm drain infrastructure along either road and water sheet flows from the west to the east, across Hardrock Rd. and into the SH161 ROW. Jelmak Rd. freely discharges water onto Hardrock Rd. and this discharge cascades as overland flow all the way to SH161. Adding a system along Jelmak Rd. intercepts the majority of this flow before it reaches Hardrock Rd. and thereby greatly reduces the overland discharge onto Hardrock. The proposed new roadway, drainage system, and interceptor swale should be designed to catch all this sheet flow and re-route it through the proposed underground system. This water would then need to be conveyed under SH161 and discharged into Bear Creek. This crossing could also be located in the elevated section of SH161 and could also potentially be open. The future design team will have to evaluate this option at that time and under those current conditions. Table 47 shows a comparison of surface flows (fully developed hydrology) across Hardrock Rd.

Table 47: Summary of Peak System Discharge - Basin K- L

| Scenario | Peak 2D flow across Hardrock Rd. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing/FD } \\ & \text { (CFS) } \end{aligned}$ | Proposed (CFS) |
| 10YR | 131 | 57 |
| 100YR | 199 | 130 |

Approximately $20^{\prime}-30^{\prime}$ wide ROW will need to be purchased along Hardrock Rd. to accommodate the interceptor swale. A 15 ' wide (minimum) easement will also need to be purchased east of Hardrock Rd. along the outfall pipe alignment all the way to Bear Creek. Exact location and size of purchased easements will have to be evaluated in more detail during design. Conceptual locations and sizes are shown on Exhibit 11W-4.

## Estimated Cost = \$3.8 MM

### 8.2.5. Basin Manana - Manana Channel Improvements

The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommends approximately 900 LF of 24 " and $30^{\prime \prime}$ RCP behind the houses along Manana Dr. However, in Spring of 2016 the City performed some minor grading in this exact location as a good faith gesture to the local resident who were complaining of various drainage issues at the time. Due to these current conditions the 2003 KEF Master Plan recommendations were modified. This study analyzed an expansion of the existing channel to intercept overland flow before it reaches the houses to the south along Manana Dr. and convey this flow to Dry Creek. This expansion involves digging out the existing Manana channel deeper, building a pilot channel, and armoring the side slopes. The current swale is roughly 8 ft wide by 1 ft deep, on average. The proposed improvements would expand this channel significantly and take advantage of the full width of the corridor in which it lies. The proposed channel would be roughly 40 ft wide by approximately 6 ft deep with a $5^{\prime}$ wide concrete pilot channel and with $3: 1$ side slopes armored with concrete riprap 10' out from the pilot channel. compares the conceptual proposed cross section to the existing cross section.

Figure 1: Proposed Manana Channel Section as Compared to Existing


The channel would run approximately 1,600 LF from the east side of the church parking towards Dry Creek. The upstream invert elevation would be approximately 504.1 and drop to approximately 471.8 (approximately $2 \%$ slope). These improvements capture, retain, and convey water which currently escapes the channel in high flow events, i.e. more flow stays in
the channel. The escaped flow impacts homes along Manana St. and gets into the Manana St. storm drain system as well as impacts commercial/industrial sites along Rock Island Rd. This additional channel capacity alleviates flooding to these houses and eases the load of the Manana St. storm drain. These improvements also provide significant reduction in surface flooding in Haynes Rd, Slocum St, and some of the commercial/industrial sites north of the Channel. A summary of peak flow in the channel at the downstream end is provided in Table 48.

Table 48: Summary of Peak System Discharge - Basin Manana

|  |  | Peak flow in channel. |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing/FD <br> (CFS) |  |
| 10YR |  | Proposed <br> (CFS) |  |
| $100 Y R$ | 8 | 10 |  |

It is important to note that the City would have to purchase a significant amount of property to perform this work. Due to the size of the channel, the City would need at least a $40^{\prime}$ wide ROW for the length of the channel. Currently, this channel sits in a sliver parcel situated between private residential lots on the south (Manana Dr. homes) and multiple industrial tracts to the north. This sliver ranges in width from about $40^{\prime}$ to about $90^{\prime}$ in places. It is recommended that the City purchase all land between the Manana Dr. homes and the industrial tracts to the north, so as to leave no remaining slivers of private land along this corridor. This would allow the City to maintain the channel by accessing the channel property from City ROW located along Slocum St. and Haynes Rd. Currently the City does not own any easement for the existing grading that is there now. The existing grading was performed on property owned by the Greater Allen Temple AME Church. In addition to ownership issues, the church does not properly maintain this swale. Therefore the City has no means of performing additional work on this property or providing any additional maintenance unless all necessary property is acquired by the City. See Exhibit 11E-5.

## Estimated Cost $=\$ 0.75 \mathrm{MM}$

### 8.2.6. Basin U - Shady Grove Rd., Gilbert Rd., Wright Blvd. Storm Drain Improvements

The 2003 KEF Master Plan proposes enlarging the existing storm drain system which serves W. Shady Grove Rd. and the Shady Grove Ranch mobile home park as well as modifying existing outfalls in the existing detention pond south of Thoroughbred Ln. by creating a new direct outfall into Bear Creek. One recommended update to the 2003 KEF Master Plan is an additional new storm drain extension north of W. Shady Grove Rd., along Gilbert Rd. north to Wright Blvd. The extension will intercept overland runoff before it reaches W. Shady Grove Rd. and the Shady Grove Ranch mobile home park. This prevents roadway and structure flooding in this area, and can be constructed entirely in City owner ROW. The total proposed storm drain improvements are approximately 3,125 LF of storm drain ranging in size from $18^{\prime \prime}$ to $72^{\prime \prime}$ and approximately $4 \sim 15^{\prime}$ curb inlets and $10 \sim 10^{\prime}$ curb inlets. These improvements were then evaluated, scored, and cost estimates were developed. These are presented in two phases. Refer to Exhibits 11E-6, 11E-6a, and 11E-6b. Table 49 compares flows over top of Shady Grove Rd.

Table 49: Summary of Peak Flows - Basin U

| $*$ Flow Over Shady Grove Rd.  <br>  Scenario Existing/FD <br> (CFS) | Proposed <br> (CFS) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 4 |
| 100 YR | 32 | 7 |

## Phase 1

The first phase of improvements includes the new storm drain extension north of Shady Grove Rd. along Gilbert Rd. north to Wright Blvd. as well as enlarging portions of the existing system and adding a few new inlets within the Shady Grove Ranch mobile home park along the existing alignment, as shown on Exhibit 11E-6a. The storm drain extension includes approximately 885 LF of storm drain ranging in size from $18^{\prime \prime}$ to $36^{\prime \prime}$ as well as approximately $4 \sim$ $15^{\prime}$ curb inlets and $10 \sim 10^{\prime}$ curb inlets to capture surface flow. It is recommended that inlet sizes and locations be more precisely evaluated during design efforts. Approximately 1,000 LF of Shady Grove, 450 LF of Gilbert Rd. and 500 LF of Wright Rd. near this alignment will also need to be replaced with a concrete curb and gutter roadway section.

In addition to this storm drain extension, enlarging approximately 840 LF of existing system and adding an additional 5 curb inlets are proposed in the Shady Grove Ranch mobile home park along Stallion Ln., Colt Terrace, Filly Ln. These inlets will require the City to purchase easements, since these are private streets. These improvements provide significant benefit by capturing surface flow and conveying it underground to the existing pond to the south.

## Estimate Cost = \$1.5 MM

## Phase 2

Phase 2 involves connecting the three existing system outfalls located in the existing pond south of Thoroughbred Ln. with approximately 1,375 LF of new underground conduit ranging in size from $36^{\prime \prime}$ to $72^{\prime \prime}$ underneath the existing pond and discharging directly into Bear Creek, as shown on Exhibit 11E-6b. The new conduit would tie 3 existing outfalls together and create one single direct outfall into Bear Creek. Currently, the existing pond stores discharge from these systems, conveys it to the east, crosses under Trinity Blvd. and discharges into Bear Creek. The initial intent of the KEF Master Plan to reconfigure these systems is unclear. At this time, this analysis does not recommend pursuing this phase of this potential CIP. However, Phase 1 may potentially be implemented as a standalone project. Further evaluation, including evaluating Bear Creek, is needed to determine the hydraulic impacts of Phase 2 of the Master Plan.

Estimate Cost =\$0.6 MM<br>Estimated Cost (All phases) = \$2.1 MM

### 8.2.7. Basin V - Shady Grove - Jones Storm Drain Improvements

The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommends approximately 2,700 LF of closed conduit ranging in size from $24^{\prime \prime}$ to $96^{\prime \prime}$. The proposed alignment is to take flow from E Shady Grove Rd. and convey it underground where it discharges into a ditch/tributary to Bear Creek, just north of Trinity Blvd. This alignment runs underneath what are currently the Kevco Electric and NATGUN office buildings. Therefore, this alignment was modified to fit current conditions. The new alignment used in this study begins at the same place upstream (servicing E. Shady Grove Rd.) but cuts to the east on the north side of the Kevco Electric and NATGUN office buildings, while still discharging into the same ditch/tributary near Trinity Blvd. as the original alignment. These improvements were modeled, evaluated, scored and priced to develop a potential CIP. These improvements involve converting approximately 800 LF of Shady Grove Rd.and 425 LF of Jones Rd. to a concrete curb and gutter section roadway with approximately 2~10' curb inlets and 2~15' curb inlets and 1 additional $10^{\prime}$ curb inlet near the Rocky Spring Missionary Baptist Church parking lot. The underground storm drain system consists of approximately 2,400 LF of pipe ranging from $24^{\prime \prime}$ to $48^{\prime \prime}$. Currently E. Shady Grove Rd. and north along Jones Rd. is drained by roadside ditches and culverts for both roadways. The main outlet of this area near the church and north of E Shady Grove Rd. is a single culvert running south underneath E Shady Grove Rd. All runoff from north of Shady Grove is discharged though this culvert onto private property. This was documented during a rain storm on 4/18/2017 and is shown on . Refer to Exhibit 11E-7.

Figure 2: Culvert under Shady Grove Discharging onto Private Property


This discharge then runs overland across private property southward towards a ditch/tributary near Trinity Blvd. which conveys this and other flow underneath Trinity Blvd. and into Bear Creek. In order to reduce this free discharge of stormwater onto private property, it is
recommended that the City purchase a $15^{\prime}$ wide (minimum) easement for the entire length of the proposed alignment and install an underground pipe network to convey stormwater from the proposed redesigned roadways to the ditch/swale discharge channel near Trinity Blvd.
Table 50 compares peak overland flows downstream of the current culvert discharge location.

| Scenario | Overland Flow Downstream of Culvert |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing/FD (CFS) | Proposed (CFS) |
| 10YR | 26 | 10 |
| 100 YR | 53 | 15 |

## Estimated Cost = \$1.3 MM

### 8.2.8. Basin X - Gilbert Drainage Improvements

This basin begins accumulating runoff in the vicinity of Gilbert Circle and Gilbert Rd. just south of Rock Island and ultimately flows into the FEMA studied Gilbert Branch. Under existing system conditions and fully developed runoff conditions, the flow in the existing channel between Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert Cir. is about 81 CFS in the 10YR event and is about 120 CFS in the 100 YR event. The flow in the channel as it enters Gilbert Branch between Enchanted Ct. and Wandering Brook St. is about 213 CFS in the 10YR event and about 355 CFS in the 100 YR event. A comparison of these flows with post-project (proposed) flows are provided in Table 51 below. There is a drainage complaint "Hot Spot" in this area, at the Texas Pro Diesel Repair just north of the Greater Allen Temple AME Church driveway on Gilbert Rd. south of Rock Island Rd. and is discussed below. The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommends approximately 3,500 LF of storm drain improvements and 4,100 LF of channel improvements. This update to the 2003 KEF plan modifies the original recommended configuration based on current drainage network and infrastructure needs. This study recommends a total of 4,400 LF of storm drain and 2,200 LF of channel improvements. The modifications include adding new conduit in the upstream reaches of the watershed and terminating the channel improvements upstream of the mapped FEMA floodplain and the concrete lined Gilbert Branch channel. These improvements were modeled, evaluated, scored and priced to develop a potential CIP. These improvements are presented in three phases. Refer to Exhibits 11E-8, 11E-8a (Phase 1), 11E-8b (Phase 2), and 11E-8c (Phase 3). Table 51 below compares peak discharges at key locations.

Table 51: Comparison of Flows for Basin X

|  | Discharge from Prop. <br> $36^{\prime \prime}$ RCP. into swale | Flow through natural <br> swale between Gilbert Cir. |  | Flow in channel as it enters <br> Gilbert Branch downstream |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Proposed Only | Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed |
| 10 YR | 45 | 81 | 82 | 213 | 116 |
| 100 YR | 65 | 120 | 160 | 355 | 298 |

## Phase 1

The first phase must be ROW acquisition, since much of the surface flow path is on private property. The main flow path for this entire basin runs from the headwaters near the intersection of Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert Rd. towards the southeast down to the FEMA studied Gilbert Branch channel. The existing swale south of Gilbert Rd. is located on private property. An easement is recommended to be purchased by the City so that a proper channel can be graded to convey the design storm and can also be properly protected from encroachments. The 2 D rain on mesh model results indicates the width of the overland flow path along the natural swale is approximately $100^{\prime}-150^{\prime}$ wide for $100-\mathrm{YR}$ fully developed flow deeper than $0.25^{\prime}$. The exact size of this easement needs to be determined based on detailed engineering analysis and surveying practice. The easement width must be determined based on proposed grading and channel design. A channel should be designed to contain the design flow to prevent flood damage to adjacent structures. The final designed configuration of an engineered channel will establish the required width of the easement. Per Section 2.5 (A) of the City's DDM, channel easements must be at least $20^{\prime}$ wider than the width of the top banks of the channel. The swale then flows south to the intersection of Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert Rd. to the south, near Bear Creek South Park. A new headwall on the north side of Gilbert Cir. and 270 LF of new 7' x 4' RCB box culvert under the roadway as well as a $4^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ Type $Y$ inlet and 75 LF of $24^{\prime \prime}$ lateral connecting the Type $Y$ inlet to the $7^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ box are proposed in this location. This culvert then discharges into a channel located in the City's Bear Creek South Park. It is recommended that the City purchase 3 whole parcels between Bear Creek South Park and Autumn View Dr. The other 6 parcels in this area are owned by Grand Prairie ISD (2) or Irving ISD (4). Ideally an agreement between Grand Prairie ISD and Irving ISD could be reached to use this property jointly, possibly as an "outdoor learning center" or park. Under this circumstance, purchasing the 3 privately held parcels would provide a contiguous block of land which could potentially be excavated and used as a regional detention pond for flood control applications. This phase would include excavating this area, constructing an earthen dam on the downstream side, and installing approximately 140 LF of $24^{\prime \prime}$ outlet pipe. If Irving ISD is not receptive to a joint agreement for these parcels, then the City should try to purchase those 4 parcels currently held by Irving. The cost estimate for this phase assumes a joint agreement can be reached and does not include the cost of those 4 other parcels held by Irving. This proposed potential regional detention reduces the flow in the channel as it enters Gilbert Branch between Enchanted Ct. and Wandering Brook St. At this location the proposed network/fully developed runoff flow in the channel, downstream of these proposed improvements, is about 116 CFS in the 10YR and about 298 CFS in the 100 YR event. Refer to Exhibit 11E-8a.

## Estimated Cost = \$1.4 MM

## Phase 2

The second phase of this project includes repaving 3,550 LF of neighborhood streets and installing approximately 2,260 LF of storm drain ranging in size from $24^{\prime \prime}$ to $36^{\prime \prime}$ to create three individual small storm drain systems along Gilbert Rd., Gilbert Cir. and Rose Lee Seaton Rd.

On the north (upstream) end of the watershed, near Gilbert Rd. and Gilbert Cir. south of Rock Island Rd. (near the aforementioned "hot spot" area), approximately 1,200 LF of new storm drain ranging in size from $24^{\prime \prime}$ to $36^{\prime \prime}$ along with approximately 12 curb inlets are proposed. This system would collect runoff from the hot spot area and convey it underground where it then discharges approximately 45 CFS (10YR) and 65 CFS (100YR) into the natural swale south of Gilbert Cir. (purchased by City in Phase 1). Under proposed network conditions and fully developed runoff, the natural swale between Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert. Cir. conveys approximately 82 CFS in the 10 YR event and 160 CFS in the 100 YR event.

Then, along Rose Lee Seaton Rd., mid-block between both intersections with Gilbert Cir., another system is proposed. This system consists of approximately 600 LF of storm drain ranging in size from $27^{\prime \prime}$ to $33^{\prime \prime}$ as well as $3 \sim 10^{\prime}$ curb inlets and $2 \sim 15^{\prime}$ curb inlets. The combined road repaving and storm system will drain the mid-block sump and also will intersect overland flow which comes from the west of Rose Lee Seaton Rd. This flow will then be discharged into the natural swale which was purchased by the City in Phase 1 above. These proposed systems would all discharge into the swale purchased and graded in Phase 1.

Near the south intersection of Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert Rd. (near Bear Creek South Park) another small storm drain system is proposed. This system consists of approximately 460 LF of $24^{\prime \prime}$ pipe and approximately 2 curb inlets along Gilbert Cir. and another located at the sump in the curve of Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert Rd. This system will facilitate the necessary drainage associated with repaving Gilbert Cir. into a curb and gutter roadway as well as collecting local runoff from the north and west of Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert Rd., respectively, at the natural low point north of the roadway. This system will tie into the proposed $7^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ box culvert which is proposed in Phase 1 above. Also in this area, approximately 800 LF of culvert will need to be removed to facilitate the new street repaving in this area. The flow once conveyed by these culverts and ditches will then be conveyed in the new curb and gutter roadways in this area. Refer to Exhibit 11E-8b.

## Estimated Cost = \$2.3 MM

## Phase 3

The remaining KEF Master Plan improvements in this basin involve installing 5 new individual storm drain systems in various places to collect surface runoff and convey it underground into Gilbert Branch as well as repaving approximately 350 LF of neighborhood roadway. In all the storm drain improvements total approximately 1,750 LF in length ranging from $18^{\prime \prime}$ to $60^{\prime \prime}$ as well as approximately $5 \sim 4^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}$ Type $Y$ inlets and $10 \sim 10^{\prime}$ curb inlets. Almost all of the proposed storm drain lines in this phase are located on private property and therefore will require another round of easement purchase.

At Gilbert Rd. near South Bear Creek Park approximately 285 LF of storm drain ranging in size from $18^{\prime \prime}$ to $60^{\prime \prime}$, a new headwall to the east and $2 \sim 4 x 4$ Type Y inlets north of Gilbert Rd. are proposed. This system collects surface runoff and conveys it underground where it discharges into the pond proposed in Phase 1. This system could be constructed within City owned ROW.

## MCKIM\&CREED

The other 4 KEF Master Plan proposed systems are all located on the western portion of the Sherwood Village Mobile Home Park property, and as such will require easement acquisition. These improvements consist of approximately 1,455 LF of storm drain ranging from $24^{\prime \prime}$ to $30^{\prime \prime}$ and approximately $10 \sim 10^{\prime}$ curb inlets and $2 \sim 4^{\prime} x^{\prime} 4^{\prime}$ Type $Y$ inlets.

The aforementioned pond could potentially be utilized to mitigate any potential increases in flow due to these new storm drains discharging into Gilbert Branch. Refer to Exhibit 11E-8c.

## Estimated Cost = \$0.9 MM

## Total Estimated Cost (All phases) = \$4.6 MM

## Hot Spot Area

There have been complaints of flooding at Texas Pro Diesel Repair just north of the Greater Allen Temple AME Church driveway near Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert Rd., allegedly due to a new church parking lot blocking the drainage path for surface runoff trying to flow south along Gilbert Rd. During the course of this study, this area was investigated to determine the nature of the surface drainage in this vicinity. Based on field observations, LIDAR data, and 2D surface flow model, it looks like Gilbert Rd. has a local sump in the vicinity of the church driveway. This sump in the roadway should allow runoff to escape the properties on the east side of Gilbert Rd. by allowing water to enter the Gilbert Rd ROW at the sump and then conveys it to the west side of Gilbert Rd. Water appears to pond up on the east side of Gilbert Rd. to depths less than 1 foot during a 100-YR event, mostly along the edge of the Gilbert Rd. pavement. Figure 3 shows this area during construction of the driveway, prior to completion.

Figure 3: Gilbert Cir. Hot Spot Area - Pre Driveway Conditions from Google Maps


## MCKIM\&CREED

The evaluated Basin X Master Plan improvements proposed in the 2003 KEF Master Plan start at this location. In this vicinity, the Master Plan improvements consist of converting Gilbert Rd. from an asphalt road with very small swales into a concrete curb \& gutter roadway with a closed conduit drainage system. The closed system includes multiple curb inlets and pipes ranging in size from $24^{\prime \prime}$ to $36^{\prime \prime}$. This proposed system should pick up runoff from both sides of Gilbert Rd. and sump area, including the complaint location. During detailed design efforts, a more detailed evaluation should be performed to ensure that inlets are placed at precise locations to drain the properties on the east side of Gilbert Rd. It is possible that inlets may potentially be placed near or on private property, including purchasing appropriate easements, to ensure positive drainage away from the church parking lot.

Since these improvements are part of a larger master plan, this area may need a solution sooner than the Master Plan implementation will allow. If a solution in this area is urgent, then it is recommended to move forward with a separate "hot spot" design evaluation immediately. The following scenarios should be investigated in more detail under that effort to determine more precise design configuration, quantities, and specifications.

Figure 4: Hot Spot Location flow patterns near church parking lot.


Option 1: Build a portion of the 2003 KEF Master Plan storm drain improvements in this area. This option would involve executing Phase 1 of the Basin X Master Plan to purchase necessary ROW and then building only a portion of Phase 2 of the Basin X storm drain improvements ( 675 LF of $24^{\prime \prime}$ RCP and 530 LF of $36^{\prime \prime}$ RCP and approximately 12 standard $10^{\prime}$ Curb Inlets) in the immediate vicinity of Gilbert Cir. and Gilbert Rd. This storm drain would collect runoff along Gilbert Rd. north of Gilbert Cir. and convey it underground along Gilbert Rd. and then discharge it into the existing swale south of Gilbert Cir. The 10YR discharge from this $36^{\prime \prime}$ RCP would be approximately 45 CFS and the 100 YR would be about 65 CFS . It is necessary to execute Phase 1 first so that all stormwater discharged by the City's storm drain is then contained within City ROW all the way to its confluence with the Gilbert Branch channel
downstream. If Phase 1 is not executed prior to constructing the storm drain in this area, then this could potentially put the City at risk because the discharge from the new storm drain would flow across private property all the way down to Gilbert Branch. Discharging public stormwater onto private property to freely flow overland is not advisable. These legal issues and liabilities should be evaluated before proceeding.

Option 2: Manana Channel improvements (described below) + relief storm drain line. This option would include further excavating the Manana channel to a depth of about 6 feet for approximately 1700 LF and then running a storm drain line from the eastern ROW line of Gilbert Rd. underneath the church parking lot to the east and daylighting the outfall of the pipe into the deepened Manana Channel. The additional excavation is necessary to do this because there is currently not enough elevation fall between the alleged flooding location and the current Manana channel bottom east of the church parking lot. It should be noted that the City would need to purchase most or all of this parcel to establish ROW to perform this work. Currently the City does not own this property and therefore has no ability to modify the existing channel any further.

Option 3: Build new storm drain running north under Rock Island.
This option would involve constructing very similar storm drain improvements as those described in Option 1 above, but running the outfall pipe north, under Rock Island Rd. (approximately 400 LF ) and discharging into the ditch adjacent to the TRE train tracks. This study did not evaluate this option for hydraulic performance. This is only a conceptual alternative which should be evaluated in detail before moving forward. In concept, it appears that there is enough elevation fall between the complaint location and the TRE ditch for this to work hydraulically. This would keep storm drain conduit within City street ROW at least until the discharge point north of Rock Island Dr. Further property ownership investigation and agreements with all other agencies should be vetted before proceeding with this option.

### 8.2.9. Basin Y - Thousand Oaks Storm Drain Improvements

The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommended constructing or replacing (enlarging) the system along Post Oak Dr. as well as connecting the sump inlet on Thousand Oaks Dr. to the Post Oak Dr. system with underground conduit. Currently, portions of the Post Oak Dr. system match the recommended sizes from the KEF Master Plan. Therefore these portions were not modified. Other portions of this system were modified (enlarged) to match the 2003 KEF pipe size recommendation. The sump inlets on Thousand Oaks Dr. currently discharge into a drainage swale for approximately 250 feet where it is then picked up by a headwall and 27" RCP which then ties in to the Post Oak Dr. system. The 2003 KEF Master Plan recommends connecting the Thousand Oaks Dr. sump inlets to the Post Oak Dr. system completely underground using 38" and $42^{\prime \prime}$ RCP. Since a $38^{\prime \prime}$ RCP is not a standard size, this study modified this run of pipe to use $42^{\prime \prime}$ pipe instead. This underground conveyance would prevent the overland flooding of houses in the immediate vicinity. Along with this pipe, a new Type Y inlet is required to collect overland flow remaining in the existing drainage swale. In total, the updated configuration of these improvements consists of replacing/enlarging approximately 1,500 LF of storm drain
along Post Oak Dr. ranging in size from 30" to 42" and installing approximately 250 LF of new $42^{\prime \prime}$ RCP to connect the Thousand Oaks Dr. sump to the Post Oak Dr. system. These improvements were modeled, evaluated, scored and priced to develop a potential CIP. This study assumes that Manana Dr. and Post Oak Dr. are City ROWs. Therefore the only easement purchase is along the proposed alignment of the connecter line between the Thousand Oaks Dr. sump inlets and the Post Oak Dr. system. Refer to Exhibit 11E-9. Table 52 compares peak system discharges at the downstream pipe.

Table 52: Summary of Peak Flows - Basin Y

| $*$ Pcenario | Peak Discharge at Outlet Pipe: <br> Existing/FD <br> (CFS) | Proposed <br> (CFS) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 130 | 150 |
| $100 Y R$ | 136 | 163 |

## Estimated Cost = \$0.7 MM

### 8.2.10. Basin Z 5

Basin Z5 was not evaluated as a storm water Capital Project because this study indicates that the potential flooding issues in this area appear to be due to floodplain issues along Dry Creek. Basin Z5, and other areas along Dry Creek, show a high number of complaints, but no 2D flow reduction due to proposed storm drain infrastructure. This indicates that the flooding shown is a tailwater issue stemming from flood levels coming from Dry Creek. In other words, storm drain does not reduce flooding in these areas but reducing the flood levels in Dry Creek may. Evaluating the Dry Creek watershed and channel is not in this scope of work, therefore no capital projects are being evaluated for these areas under this study.
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| Streams | Model Boundary |
| :---: | :---: |
| Existing Land Use |  |
| Commercial and Business | Residential 1/3 Acre |
| Industrial | Residential 1/4 Acre |
| Open Space Fair Condition | Residential 1/8 Acre |
| Open Space Good Condition | Residential 2 Acre |
| Open Space Poor Condition | $\triangle$ Streets and Roads, Paved, Parking Lots |
| Residential 1 Acre | Streets and Roads, Paved, Open ditches |
| Residential 1/2 Acre |  |
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