

PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE STUDY The Bishop's School

7607 La Jolla Boulevard, La Jolla, CA 92037 PRJ-PMT-DWG. # -D

> CUP SUBMITTAL August 16, 2022

Prepared by: Michael Baker International 9755 Clairemont Mesa Blvd San Diego, CA 92124 858.614.5000 Contact: Jay Sullivan, PE, CFM, QSD JN 182696



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1 | Proj | Project Description1 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 | Project Data | | | | | | |
| _ | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Stu | dy Objectives3 | | | | | | |
| 3 | Met | thodology3 | | | | | | |
| | 3.1 | Hydrology | | | | | | |
| | 3.2 | Hydrology | | | | | | |
| | J.Z | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Res | ults4 | | | | | | |
| | 4.1 | Hydrology4 | | | | | | |
| | 4.2 | Hydraulics | | | | | | |
| 5 | CEO | A THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | | | | | |
| 6 | Con | clusions and Recommendations6 | | | | | | |
| 7 | Dec | leration of Responsible Charges7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | Ref | erences | | | | | | |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1 - Vicinity Map (nts) | 2 |
|-------------------------------|---|
|-------------------------------|---|

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 4-1- Summary of Pre vs. Post Development Peak Flow Rates | 4 |
|--|---|
| Table 4-2- Storm Drain Capacity Summary | 5 |
| Table 4-3- Inlet Summary | 5 |



ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A. Site Information Attachment B. Existing Hydrology Attachment C. Proposed Hydrology Attachment D. Hydraulics Attachment E. Plan Sheets



PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 PROJECT DATA

| Project Owner: | The Bishop's School 7607 La Jolla Blvd. La Jolla, CA 92037 |
|-----------------------|--|
| Project Site Address: | 7607 La Jolla Blvd., La Jolla, CA 92037 |
| Project Location: | Latitude: 32.841289 Longitude: -117.279040 |
| Adjacent Areas: | North: Ex. Development/Prospect St. West: Prospect St./ La Jolla Blvd. South: Ex. Development/Alley East: Draper Ave. |
| Adjacent Land Uses: | Residential/Commercial |
| Legal Description: | Parcel 1 of Parcel Map 19523 |
| APN: | 350-420-05 |

1.2 SCOPE OF REPORT

This study develops 100-year, 6-hour peak flow runoff for the existing and proposed conditions to identify the hydrologic impacts of the proposed improvements. This study includes the preliminary design and capacity of proposed stormwater infrastructure, through the implementation of proposed stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs).

This report does not discuss required water quality measures to be taken on an interim level during construction, nor those necessary to be implemented permanently. Those discussions can be found under separate cover in the project "Storm Water Pollution Prevent Plan" (SWPPP) and the "Storm Water Quality Management Plan" (SWQMP), respectively. Additionally, this report does not discuss hydromodification mitigation requirements and/or exemptions. That discussion can be found in Attachment 2 of the SWQMP.

1.3 LOCATION

The Bishop's School project site comprises approximately 2.41 acres and is located along the west side of Draper Street at the intersection of Draper St. and Silver St., in the City of San Diego, California. The project site is roughly 0.2 miles from the Pacific Ocean, the approximate location can be seen on Figure 1 – Vicinity Map.





FIGURE 1 - VICINITY MAP (NTS)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has not mapped any Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) for the project site. The entire project site lies within un-shaded Zone X, which correlates with areas determined to be outside the 500-year floodplain. A copy of the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) included in Attachment A.

The NRCS Web Soil Survey was referenced, and most of the project site is hydrologic soil Group "D". Group "D" soils have very slow to infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. Soils in Group "D" are characterized by having a layer impeding the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture making for a slow rate of water transmission. A copy of the NRCS map is included in Attachment A.

1.4 EXISTING CONDITION

The project site is entirely built out in the existing condition and has been hydrologically analyzed as two drainage basins, a northern and southern basin. The site generally drains westerly via a combination of surface flow and pipe flow via existing area drains. The project site does not receive surface run-on from the neighboring properties; project site runoff is ultimately discharges into an existing public 4'x6' RCB culvert located on-site within an easement dedicated to the City of San Diego.

Impervious area is comprised of the concrete walkways, tennis courts, drive isles and roofing. Pervious area is comprised of landscape located within adjacent to walkways and the existing building.

The existing site topography, drainage patterns, and stormwater conveyance systems are shown on the Existing Condition Hydrologic Work Map included in Attachment B.



1.5 PROPOSED CONDITION

The proposed structures will be located close to the property lines on all sides of the project site. Roof leaders, area drains, and new on-site private storm drain will direct project site runoff to an existing public storm drain (4'x6' RCB) on-site, said public storm drain is within an easement to the City of San Diego. The project site is entirely built out in the proposed condition and has been hydrologically analyzed as two drainage basins, similar to the existing condition analysis.

Discharge from the project area will outlet into modular wetlands systems and will connect to the City's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) via a public storm drain (4'x6' RCB) on-site.

Refer to Appendix C for an exhibit detailing the proposed condition.

2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

- Quantify the pre- and post-development 100-year peak flow rates for each respective project area;
- Demonstrate the proposed improvements will not increase the potential for erosion on the project site or downstream areas;
- Document the hydraulic capacities of preliminary on-site, private pipes and inlets using methodology outlined in the City's DDM;
- Document compliance with CEQA thresholds of significance.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 HYDROLOGY

The Rational Method has been utilized to perform the hydrologic analyses. The following formula conforms to the hydrologic methodologies outlined in the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual (January 2017).

Where, Q = Peak Discharge - (cfs)

C = Runoff Coefficient

/ = Average Rainfall Intensity - (in/hr)

A = Drainage Area - (acres)



A runoff coefficient has been determined for the existing and proposed conditions per Section A.1.2 of the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual. The tabulated impervious area chosen for the project site is 85% (commercial use) for the existing and proposed condition.

Intensity has been calculated per the IDF Curve in Figure A-1 of the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual.

3.2 HYDRAULICS

The on-site, private storm water inlet capture capacity has been determined in accordance with the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual (DDM, Jan. 2017) using AutoDesk's Hydraflow Express. This software uses standard weir and orifice equations and follows the methodology outlined in Section 3.2.2 of the City's DDM (Jan. 2017).

The on-site, private storm water pipe capacity has been determined in accordance with the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual (DDM, Jan. 2017) using AutoDesk's Hydraflow Express. This software assumes uniform flow and normal depth and follows the methodology outlined in Section 4.0 of the City's DDM (Jan. 2017).

4 RESULTS

4.1 HYDROLOGY

The summary of peak flow rates for the 100-year event are summarized in Table 4-1 below. Refer to Attachments B, C, and D for the existing, proposed, and mitigated peak flow calculations; respectively.

| Node | Tc (min) | C - | l (in/hr) | A (ac) | Q100 (cfs) | V100 (ft/s) | | | |
|-----------------|---|--------|--------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| | • | | Dro Dovalar | | | | | | |
| | | | Pre-Develop | oment | | | | | |
| 150 | 6.71 | 0.80 | 4.00 | 2.10 | 6.75 | 7.03* | | | |
| 250 | 5.00 | 0.95 | 4.40 | 0.19 | 0.79 | 2.82* | | | |
| Total | - | - | - | 2.29 | 7.54 | - | | | |
| | | | Post-Develo | pment | | | | | |
| 150 | 5.00 | 0.89 | 4.40 | 2.10 | 8.23 | 7.62* | | | |
| 250 | 5.00 | 0.95 | 4.40 | 0.19 | 0.79 | 2.82* | | | |
| Total | - | - | - | 2.29 | 9.02 | - | | | |
| *Velocities are | *Velocities are obtained from using the 4'x6' RCB that passes through the site. | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 4-1- SUMMARY OF PRE VS. POST DEVELOPMENT PEAK FLOW RATES



4.2 HYDRAULICS

Surface runoff is directed to proposed inlets via curb and gutter, ribbon gutters, and roof leaders; then directed to the proposed storage facilities via new private storm drain. The tables below summarize the respective inlet and pipe capacities for the site. Refer to Appendix D for hydraulic calculations.

| Pipe Diameter (in) | Slope | Material | Capacity (cfs) | Velocity (ft/sec) | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 8 | 1.0 | PVC | 1.3 | 3.90 | | | |
| 12 | 1.0 | PVC | 3.8 | 5.06 | | | |
| 18 | 1.0 | PVC | 11.2 | 6.64 | | | |
| 24 | 1.0 | PVC | 24.3 | 8.00 | | | |
| 4'x6' | 3.3 | RCB | 600.0 | 26.14 | | | |
| 60* | 3.3 | RCP | 600.0 | 27.02 | | | |
| *Assumed pressure flo | *Assumed pressure flow. | | | | | | |

TABLE 4-2- STORM DRAIN CAPACITY SUMMARY

TABLE 4-3- INLET SUMMARY

| Туре | Size | Condition | Capture (cfs) | Bypass (cfs) | Ponding Depth (in) |
|-------|---------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Grate | 12"x12" | Sag | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Grate | 18"x18" | Sag | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |

5 CEQA THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

1. Will the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

The project will not alter the existing overall drainage pattern across the site. Grading is proposed for three new buildings, re-paving of an existing parking lot, and a proposed pavilion.

2. Will the project increase water surface elevation in a watercourse within a watershed equal to or greater than 1 square mile, by 1 foot or more in height and in the case of the San Luis Rey River, San Dieguito River, San Diego River, Sweetwater River and Otay River, 2/10 of a foot or more?

The project will not increase water surface elevations across the site or downstream. Proposed improvements will not alter the existing hydrologic and hydraulic properties of the site. Increase in peak flow discharge is anticipated to be minimal as a result of the proposed project.

3. Will the project result in increased velocities and peak flow rates exiting the project site that could cause flooding downstream or exceed the storm water drainage system capacity serving the site?

The project will minimally increase runoff velocities or peak flow rates leaving the site. Runoff will continue to flow as it does under existing conditions. The project will not cause flooding downstream, nor will it hydraulically impact downstream storm water infrastructure.

4. Will the project result in placing housing, habitable structures, or unanchored impediments to flow in a 100-year floodplain area or other special flood hazard area, as shown on a FIRM, a County Flood Plain Map or County Alluvial Fan Map, which would subsequently endanger health, safety and property due to flooding?

There are no proposed habitable structures located within a 100-year flood plain. The project site is located in a FEMA Zone X, correlating with being outside the 500-year floodplain.

- 5. Will the project place structures within a 100-year flood hazard or alter the floodway in a manner that would redirect or impede flow resulting in any of the following:
 - a) Alter the line of inundation resulting in the placement of other housing in a 100 year flood hazard
 - b) Increase water surface elevation in a watercourse with a watershed equal to or greater than 1 square mile by 1 foot or more in height and in the case of the San Luis Rey River, San Dieguito River, San Diego River, Sweetwater River and Otay River, 2/10 of a foot or more?

Proposed improvements will not impact 100-year limits of inundation.

The project will not increase water surface elevations across the site or downstream. Proposed improvements will not alter the existing hydrologic and hydraulic properties of the site. Increase in peak flow discharge, as compared to pre-development conditions, is anticipated to be minimal as a result of the proposed project.

6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Proposed improvements will result in a minor increase to 100-year peak flow discharge from the site, as compared to the existing condition. Increases in peak flow associated with new impervious area don't require mitigation due to the outflow draining into a lined conveyance system that then outlets into the Pacific Ocean located 2 miles from the project site. The downstream storm drain infrastructure has capacity to handle the minor increase in flow, which is less than 0.3% of total capacity.

Furthermore, the project is located towards the downstream portion of total storm drain system with a very minimal time of concentration and thus will peak much sooner than the time it takes total peak flow in the system to reach the site and downstream infrastructure. As such, the minor increase is insignificant.

The project will not discharge, dredge, or fill material into any Water of the United States, thus the project is not required to obtain a Section 401 certification or Section 404 permit from the State of California or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.



7 DECLERATION OF RESPONSIBLE CHARGES

I, hereby declare that I am the Civil Engineer of work for this project, that I have exercised responsible charge over the design of the project as defined in Section 6703 of the Business and Professions Code, and that the design is consistent with current design.

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

Date

Jullivan

8/16/2022



Jay Sullivan, PE, CFM, QSD RCE 77445

8 REFERENCES

City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual (June 2017).

FEMA. (1997). Flood Insurance Rate Map. San Diego.



Attachment A. Site Information

Rainfall Isopluvials FEMA FIRM NRCS WebSoil Survey

Michael Baker





County of San Diego Hydrology Manual



Rainfall Isopluvials

100 Year Rainfall Event - 6 Hours

Isopluvial (inches)





THIS MAP IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Copyright SanGIS, All Rights Reserved. may contain infor

3 Miles 3

SANDAG This product may contain information which has be permission granted by Thomas Brothers Maps.



County of San Diego Hydrology Manual



Rainfall Isopluvials

100 Year Rainfall Event - 24 Hours

Isopluvial (inches)





THIS MAP IS PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Copyright SanGIS, All Rights Reserved.



This products may contain information from the SANDAG Regional Information System which cannot be reproduced without the written permission of SANDAG.

This product may contain information which has been reproduced with permission granted by Thomas Brothers Maps.



National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette



Legend



Basemap: USGS National Map: Orthoimagery: Data refreshed October, 2020

Custom Soil Resource Report Soil Map



| | MAP LEGEND | | | MAP INFORMATION | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Area of In | Area of Interest (AOI) | | Spoil Area | The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000. | | |
| | Area of Interest (AOI) | Ô | Stony Spot | 1.24,000. | | |
| Soils | Soil Map Unit Polygons | 0 | Very Stony Spot | Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale. | | |
| | Soil Map Unit Lines | Ŷ | Wet Spot | | | |
| ~ | · | \triangle | Other | Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil | | |
| | Soil Map Unit Points | ·** | Special Line Features | line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of | | |
| Special (0) | Point Features Blowout | Water Fea | itures | contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale. | | |
| - | Borrow Pit | \sim | Streams and Canals | | | |
| i⊠a j Clay Sp ⊘ Closed I | Clay Spot | Transport ⊢∎-∔ | ation Rails | Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements. | | |
| | Closed Depression | ~ | Interstate Highways | Source of Many Natural Descurses Concentration Service | | |
| | Gravel Pit | ~ | US Routes | Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL: | | |
| 0 0 0 | Gravelly Spot | ~ | Major Roads | Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857) | | |
| Ø | Landfill | ~ | Local Roads | Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator | | |
| ٨ | Lava Flow | Backgrou | nd | projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts | | |
| خلله | Marsh or swamp | | Aerial Photography | distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more | | |
| ~ | Mine or Quarry | | | accurate calculations of distance or area are required. | | |
| 0 | Miscellaneous Water | | | This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as | | |
| 0 | Perennial Water | | | of the version date(s) listed below. | | |
| \vee | Rock Outcrop | | | Soil Survey Area: San Diego County Area, California | | |
| + | Saline Spot | | | Survey Area Data: Version 16, Sep 13, 2021 | | |
| 0 0 0 | Sandy Spot | | | Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales | | |
| Severely Eroded Spot | | | 1:50,000 or larger. | | | |
| \diamond | Sinkhole | | | Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Aug 22, 2018—Aug | | |
| Slide or Slip Sodic Spot | | | 31, 2018 | | | |
| | | | 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. | | | |

Map Unit Legend

| Map Unit Symbol | Map Unit Name | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Ur | Urban land | 11.3 | 100.0% |
| Totals for Area of Interest | | 11.3 | 100.0% |

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An *association* is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

San Diego County Area, California

Ur—**Ur**ban land

Map Unit Composition

Urban land: 100 percent *Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.*

Description of Urban Land

Typical profile

H1 - 0 to 6 inches: variable

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 8 Hydric soil rating: No

Attachment B. Existing Hydrology

Existing Hydrologic Work Map Existing Hydrology Calculations Offsite Drainage Map

Michael Baker

APPENDIX A: RATIONAL METHOD AND MODIFIED RATIONAL METHOD

| Land Use | Runoff Coefficient (C) | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Lanu Use | Soil Type (1) | |
| Residential: | | |
| Single Family | 0.55 | |
| Multi-Units | 0.70 | |
| Mobile Homes | | |
| Rural (lots greater than ½ acre) | 0.45 | |
| Commercial (2) | | |
| 80% Impervious | 0.85 | |
| Industrial ⁽²⁾ | | |
| 90% Impervious | 0.95 | |

Table A-1. Runoff Coefficients for Rational Method

<u>Note:</u>

(1) Type D soil to be used for all areas.

⁽²⁾ Where actual conditions deviate significantly from the tabulated imperviousness values of 80% or 90%, the values given for coefficient C, may be revised by multiplying 80% or 90% by the ratio of actual imperviousness to the tabulated imperviousness. However, in case shall the final coefficient be less than 0.50. For example: Consider commercial property on D soil.

| Actual imperviousness | = | 50% |
|--------------------------------|---|------|
| Tabulated imperviousness | = | 80% |
| Revised C = $(50/80) \ge 0.85$ | = | 0.53 |

The values in Table A–1 are typical for urban areas. However, if the basin contains rural or agricultural land use, parks, golf courses, or other types of nonurban land use that are expected to be permanent, the appropriate value should be selected based upon the soil and cover and approved by the City.

A.1.3. Rainfall Intensity

The rainfall intensity (I) is the rainfall in inches per hour (in/hr.) for a duration equal to the T_c for a selected storm frequency. Once a particular storm frequency has been selected for design and a T_c calculated for the drainage area, the rainfall intensity can be determined from the Intensity-Duration-Frequency Design Chart (Figure A-1).





<u>LEGEND</u>

DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AREA (DMA)

SITE BOUNDARY/DRAINAGE BOUNDARY

CALCULATION NODE





 Michael Baker
 9755 Clairemont Mesa Blvd

 Suite 100
 San Diego, CA 92124

 Phone: (858) 614-5000
 MBAKERINTL.COM

MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL



Ex Hydrlgy_1

MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL



Ex Hydrlgy_2





Google Earth

2000 ft

Attachment C. Proposed Hydrology

Proposed Hydrologic Work Map Proposed Hydrology Calculations





<u>LEGEND</u>

DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AREA (DMA)

SITE BOUNDARY/DRAINAGE BOUNDARY FLOW DIRECTION

CALCULATION NODE

- - -



NOTE: REFER TO PLUMBING DESIGN FOR THE INTERNAL ROUTING OF ROOFTOP RUNOFF DIRECTLY TO THE VAULTS.



THE BISHOP'S SCHOOL PROPOSED DRAINAGE EXHIBIT PROJECT PERMIT NO: ----



MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL



PR Hydrlgy_1

MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL



PR Hydrlgy_2

Attachment D. Hydraulics

Inlet Capacity Pipe Capacity

Michael Baker

Inlet Report

Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

12x12in Area Drain

| Drop | Grate | Inlet | |
|------|-------|-------|--|
| | | | |

| = | Sag |
|--------|----------------|
| = | -0- |
| = | -0- |
| = | 0.50 |
| = | 1.00 |
| = | 1.00 |
| | |
| | |
| = | 0.020 |
| | 0.020 0.020 |
| = | |
| = = | 0.020 |
| = = | 0.020 -0- |
| | |

| Calculations Compute by: Q (cfs) | Known Q = 1.00 |
|---|-------------------|
| Highlighted | |
| Q Total (cfs) | = 1.00 |
| Q Capt (cfs) | = 1.00 |
| Q Bypass (cfs) | = -0- |
| Depth at Inlet (in) | = 2.29 |
| Efficiency (%) | = 100 |
| Gutter Spread (ft) | = 20.06 |
| Gutter Vel (ft/s) | = -0- |
| Bypass Spread (ft) | = -0- |
| Bypass Depth (in) | = -0- |
| | |

All dimensions in feet



Inlet Report

Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

18x18in Area Drain

| Drop | Grate | Inlet | |
|------|-------|-------|--|
| | | | |

| Location | = | Sag |
|--------------------|---|-------|
| Curb Length (ft) | = | -0- |
| Throat Height (in) | = | -0- |
| Grate Area (sqft) | = | 1.13 |
| Grate Width (ft) | = | 1.50 |
| Grate Length (ft) | = | 1.50 |
| Gutter | | |
| Slope, Sw (ft/ft) | = | 0.020 |
| Slope, Sx (ft/ft) | = | 0.020 |
| Local Depr (in) | = | -0- |
| Gutter Width (ft) | = | 1.50 |

| Local Depr (in) | = -0- |
|-------------------|-------|
| Gutter Width (ft) | = 1.5 |
| Gutter Slope (%) | = -0- |
| Gutter n-value | = -0- |

| Calculations Compute by: Q (cfs) | Known Q = 1.00 |
|---|-------------------|
| Highlighted | |
| Q Total (cfs) | = 1.00 |
| Q Capt (cfs) | = 1.00 |
| Q Bypass (cfs) | = -0- |
| Depth at Inlet (in) | = 1.75 |
| Efficiency (%) | = 100 |
| Gutter Spread (ft) | = 16.05 |
| Gutter Vel (ft/s) | = -0- |
| Bypass Spread (ft) | = -0- |
| Bypass Depth (in) | = -0- |
| | |

All dimensions in feet



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

8in Storm Drain S=1percent

| | Highlighted | |
|----------|--|--|
| = 0.67 | Depth (ft) | = 0.60 |
| | Q (cfs) | = 1.300 |
| | Area (sqft) | = 0.33 |
| = 100.00 | Velocity (ft/s) | = 3.90 |
| = 1.00 | Wetted Perim (ft) | = 1.66 |
| = 0.013 | Crit Depth, Yc (ft) | = 0.54 |
| | Top Width (ft) | = 0.41 |
| | EGL (ft) | = 0.84 |
| Known Q | | |
| = 1.30 | | |
| | = 100.00 = 1.00 = 0.013 Known Q | = 0.67 Depth (ft) Q (cfs) Area (sqft) = 100.00 Velocity (ft/s) = 1.00 Wetted Perim (ft) = 0.013 Crit Depth, Yc (ft) Top Width (ft) EGL (ft) |



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

12in Storm Drain S=1percent

| Circular | | Highlighted | |
|------------------|----------|---------------------|---------|
| Diameter (ft) | = 1.00 | Depth (ft) | = 0.91 |
| | | Q (cfs) | = 3.800 |
| | | Area (sqft) | = 0.75 |
| Invert Elev (ft) | = 100.00 | Velocity (ft/s) | = 5.06 |
| Slope (%) | = 1.00 | Wetted Perim (ft) | = 2.54 |
| N-Value | = 0.013 | Crit Depth, Yc (ft) | = 0.83 |
| | | Top Width (ft) | = 0.57 |
| Calculations | | EGL (ft) | = 1.31 |
| Compute by: | Known Q | | |
| Known Q (cfs) | = 3.80 | | |
| | | | |



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

8 in Storm Drain S=0.5percent

| Circular | | Highlighted | |
|------------------|----------|---------------------|---------|
| Diameter (ft) | = 0.67 | Depth (ft) | = 0.60 |
| | | Q (cfs) | = 0.920 |
| | | Area (sqft) | = 0.33 |
| Invert Elev (ft) | = 100.00 | Velocity (ft/s) | = 2.76 |
| Slope (%) | = 0.50 | Wetted Perim (ft) | = 1.66 |
| N-Value | = 0.013 | Crit Depth, Yc (ft) | = 0.46 |
| | | Top Width (ft) | = 0.41 |
| Calculations | | EGL (ft) | = 0.72 |
| Compute by: | Known Q | | |
| Known Q (cfs) | = 0.92 | | |



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

12 in Storm Drain S=0.5percent

| Circular | | Highlighted | |
|------------------|----------|---------------------|---------|
| Diameter (ft) | = 1.00 | Depth (ft) | = 0.90 |
| | | Q (cfs) | = 2.680 |
| | | Area (sqft) | = 0.74 |
| Invert Elev (ft) | = 100.00 | Velocity (ft/s) | = 3.60 |
| Slope (%) | = 0.50 | Wetted Perim (ft) | = 2.50 |
| N-Value | = 0.013 | Crit Depth, Yc (ft) | = 0.71 |
| | | Top Width (ft) | = 0.60 |
| Calculations | | EGL (ft) | = 1.10 |
| Compute by: | Known Q | | |
| Known Q (cfs) | = 2.68 | | |
| | | | |



Reach (ft)

Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Monday, Aug 15 2022

EX. DMA 1

| Rectangular | | Highlighted | |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------|---------|
| Bottom Width (ft) | = 4.00 | Depth (ft) | = 0.24 |
| Total Depth (ft) | = 6.00 | Q (cfs) | = 6.750 |
| | | Area (sqft) | = 0.96 |
| Invert Elev (ft) | = 100.00 | Velocity (ft/s) | = 7.03 |
| Slope (%) | = 3.30 | Wetted Perim (ft) | = 4.48 |
| N-Value | = 0.013 | Crit Depth, Yc (ft) | = 0.45 |
| | | Top Width (ft) | = 4.00 |
| Calculations | | EGL (ft) | = 1.01 |
| Compute by: | Known Q | | |
| Known Q (cfs) | = 6.75 | | |



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Monday, Aug 15 2022

PR. DMA 1

| | Highlighted | |
|----------|--|---|
| = 4.00 | Depth (ft) | = 0.27 |
| = 6.00 | Q (cfs) | = 8.230 |
| | Area (sqft) | = 1.08 |
| = 100.00 | Velocity (ft/s) | = 7.62 |
| = 3.30 | Wetted Perim (ft) | = 4.54 |
| = 0.013 | Crit Depth, Yc (ft) | = 0.51 |
| | Top Width (ft) | = 4.00 |
| | EGL (ft) | = 1.17 |
| Known Q | | |
| = 8.23 | | |
| | = 6.00 = 100.00 = 3.30 = 0.013 Known Q | = 4.00 Depth (ft) = 6.00 Q (cfs) Area (sqft) = 100.00 Velocity (ft/s) = 3.30 Wetted Perim (ft) = 0.013 Crit Depth, Yc (ft) Top Width (ft) EGL (ft) |



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Monday, Aug 15 2022

EX./PR. DMA 2

| Rectangular | | Highlighted | |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------|---------|
| Bottom Width (ft) | = 4.00 | Depth (ft) | = 0.07 |
| Total Depth (ft) | = 6.00 | Q (cfs) | = 0.790 |
| | | Area (sqft) | = 0.28 |
| Invert Elev (ft) | = 100.00 | Velocity (ft/s) | = 2.82 |
| Slope (%) | = 3.30 | Wetted Perim (ft) | = 4.14 |
| N-Value | = 0.013 | Crit Depth, Yc (ft) | = 0.11 |
| | | Top Width (ft) | = 4.00 |
| Calculations | | EGL (ft) | = 0.19 |
| Compute by: | Known Q | | |
| Known Q (cfs) | = 0.79 | | |



Hydraflow Express Extension for Autodesk® Civil 3D® by Autodesk, Inc.

Tuesday, Aug 16 2022

4'x6' RCB

| Rectangular | | Highlighted | |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|
| Bottom Width (ft) | = 4.00 | Depth (ft) | = 5.59 |
| Total Depth (ft) | = 6.00 | Q (cfs) | = 600.00 |
| | | Area (sqft) | = 22.36 |
| Invert Elev (ft) | = 100.00 | Velocity (ft/s) | = 26.83 |
| Slope (%) | = 3.30 | Wetted Perim (ft) | = 15.18 |
| N-Value | = 0.013 | Crit Depth, Yc (ft) | = 6.00 |
| | | Top Width (ft) | = 4.00 |
| Calculations | | EGL (ft) | = 16.78 |
| Compute by: | Known Q | | |
| Known Q (cfs) | = 600.00 | | |



Michael Baker

Attachment E. Plan Sheets



rchite σ dio





Revision Schedule No. Revision Issue Date

Drawing Set Issue Schedule Description Amendment Submittal 01 Issue Date 29 Oct 2021





GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN







No. Revision Issue Date

Drawing Set Issue Schedule Issue Date

Description Amendment Submittal 01

29 Oct 2021







| I he Bishop's School 7607 La Jolla Blvd. La Jolla, CA 92037 | Encumbrance Exhibit |
|---|---------------------|
|---|---------------------|

Revision Schedule No. Revision Issue Date

Drawing Set Issue Schedule Description Amendment Submittal 01

Issue Date 29 Oct 2021





EXISTING TOPOGRAPHY EXHIBIT

Irchite σ ludio





Revision Schedule No. Revision Issue Date

Drawing Set Issue Schedule Description Amendment Submittal 01 Issue Date 29 Oct 2021

C4.1 Sheet 5 of 16