DATE: October 10, 2023
TO: City of Lone Tree
CC: Roshana Floyd, Jennifer Drybread, Jacob James
FROM: Kristofer K. Wiest, P.E.
SUBJECT: Ridgegate Couplet - Snow Storage Basis of Design

The design team (Merrick \& Company, KTGY Architecture, and Century Communities) has reviewed the snow storage required for the proposed Ridgegate Couplet development. The City of Lone Tree Municipal Code requires adequate snow storage be provided. However, it does not specify a specific method for calculating the required storage volume. Based on the developer's prior experience in the City of Lone Tree with a similar project, the approach outline below was utilized to determine is adequate snow storage has been provided.

The basis of design is dependent upon several variables: snow moisture content, snowfall depth, height of storage and compaction of stored snow. Based on these variables, two approaches were used to in the analysis. Both approaches assume that only the drive lanes within the parking deck are taken into account when calculating volumes.

The first approach was to utilize a snow compaction rate of $20 \%$ with an average snowfall depth of 4 ", to represent a typical snowfall event that would necessitate snow removal. Required storage volumes for this approach are shown below.

| Location | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | Calculation | Required Storage $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking Deck | 27,000 | $27000 \times 0.33 \times 0.8$ | 7,128 |
| East Private Drive | 1,000 | $1000 \times 0.33 \times 0.8$ | 264 |
| West Private Drive | 10,300 | $10300 \times 0.33 \times 0.8$ | 2,719 |

The second approach was to utilize a compaction rate of $80 \%$ with a maximum depth of snow of 12 ". Required storage volumes for this approach are shown below.

| Location | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | Calculation | Required Storage $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking Deck | 27,000 | $27000 \times 1 \times 0.2$ | 5,400 |
| East Drive | 1,000 | $1000 \times 1 \times 0.2$ | 200 |
| West Private Drive | 10,300 | $10300 \times 1 \times 0.2$ | 2,060 |

Averaging the two snowstorm approaches resulted in the following volumes that were used to verify the area provided was sufficient.

| Location | Average Volume $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Parking Deck | 6,264 |
| East Drive | 232 |
| West Private Drive | 2,390 |

Based on the averaged design snow storage volumes, the areas were checked to verify the required volumes could be provided. Based on similar projects, it was assumed that on average, snow could be stacked 5 -ft in height. The following table summarizes the required and provided snow storage volumes.

| Location | Required Storage <br> Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | Storage Area <br> Provided $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | Storage Required <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3}\right)$ | Storage Provided <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking Deck | 1,253 | 1,517 | 6,264 | 7,585 |
| East Drive | 46 | 50 | 232 | 250 |
| West Private <br> Drive | 478 | 480 | 2,390 | 2,400 |

Based on the above table, the parking deck for the site can provide sufficient snow storage for the proposed development. If there are any questions or if any additional information is needed, please let us know.

Respectfully
Merrick \& Company

Kristofer K. Wiest, P.E.

