

June 24, 2021

Nick Williams, P.E., CFM Director of Public Works City of Stephenville 298 W. Washington Stephenville, TX 76401

Stephenville Townhomes Drainage Technical Memorandum

The purpose of this drainage study is to show the impact of the proposed Stephenville Townhome development on the downstream property. This study was done by comparing pre-development conditions to post-development conditions and demonstrates that there are no adverse impacts to the immediate downstream property and detention will not be necessary.

Existing Conditions

In existing conditions, both lots generally outfall to the south to three design points at a swale along the railroad. Both lots accept upstream flow from the properties to the north and there is no existing storm water drainage infrastructure. Refer to the Pre-Development Drainage Area Map, Exhibit A, for the existing drainage area delineations. A more detailed description of each drainage area outfall can be seen below:

- Existing drainage area A drains to the south end of the smaller lot of the proposed development.
 - The discharge drains across West Swan Street and through a grassed area to the swale along the railroad.
- Existing drainage area B drains to the south end of the larger lot of the proposed development.
 - \circ The discharge drains to the swale along the railroad.
- Existing drainage area C drains to the south east corner of the larger lot of the proposed development.
 - The discharge drains south along South Lillian Street then to the east to the swale along the railroad.





Table 1 is a summary of the discharge going to each design point in the existing conditions.

lunation	Existing Discharge (cfs)														
Junction	1-Yr	2-Yr 5-Yr		10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr								
1	17.8	20.9	32.5	41.7	54.3	64.3	74.9								
2	25.2	29.7	46.4	59.6	77.9	92.3	107.7								
3	10.2	12.2	19.7	25.7	34.0	40.6	47.6								

Table 1- Design	Point	Existing	Conditions	Summary
Table 1- Desigi	FOIL	LAISUNY	Conditions	Summary

Proposed Conditions

In the proposed conditions both lots will continue to drain to the south to the swale along the railroad. The drainage areas have been adjusted to demonstrate the allowable fully developed flow that can go to each design point without causing an adverse impact. The actual percent impervious value for the proposed development has been calculated and was used in determining post-development discharge. Refer to the Post-Development Drainage Area Map, Exhibit B, for the proposed drainage area delineations.

Table 2 is a summary of the discharge going to each design point in the proposed conditions.

lunction	Proposed Discharge (cfs)												
Junction	1-Yr	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr						
1	17.8	20.9	32.6	41.7	54.4	64.3	75.0						
2	23.4	27.6	43.4	55.9	73.2	86.8	101.5						
3	9.7	11.6	18.8	24.5	32.5	38.9	45.7						

Table 2- Design Point Proposed Conditions Summary





Pre vs. Post Development Conditions

Table 3 compares the pre and post development discharges at each design point. We can see that the proposed design does not cause an increase in discharge at design points 2 and 3. Design point 1 has a max increase of 0.1 cfs. This increase does not cause an increase in water surface elevation or water velocity in the swale and is therefore considered negligible.

			Existir	ng Disch	arge (cf	s)		Proposed Discharge (cfs)							
Junction	1 Vr	2 Vr		10-	25- 50-		100 Vr	1 Vr	2 Vr		10-	25-	50-	100 Vr	
	1-11	2-11	5-11	Yr	Yr	Yr	100-11	1-11	2-11	5-11	Yr	Yr	Yr	100-11	
1	17.8	20.9	32.5	41.7	54.3	64.3	74.9	17.8	20.9	32.6	41.7	54.4	64.3	75.0	
2	25.2	29.7	46.4	59.6	77.9	92.3	107.7	23.4	27.6	43.4	55.9	73.2	86.8	101.5	
3	10.2	12.2	19.7	25.7	34.0	40.6	47.6	9.7	11.6	18.8	24.5	32.5	38.9	45.7	

Junction	Difference														
Junction	1-Yr	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr								
1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1								
2	-1.8	-2.1	-3.1	-3.8	-4.7	-5.5	-6.2								
3	-0.5	-0.6	-1.0	-1.2	-1.5	-1.7	-1.9								

Table 3-	Design	Point	Comparison
----------	--------	-------	------------

Conclusion

While the proposed development will have an increase in discharge it does not create adverse impacts to the immediate downstream property and this increase is considered negligible. There will not be in increase in water surface elevation or velocity in the swale that is immediately downstream from the proposed development and detention will not be necessary.

I, Reece Flanagan, a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Texas and in good standing, have prepared the enclosed drainage study in compliance with the latest published requirements and criteria of the City of Stephenville, Texas, and have verified that the topographic information used in this study is in compliance with said requirements and is otherwise suitable for developing this workable Plan of Drainage which can be implemented through proper subsequent detailed construction planning.

Signature_ P.E. Date 6/25/2021

519 E. Border Street Arlington, TX 76010 www.mmatexas.com

Page | 3



						,			Time of Con	centratior	Calculati	ions								
				She Tc= (0.007)(r	et Flow nL) ^{0.8} /(P ₂) ^{0.5} (s) ⁽	0.4		Shallow Concentrated Flow					Channelized Flow							
Drainage Area	Inlet Number	Length (ft)	Slope (ft/ft)	2-yr, 24-hr Rainfall Depth ¹ (in)	Manning's Coefficient (n)	Velocity (ft/min)	T _c 1 (min)	Length (ft)	Surface Type	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity ² (ft/s)	T _c 2 (min)	Length (ft)	Slope (ft/ft)	Manning's Coefficient (n)	Cross Section Area (ft ²)	Wetted Perimeter (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	T _c 3 (min)	Total Travel Time (min)
A		50	0.0202	3.522	0.03	33.91	1.47	225	Unpaved	0.012	1.74	2.16								
								83	Paved	0.005	1.39	0.99								
1								478	Unpaved	0.010	1.63	4.89								
								93	Paved	0.008	1.81	0.85								
p-								137	Unpaved	0.018	2.15	1.06	33	0.022121	0.035	24	24.33	6.27	0.09	11.52
В		35	0.018	3.522	0.011	67.29	0.52	590	Unpaved	0.018	2.14	4.59	128	0.000234	0.035	24	24.33	0.65	3.30	<mark>8.4</mark> 1
С		50	0.0082	3.522	0.03	23.65	2.11	321	Unpaved	0.027	2.65	2.02								
								31	Paved	0.030	3.54	0.15								
								243	Unpaved	0.021	2.31	1.75	225	0.008889	0.011	. 12.5	50	5.07	0.74	
								108	Unpaved	0.014	1.93	0.93								7.70







<u>NOTE:</u>

- DRAINAGE AREAS ARE BASED ON 2016 TNRIS LIDAR CONTOURS.
 SCS METHOD WAS USED FOR THE DRAINAGE
- ANAL YSIS.



819 OLD ANNETTE ROAD ALEDO, TEXAS 76008 EMAIL: MPACE37@YAHOO.COM CONTACT: MARC PACE









lunation			Existi	ing Discharg	ge (cfs)			Proposed Discharge (cfs)							Difference						
Junction	1-Yr	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr	1-Yr	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr	1-Yr	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr
1	17.8	20.9	32.5	41.7	54.3	64.3	74.9	17.8	20.9	32.6	41.7	54.4	64.3	75.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
2	25.2	29.7	46.4	59.6	77.9	92.3	107.7	23.4	27.6	43.4	55.9	73.2	86.8	101.5	-1.8	-2.1	-3.1	-3.8	-4.7	-5.5	-6.2
3	10.2	12.2	19.7	25.7	34.0	40.6	47.6	9.7	11.6	18.8	24.5	32.5	38.9	45.7	-0.5	-0.6	-1.0	-1.2	-1.5	-1.7	-1.9
			100 M	100			5 m			1000	10000	A COLUMN								-	

~					She Tc= (0.007)(I	et Flow nL) ^{0.8} /(P ₂) ^{0.5} (s)	0.4		Shallow Concentrated Flow					Channelized Flow							
	Drainage Area	Inlet Number	Length (ft)	Slope (ft/ft)	2-yr, 24-hr Rainfall Depth ¹ (in)	Manning's Coefficient (n)	Velocity (ft/min)	T _c 1 (min)	Length (ft)	Surface Type	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity ² (ft/s)	T _c 2 (min)	Length (ft)	Slope (ft/ft)	Manning's Coefficient (n)	Cross Section Area (ft ²)	Wetted Perimeter (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	T _c 3 (min)	Total Travel Time (min)
2	A1		50	0.0202	3.522	0.03	33.91	1.47	225	Unpaved	0.012	1.74	2.16								
2									83	Paved	0.005	1.39	0.99								
2									265	Unpaved	0.013	<mark>1.81</mark>	2.45	202	0.011386	0.011	2.88	24	3.52	0.96	
19									124	124 Paved		1.90	1.09								
62									137	137 Unpaved		2.15	1.06	33	0.022121	0.035	24	24.33	6.27	0.09	10.27
6	B1		50	0.01	3.522	0.03	25.60	1.95	39	39 Unpaved		1.61	0.40	212	0.01	0.011	2.88	24	3.30	1.07	
-														146	0.005	0.011	2	5	5.20	0.47	3.90
	B2		50	0.0126	3.522	0.03	28.08	1.78	268	Unpaved	0.013	1.81	2.47	63	0.01619	0.013	3.142	6.28	9. <mark>1</mark> 9	0.11	
10														152	0.019868	0.03	6	12.17	4.37	0.58	4.94
	B3													373	0.003271	0.035	24	24.33	<mark>2.4</mark> 1	2.58	2.58
	C1		50	0.01	3.522	0.03	25.60	1.95	51	Unpaved	0.010	1.61	0.53								
P									30	Paved	0.030	3.52	0.14								2.62
3	C2		50	0.0082	3.522	0.03	23.65	2.11	321	Unpaved	0.027	2.65	2.02								
2									31	Paved	0.030	3.54	0.15								
m									243	Unpaved	0.021	2.31	1.75	225	0.008889	0.011	12.5	50	5.07	0.74	
									108	108 Unpaved		1.93	0.93								7.70



COPYRIGHT © 2021 MMA, INC.