

SFCTA Contract Number 06/07-29

Caltrans EA Number 04-163701

SOUTH ACCESS TO THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

DOYLE DRIVE

DOYLE DRIVE REPLACEMENT PROJECT Final Copy Stormwater Drainage – Contract 4 Technical Advice Report

February 2010

Prepared By:

Arup PB Joint Venture

California Department of
Transportation District 4

**Doyle Drive
Replacement Project**

Final Copy Stormwater
Drainage Report

California Department of
Transportation District 4

**Doyle Drive
Replacement Project**

Final Copy Stormwater
Drainage Report

Contract 4

February 2009

This report takes into account the
particular instructions and requirements
of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be
relied upon by any third party and no
responsibility is undertaken to any third
party

Job number 131558

California Department of
Transportation District 4

**Doyle Drive
Replacement Project**

Storm Drainage Report

FINAL COPY

Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
1 Drainage Objectives	3
1.1 Project Goals	3
1.2 Background	3
1.3 Project Contracts	4
1.4 Existing Site Conditions	5
1.5 Existing Offsite Drainage System	7
1.6 Proposed Drainage Objectives	7
2 Methodology	11
2.1 Roadway Computations	11
2.2 Temporary Detour Roadway Design Criteria	13
2.3 Dynamic Modeling Software	13
2.4 Outfalls Design Criteria	16
2.5 Special Conditions	17
3 Existing Site Base Conditions	18
3.1 San Francisco Bay Model	19
3.2 Crissy Marsh Model	22
3.3 Results Discussion	23
4 Proposed Design	24
4.1 Roadway Results Discussion	24
4.2 Temporary Detour Roadway Results Discussion	24
4.3 Offsite Drainage System	24
4.4 Presidio Trust Detention Devices/BMP's	25
4.5 Roadway Stormwater Detention Devices/BMP's	25
4.6 Stormwater Pump Stations	25
4.7 Dynamic Modeling	25
4.8 Outfall Results	28
4.9 Construction Drawings Supporting Information	29

Tables

Table 1 - IDF Intermediate Intensity Values (in/hr)

Table 2 - San Francisco Bay Model Outfall Existing Results
Table 3 - Crissy Marsh Model Bay Model Existing Outfall Results
Table 4 - San Francisco Bay Model Outfall Interim Results
Table 5: Existing Pipe Capacities
Table 6: Proposed Pipe Capacities
Table 7: Channel unit

Figures

Figure 1 – Proposed Project Rendering
Figure 2 – Contracts 3 through 7 for the Doyle Drive Replacement Project
Figure 3 - Presidio Watersheds with Proposed Doyle Drive Alignment
Figure 4 – Pump Structure Conveying Flow from OF2 and OF3 to Outfall A
Figure 5 – Proposed Roadway Drainage Discharge Points and Associated Subcatchments
Figure 6 – Existing Storm Drainage at area from High Viaduct to Halleck Street Crossing Proposed Alignment
Figure 7 – Proposed Storm Drainage Transverse Crossing (System 5 – unit f and g)
Figure 8 – Example of Actual Pipe Network
Figure 9 – Example of Modeled Pipe Network
Figure 10 – San Francisco Bay Model – Outfall A and Outfall B (Excerpts from Appendix A 3.1)
Figure 11 – San Francisco Bay Model – Outfall IJKL and Outfall 15 (Excerpts from Appendix A 3.1)
Figure 12 – Crissy Marsh Model (Excerpt from Appendix A 3.2)
Figure 13 – Existing Watersheds with the Proposed Doyle Drive Highway Watersheds

Appendices

Appendix A

Existing Conditions

A1	Modeling Parameters
A1.1	Rainfall Data
A1.2	Rainfall Data Graph
A1.3	Network – Existing Model San Francisco Bay
A1.4	Node Data – Existing Model San Francisco Bay
A1.5	Conduit Data – Existing Model San Francisco Bay
A1.6	Subcatchment Data – Existing Model San Francisco Bay
A1.7	Land Use Data – Existing Model San Francisco Bay
A1.8	Runoff Surface Data – Existing Model San Francisco Bay
A1.9	Network – Existing Model Crissy Marsh
A1.10	Node Data – Existing Model Crissy Marsh
A1.11	Conduit Data – Existing Model Crissy Marsh
A1.12	Subcatchment Data – Existing Model Crissy Marsh
A1.13	Land Use Data – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A1.14 Runoff Surface Data – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A2 Modeling Results

A2.1 Node Results – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model San Francisco Bay

A2.2 Conduit Results – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model San Francisco Bay

A2.3 Outfall IJKL Hydrograph – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model San Francisco Bay

A2.4 Outfall 15 Hydrograph – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model San Francisco Bay

A2.5 PRN Results – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model San Francisco Bay

A2.6 Newtwork Results – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A2.7 Node Results – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A2.8 Conduit Results – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model San Crissy Marsh

A2.9 Outfall C Hydrograph – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A2.10 Outfall D Hydrograph – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A2.11 Outfall F Hydrograph – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A2.12 Outfall G Hydrograph – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A2.13 PRN Results – 25 YEAR Storm – Existing Model Crissy Marsh

A3 Modeling Sketches

A3.1 Existing Hydraulic Model Draining to the Bay

A3.2 Existing Hydraulic Model Draining to Crissy Marsh

Appendix B

Proposed Roadway Drainage System

B1 Analysis

B1.1 Network

B1.2 Inventory Report

B1.3 Summary Report

B1.4 Tabulation

B1.5 Inlet Report

B1.6 HGL Profiles

B1.7 Inlet Spreadwidth Calculations

Appendix C

Contract 3 Proposed Roadway and Offsite Drainage System

C1 Modeling Parameters

C1.1 Network – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh

C1.2 Node Data – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh

C1.3 Conduit Data – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh

- C1.4 Subcatchment Data – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
- C1.5 Land Use Data – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
- C1.6 Runoff Surface Data – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
- C2 Modeling Results
 - C2.1 Network Results – 25-year Storm – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
 - C2.2 Node Results – 25-year Storm – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
 - C2.3 Conduit Results – 25-year Storm – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
 - C2.4 Outfall F Hydrograph – 25-year Storm – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
 - C2.5 Outfall G Hydrograph – 25-year Storm – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
 - C2.6 PRN Results – 25-year Storm – Contract 4 Model Crissy Marsh
- C3 Modeling Sketches
 - C3.1 Contract 4 Hydraulic Model Crissy Marsh

Appendix D

Quantities Table Discussion

- D1 Support Materials
 - D1.1 APC Table Letter
- D2 Calculations
 - D2.1 Deep Manhole Design – (Drainage System 5, Units e)
 - D2.2 Transverse Crossing Calculations – (Drainage System 5 and 6)
Temporary Channel – (Drainage System 27, Units)
Temporary Underdrain Design – (Drainage System 42, Units f, and g)

Appendix E

Construction Drawings

Appendix F

Outfall F Reconfiguration – Contract 2 Package 2C Construction Drawings

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to document the stormwater hydraulic modeling completed to design the systems and produce construction drawings for the Doyle Drive Replacement Project (Project) Contract 4. The purpose of the Drainage Report is to describe the following:

1. The drainage objectives of the project
2. The methodology for attaining objectives
3. The existing system baseline
4. The proposed design

This report builds on the findings of the 35% schematic design *Stormwater Drainage Report* dated February 2009 (35% Report) and the *Contract 3 Storm Drainage Report* dated July 2009. This report uses the information from both of these reports to progress and refine the analysis of the storm drainage system to understand the interaction between the Doyle Drive roadway (Roadway) drainage system, Presidio Trust (Offsite) drainage areas, any potential detention spaces throughout the Presidio, roadway Best Management Practices (BMP's), stormwater pump stations, and the discharge outfalls.

Hydraflow, static modeling software, has been used to analyze the proposed Roadway drainage system and help determine size of inlets, diameter of pipes, and pipe profiles.

Infoworks CS, dynamic modeling software developed by Wallingford software, has been used to assess the existing condition of the Offsite drainage, and model the Roadway and Offsite drainage systems together Contract 4 of the Project. The Infoworks modeling process is described within the context of the dynamic hydraulic model for the project and it incorporates the agreed parameters of the 35% Report.

The overall approach for carrying out and documenting the work done on each contract will be as follows:

1. Identify the drainage objectives as follows:
 - General project objectives (background and project contracts)
 - Existing site conditions including location (maps, latitude/longitude, etc), basin characteristics (topography, water bodies, NRCS soil types, land use, etc), existing drainage systems and their watersheds, existing outfalls, tides, floodplain studies, etc. Base maps showing existing drainage should be attached
 - Existing drainage, maintenance, water quality, operational and other issues affecting proposed design
 - Proposed drainage objectives including location (maps, latitude/longitude, etc), basin characteristics (topography, water bodies, NRCS soil types, land use, etc)
2. The methodology section will discuss:
 - Design standards and Standard references
 - Hydrology (design storms, hydrographs, routing methods, software used, etc)
 - Key equations (Rational method + IDF equations + time of concentration + runoff coefficients, Manning's equation + roughness coefficients for pipes and open channels, modified Manning's equation for spread calculations + clogging factors, etc)

- Soil conditions, special conditions, and requirements by other agencies. This discussion will include the following (pipe materials, joints, subexcavation, need for culvert end protection and erosion control, bicycle traffic, ADA compliance, Presidio requirements, San Francisco, etc)
3. The existing system baseline will include the following:
- Establish the existing conditions for the Offsite Presidio Trust storm drainage network using a dynamic hydraulic model.
 - Set the baseline for evaluating outfall design for the Project

It should be noted that no new information has been received on the existing system and thus, the baseline results have not been updated since the Contract 3 submission.

4. The proposed design will include the following:
- Use static hydraulic modeling to design the Roadway drainage for each of the proposed contracts of the Project. The appendix of the report will contain, proposed drainage system layout (pipes and channels), profiles, Results of calculations (include sample calculations, output hydrographs, hydraulic grade lines, channel sections, riprap layering and dimensions, basin calculations, etc)
 - Simulate the impact of the Roadway Drainage system by incorporating the systems and the results of the roadway static model into the dynamic model. This will include routing the Roadway drainage to the existing outfalls, and rerouting the transverse crossings of the Presidio storm drainage network to avoid the obstructions defined by the Project
 - Assess the hydraulic impacts of proposed Presidio Trust detention devices/BMP's, Roadway detention devices/BMP's and stormwater pump station
 - Determine the peak flow at each outfall and compare it to the capacity of each outfall and the existing condition to determine whether the outfall capacity needs to be increased. If the outfalls need to be replaced, the dynamic model will be re-evaluated to verify the design
 - Discussion of information presented in the Construction Drawings. This will include the Alternative Pip Culvert (APC) table, supporting calculations/design for items shown in the Quantities Table and any other pertinent information to the drawing set

Not all steps in the overall approach are relevant to the Contract 4 design. This approach represents the studies and analysis that will be considered for each contract in the Project. The Drainage Construction Drawings (plans, profiles, details and quantity sheets) have been provided within Appendix E and should be reviewed along with this report.

1 Drainage Objectives

1.1 Project Goals

The goals of the stormwater drainage system for the project are as follows:

- Design a system for the Roadway for the 25 Year Storm Event
- Treat all stormwater from the proposed Roadway in the ultimate condition of the Project
- Verify that the existing Presidio Trust outfalls to San Francisco Bay can convey the 25 Year Storm Event, and upgrade them as necessary
- Do not increase flooding or cause flooding as a result of the Project storm drainage system in the ultimate condition
- Work with the Presidio Trust to satisfy their goals to maximum extent practical


1.2 Background

Doyle Drive is an approximately 1.5 miles long freeway and forms the southern approach of Route 101 to the Golden Gate Bridge. It is a critical link for traveling between the San Francisco Peninsula and the North Bay.

Currently, over 91,000 vehicles use Doyle Drive every weekday. The freeway, built in 1936 has reached the end of its useful life. Short-term improvements to keep the existing highway structures safe are no longer cost effective and the existing structures have structural sufficiency ratings below recommended levels, and so need to be replaced.

The Doyle Drive Replacement Project extends from the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza on the west to Broderick Street on the east, and includes Richardson Avenue, Gorgas Avenue and Marina Boulevard. On the eastern end of the project area, access to Doyle Drive is provided via two approaches: one beginning at the intersection of Marina Boulevard and Lyon Street and the other at the intersection of Richardson Avenue and Lyon Street. Access is also provided where Veterans Boulevard (Route 1) connects to Doyle Drive approximately one mile west of the Marina Boulevard approach.

Figure 1 – Proposed Project Rendering



1.3 Project Contracts

The Project will be constructed in several contracts, and storm drainage improvements will be part of Contract 3 to Contract 7. Arup PB JV (Design Team) has evaluated the stormwater systems of the entire project at a design development level. As roadway construction drawings are produced for each contract, the associated stormwater modeling and analysis will also be completed. This report focuses on documenting the modeling and analyses for the storm drainage systems associated with Contract 4. Figure 2 shows the breakdown of the contracts for the project.

Figure 2 – Contracts 3 through 7 for the Doyle Drive Replacement Project



Contract 4 is shown in pink in the figure above. This contract includes constructing the new southbound Battery Tunnel and a temporary detour roadway that moves the traffic north of the current/proposed alignment in the east end of project and reconnected with Marina Blvd and Richardson Avenue. For a more complete description of the limits of Contract 4 work refer to the Construction Documents.


1.4 Existing Site Conditions

The 35% Report establishes the baseline input parameters for the analysis of the existing condition. The sub-catchment areas, sub-catchment runoff SCS curve numbers, and time of concentration inputs were used for the analysis of the existing condition.

1.4.1 Input Parameters

The tributary area of the Presidio site has been divided into 6 watersheds based on topography and which outfalls they historically have discharged to. These watersheds include portions of the existing Doyle Drive Alignment. They are shown in Figure 3 below, and more detailed information can be found in Appendix A1.

Figure 3 - Presidio Watersheds with Proposed Doyle Drive Alignment



Additional site survey was requested at key locations throughout the Presidio Trust network. These areas include the outfalls and the areas where the existing network will be impacted by the proposed Doyle Drive Replacement Project (for example, at the proposed Main Post Tunnel). Survey at the outfalls allowed for a greater understanding of the existing capacity of the system. The modeling is reflective of the information provided by the Presidio Trust and selective survey investigations on site.

The input parameters from the 35% design report were incorporated into the dynamic model. The input parameters include subcatchment areas, runoff generation SCS curve numbers, and time of concentration inputs. The only change in modeling the existing conditions is the storm drainage pipes sizes and inverts were defined, instead of assuming channel flow with uniform slopes. Pipe sizes and invert levels were provided from as-built information provided by the Presidio Trust.

1.4.2 Time of Concentration

In the 35% Report, the time of concentration was calculated by inputting the watershed parameters into NRCS's WinTR-55 computer program. Each watershed's time of concentration was determined by flow path characteristics (sheet flow, shallow flow, and channel flow) and using Manning's equation. The time of concentration contributions from the 35% Report shows the shallow concentrated flow and in-channel flow small in comparison to sheet flow. It is assumed that the change in the time of concentration contribution due to the modeling of storm drainage pipes in lieu of shallows and channels would be negligible, and so the previous time of concentration has been incorporated into the new model.

1.4.3 Changes to Existing Site Conditions

The Presidio Trust has informed the Design Team that Outfall B discharging to San Francisco Bay located between the eastern edge of Crissy Marsh and the Marina Gate is completely blocked. A plan showing the location of Outfall B is located in Appendix A 3.1. The runoff from the OF 2 and OF3 watersheds (colored blue and green respectively in Figure 3) that have historically drained to outfall B, as assumed in the 35% Report, are now being conveyed to Outfall A via a temporary pump facility. This is located between Richardson Avenue and Mason Street near Marshall Street, as shown in Figure 4.

The Presidio Trust has stated that this blockage and pumping scenario has been ongoing since 2004, and that during larger storm events there is flooding throughout the OF 2 and OF 3 watersheds. This information invalidates the fundamental approach in the 35% Report, and will be incorporated into the current existing conditions hydraulic model when the capacity of the pumps, any storage associated with the system, and other specifications clarifying how the pump should be modeled are provided from the Presidio Trust.

Figure 4 – Pump Structure Conveying Flow from OF2 and OF3 to Outfall A



1.5 Existing Offsite Drainage System

As per the 35% Report, there are no creeks, streams, open culverts or bridges that cross the current Doyle Drive alignment. Most of the drainage in the urban areas occurs through the Presidio storm drain system in underground pipes and open channels along roads. There are several parts of the storm drainage network that cross or run alongside the proposed Doyle Drive that may have potential conflict with the proposed Doyle Drive Replacement Project.

There are no water quality treatment devices or BMP's within the Project area. However, Presidio Trust had installed sand/oil separators near several outfalls to the Crissy Marsh.

1.6 Proposed Drainage Objectives

The following section describes the proposed drainage objectives for the roadway drainage system, offsite systems, and outfalls.

1.6.1 Roadway Drainage System


The stormwater from the roadway will need to be managed. In its current condition most of the runoff from the highway is collected and conveyed to the Presidio storm drain network via overland flow. A condition for the Project is that roadway runoff must be treated before it is discharged to the Presidio Trust System, and ultimately to the outfalls. Treatment will only occur in the ultimate condition of the Project, and not at interim conditions such is the case of Contract 4.

The drainage areas for the roadway section have been divided into four major drainage area, each corresponding to a large catchment area that are described as follows:

- The first area will include the majority of roadway area on the eastern side of the project just east of the Main Post Tunnel. Runoff from this area will be conveyed to a pump station near Girard Road interchange and ultimately be pumped to Outfall A or a new Outfall structure in proximity to Outfall A.
- The second area will include roadway area of the at grade roadway between the Battery Tunnel and Main Post Tunnel. Runoff from this area will be conveyed to a pump station near Girard Road interchange and ultimately be pumped to Outfall A or a new Outfall structure in proximity to Outfall A.
- The third area will include area of the Route 1/101 interchange and at grade roadway just west of the Battery Tunnel. The runoff from this area will be conveyed by gravity and ultimately be discharged to Outfall IJKL or a new outfall structure in proximity to Outfall IJKL. Outfall IJKL is highly susceptible to filling up by the tidal sands and a headwall structure and extension out to the Bay must be constructed.
- The fourth and last area includes a small roadway area in the western end of the Doyle Drive project near the Golden Gate Toll Plaza. Runoff from this area is conveyed and is discharged to Outfall M. This is a small amount of runoff from t and is very similar to the existing condition (highway with drainage inlets) and thus has not been modeled.

Figure 5 shows the entire alignment and the four separate points of discharge and their associated subcatchment areas.

Figure 5 – Proposed Roadway Drainage Discharge Points and Associated Subcatchments




1.6.2 Offsite Drainage

The area of impact for Contract 4 – High Viaduct to Eastern Portal of Battery Tunnel can be summarized as follows:

Existing offsite flows generated between the high viaduct and the proposed eastern portal of the Battery Tunnel currently drain under Doyle Drive in storm drain that cross the roadway from south to north, see Figure 6 . The storm drains eventually empty into Crissy Marsh through Outfall F and Outfall G. Flows in excess of the storm drain capacities are intercepted by local streets and eventually drain under Doyle Drive as surface runoff under the Low Causeway.

Figure 6 – Existing Storm Drainage at area from High Viaduct to Halleck Street Crossing Proposed Alignment




Under future conditions, Doyle Drive will be lowered and it will go into the proposed shallow cut-and-cover Battery Tunnels. The roadway will then continue eastward in an open at-grade roadway and then into the Main Post Tunnels to Girard Road. This area of the project is severely obstructive to utility crossings because of the need for retaining walls, and the aforementioned tunnels.

The existing four drainage crossings within the Contract 4 area will be combined into one single crossing shown as System 5 in the construction documents. The criteria for transverse crossings are that they must convey the 25-year event without increasing flooding in Presidio Lands, and will not endanger the highway with flooding for the 100-year event.

These existing crossings were combined into one 36" culvert because the retaining walls constructed as part of Contract 4 require that storm drainage crossings be extremely deep. To limit the amount of deep manholes, drainage inlets, and culverts the Design Team has combined all the existing crossings into a single crossing. An image of the crossing from the Contract 4 construction documents is shown in Figure 7

Figure 7 – Proposed Storm Drainage Transverse Crossing (System 5 – unit f and g)



Dynamic Modeling further discussed in Section 4 and shown in Appendix C will show that the reconfiguration of this crossing does not flood the Presidio Trust Areas more than what is done currently, and the highway does not flood for the 100-year event. Further supporting calculations are shown in Appendix D.

1.6.3 Outfalls

The aim of the Project is to use the existing storm drainage system to the maximum extent practical. As presented in the Outfalls Report dated April 2009 it is the Design Team’s objective to either reuse the existing outfalls or if necessary upsize the necessary outfalls within the same alignment. When discharging to Crissy Marsh in the interim condition the Project aims to keep in tact the volume of flow and peaks conveyed to the Marsh to preserve its integrity.

2 Methodology

The proposed stormwater drainage analysis for the Doyle Drive Project has been approached holistically to analyze the ultimate and integrated stormwater strategy as opposed to analysis of the roadway drainage isolated from the Presidio Network's outfalls. The approach of designing the roadway drainage in a separate static model and then incorporating the design parameters into the dynamic model allows the Design Team to evaluate design scenarios for the outfalls easily while understanding the interactions between the different components of the system (such as roadway drainage, changes in transverse/offsite crossings, detention devices, BMP's, stormwater pump stations, outfalls, etc).

2.1 Roadway Computations

Hydraflow has been used for the static modeling exercise and Infoworks has been used for the dynamic modeling exercise. The static model will analyze the proposed drainage systems to size the system for the 25-year event while conforming to the design criteria for the project. The proposed dynamic hydraulic model has incorporated the Roadway drainage and Offsite drainage for Contract 4.

2.1.1 Approach

Hydraflow software has been used to design the roadway drainage system. The inlet sizes, spacing, and pipe sizes for the roadway drainage were designed using Hydraflow software. Hydraflow is a static modeling software that is the preferred method of Caltrans to analyze the roadway drainage system. The complete of the drainage system for the Project (southbound, northbound, and interchange) is analyzed in order to size the inlets, pipes, and other structures. The watershed area of the Hydraflow model for Contract 4 includes only southbound at grade roadway areas between Battery Tunnel and Main Post Tunnel.

The static model has not been used to model the offsite Presidio Trust system because static models interpret results based on a calculated peak flow, rather than calculating results continuously throughout the duration of the storm.

2.1.2 Design Criteria

The following are the design criteria used for the roadway hydraulic modeling.

1) Design Criteria & Reference

- a. Caltrans Highway Design Manual
- b. FHWA Urban Drainage Design Manual (HEC 22)
- c. Rainfall Depth-Duration-Frequency data from California Department of Water Resources Website (San Francisco Sunset Station)
(<http://www.water.ca.gov/floodmgmt/hafoo/hb/csm/engineering/index.cfm>), refer to Table 1 for intensity values

Table 1 - IDF Intermediate Intensity Values (in/hr)

Storm Event	5-Minute	15-Minute	30-Minute	60-Minute
2-year	1.87	1.11	0.77	0.49
5-year	2.63	1.55	1.08	0.68

10-year	3.14	1.86	1.29	0.81
25-year	3.77	2.23	1.55	0.98
50-year	4.24	2.51	1.74	1.10
100-year	4.70	2.78	1.93	1.22

- 2) Design Storm: 25 years (4%) (HDM Table 831.8)
- 3) Design Water Spread: Shoulder or parking lane (HDM Table 831.8)
- 4) Computer Software: “Hydraflow - Storm Sewers 2000”

2.1.3 Hydrology Analysis

The following is a description of the design calculations and parameters used.

- 1) Using Rational Method ($Q=CiA$) to estimate peak discharge
- 2) Coefficient of runoff
 - a. Paved Area = 0.95
 - b. Unpaved Area = 0.44
- 3) Frequency Adjustment (HDM Chapter 818.2 (1))
 - a. For 25 years storm, $C(f) = 1.1$
 - b. $C(f)*C \leq 1.0$

2.1.4 Hydraulic Analysis and Modeling

The following is a description of the process followed using Hydraflow, the analysis and modeling software used.

- 1) Use energy-based Standard Step method (Bernoulli’s energy equation) to determine the Hydraulic Profile
- 2) Use Manning’s equation to estimate the friction loss in pipe
- 3) Tailwater Level/Design Constraint is assumed to be equal to the Mean High High Water Level of Tidal = 5.80’ (NAVD 88)
 - a. Information is obtained from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Website (www.noaa.gov) – San Francisco Bay Station
- 4) Inlet Capacity Calculation
 - a. Using Computer Software, “Hydraflow” to assist calculation
 - b. Calculation is based on FHWA HEC 22 for inlet interception capacity calculation
 - c. Any bypass flow will carryover to the next inlet downstream
 - d. Inlet in Sag will capture 100% of the flow
 - e. The interception efficiency for a grate inlet is assumed to be 50% (partially clogged conditions)
- 5) Inlet Type and Location
 - a. Within freeway area = Grate Inlet (Caltrans Std Type G2 Inlet)

b. Outside of freeway area = Combination Inlet (Caltrans Std Type GO)

6) Water Spread Width Calculation

- a. The water depth and water spread calculation is based on the equations in FHWA HEC 22 Section 4.
- b. Standard Gutter Depression is assumed at all inlet locations unless otherwise noted in the construction documents
- c. At points where the super elevation changes direction and the cross slope is 0% provide an upstream drainage inlet will be added to prevent flow from cross the roadway.

7) Self Cleaning Velocity

- a. To the maximum extent practical the self cleaning velocity of the pipe network should be 3 ft/s and at a minimum 2 ft/s. It should be noted that the velocity is highly dependent on the pipe material, so engineering judgment should be used when conducting this self cleaning velocity check

2.2 Temporary Detour Roadway Design Criteria

The following are the design criteria used for the temporary detour roadway hydraulic modeling.

- 1) Design Storm: 5 years (20%) (HDM Table 831.8)
- 2) Design Water Spread: Shoulder, parking lane, or 2' if no shoulder.
- 3) Hand calculations have been used for the temporary drainage works with supporting computations located in Appendix D.
- 4) Drainage scupper will be constructed at the bottom of concrete barrier to allow runoff drain away from the edge of travelway.

2.3 Dynamic Modeling Software

Infoworks CS has been used to create the dynamic hydraulic model for the existing project conditions. Static modeling has not been used to model the offsite Presidio Trust system and outfalls because static models interpret results based on a calculated peak flow, rather than calculating results continuously throughout the duration of a storm event. The Infoworks CS software can also help refine the drainage design by incorporating additional appropriate parameters into the model:

- Modeling of the systems using pipes instead of channel flow, to allow for a more accurate set of results with regard to flow routing to the outfalls.
- Modeling attenuation, storage, and pump structures on one software platform will alleviate the need to integrate different software results to obtain results for the entire system.
- The same storm data, rainfall distribution, runoff curves, and volume runoff generation methods will be used from the 35% Report. The 35% Report used a Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) unit hydrograph distribution routing model, while the analysis described herein uses the simplified unit hydrograph approach. The difference between these two methods is minimal and thus is not considered to be significant in the analysis.

- Continuous modeling of tailwater conditions of varying sea level conditions. Within the analysis a constant tailwater condition has been assumed, however if in-depth flood modeling is required the capability of modeling tidal activity is possible.
- Contour grading models (.tin) can be input into the dynamic model to understand areas at risk of flooding, and the extent of the flood boundary.

As storm intensity changes, runoff is routed through the system based on intensity, runoff generated, pipe capacity, flow in the system, and time of concentration for runoff to reach the pipe network. Continuous dynamic modeling offers the ability to analyze any part of the system at any specific point in time in order to get a greater understanding of the entire network. Infoworks also offers the ability to model details of the system such as invert and ground elevations so that pipe flows are modeled accurately to obtain an understanding of areas of potential flooding.

2.3.1 Rainfall Data

The rainfall depth has been obtained from the rainfall gauge for the City of San Francisco with over 116 years of data, from the California Department of Water Resources website. This rainfall depth was distributed over a 24-hr period per the NRCS Type 1 distribution method to obtain rainfall intensity over the storm duration.

2.3.2 Pipe Network Modeling

To simplify the modeling process only one length of pipe was assumed to capture all of the runoff from each subcatchment, and the pipe size was selected as the largest pipe in the subcatchment. Figure 8 and Figure 9 illustrate how the actual pipe network information relates to the information within the hydraulic model. The main objective of this analysis is to determine outfall capacity. Therefore, this approach will ensure that the maximum amount of flow reaches the downstream ends of the system and ultimately the outfall, regardless of potential flow restrictions within the system caused by smaller pipe sizes. This modeling technique will ensure that the overall analysis of the peak flow at the outfalls remains conservative. If it is determined that certain areas may be risk to flooding, a more detailed analysis may be considered to accurately assess the impacts on the upstream reaches of the system.

Figure 8 – Example of Actual Pipe Network





Figure 9 – Example of Modeled Pipe Network



A manning's n value of 0.013 (concrete pipe) was used to model all of the pipes in the network. When evaluating the peak discharge at the outfalls it is conservative to use a lower n value because it will result in the greatest peak flow.

2.4 Outfalls Design Criteria

The following section describes the outfalls criteria for the temporary and permanent condition.

2.4.1 Temporary Condition

The discharge rate to the outfalls of the Roadway Drainage in Contract 3 represents an interim condition of the project. Caltrans hydraulics officials have advised that the drainage criteria for temporary drainage should be no less than twice the expected life of the temporary facility. The Design Team has decided that using the criteria of the 5-year event for the evaluation of the outfalls in the temporary condition of Contract 4 would be appropriate. The roadway system represents a permanent condition and was sized to the 25-year event per Caltrans standards.

2.4.2 Permanent Condition

The analysis for the roadway systems is based on a 25-year design storm event, however the permanent design of the outfalls may be considered to be designed to the 10-year event. While the 25-year event is typical for Caltrans facilities, the outfalls are part of the Presidio Trust drainage system, which is comprised of local streets that only need to be designed per the 10-year event.

Index 801.3 Drainage Standards of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, which states, in part:

"...State-of-the-art methods and procedures associated with the necessary hydrologic analysis required to determine the severity and probability of occurrence of possible rare storms and flood events are inherently ambiguous. Therefore, the suggested drainage design criteria relating to frequency of occurrence references in this manual are provided for guidance only and are not intended to establish either legal or design standards which must be strictly adhered to. Rather, they are intended as a starting point of reference for designing the most cost effective drainage structures and facilities considering the importance of the highway, safety, legal obligations, ease of maintenance, and aesthetics...."

Index 801.5 Economics of Design states that,

"an economic analysis of alternate drainage designs, where a choice is available, should always be made."

Index 831.3 Design Storm and Water Spread, the section that most directly deals with "the selection of appropriate design storm frequency", furthermore:

"In order for a design frequency to be meaningful criteria for roadway drainage design, it must be tied to an acceptable tolerance of flooding."

Caltrans guidelines state:

"Drainage design criteria relating to the frequency of occurrence of rare storms and flood events were considered, based on guidance provided in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. The decision to use the 25-year event only for permanent drainage for both Caltrans facilities and local streets was agreed upon by both Caltrans Hydraulics and the Consultant."

The above text illustrates that the use of the 10-year event for design of the Outfalls may be justifiable if the cost of construction and upgrade is too high, from a financial and environmental point of view. Contract 4 represents a temporary case, in which the Roadway runoff will be routed through to the existing Presidio Trust's drainage system and subsequently discharge to Crissy Marsh via Outfall F with the 5-year design storm in mind. In the permanent case all roadway runoff within the area of Contracts 4 will be discharged to Outfall A via a future pump station.

The capacity and design of Outfall A will be re-evaluated in the future contract when the Girard Road interchange is constructed and the storm drainage system in this area will be complete and will be subject to the requirements of the permanent case. The merits and consequences for using the 10 and 25-year design event will be studied in greater with respect to economic feasibility, environmental stewardship and the safety concerns to the travelling public and adjacent property within the Presidio Lands.

2.5 Special Conditions

The National Park Services (NPS) has previously stated that no Doyle Drive roadway runoff can be conveyed to Crissy Marsh, and their stance on this issue has not changed. With regard to construction activities of the interim Project condition of Contract 4 they have specifically stated the following.

1. The Presidio Trust installed Jenson Precast oil/water separators on some of their existing drainage systems. It is their understanding that the Design Team knows which existing pipelines drain through these separators. They discourage any connections to these systems during construction since silt and debris may wash downstream resulting in increased maintenance.
2. The Presidio Trust recommends that the Design Team reroute all construction flows from Contract 4 away from Crissy Marsh. The Presidio Trust claims that the National Park Service (NPS) would need to approve any drainage concept which discharges to the marsh. The Trust seems to think this approval from the NPS would be virtually impossible.


The design team has examined these issues and has done their best to meet the conditions of the Presidio Trust. As Contract 4 represents an interim condition of the Project it is difficult to meet all of these demands because the build-out of the Project's infrastructure is not yet in place. In the ultimate condition of the project these conditions will be met, however during Contract 4 the Design Team could only make a best effort to meet these requirements in using sediment pools, inlet protection, and other erosion control measures.

3 Existing Site Base Conditions

To simplify the modeling process two separate models were created. The first model incorporates the subcatchments associated with OF1, OF2, OF3, OF5, and OF6. These areas were included within one model because they all discharge to San Francisco Bay. Within this report, and subsequent reports this model will be referred to the San Francisco Bay Model. Subcatchments associated with OF 4 all discharge to Crissy Marsh, and were modeled separately. Within the report, and subsequent reports this model will be referred to as the Crissy Marsh Model.

These results supersede the preliminary analysis conducted in the Outfalls Report Dated April 2009. There has been no new information received since the submission of the Contract 3 Storm Drainage Report in July 2009. The results documented herein are consistent with those previously submitted for Contract 3.

Figure 11 – San Francisco Bay Model – Outfall IJKL and Outfall 15 (Excerpts from Appendix A 3.1)



The western portion of the Doyle Drive Roadway in the Golden Gate Toll Plaza drains to Outfall M. The contribution from the roadway in the existing and proposed condition is a very small watershed and it has not been captured in the dynamic model.

Table 2 summarizes the existing capacity and peak flows to the outfalls. As mentioned earlier the information for the current pump configuration of the Presidio Trust has not been provided to the design team. Thus, the baseline analysis for Outfall A cannot be determined at this time and will be provided in a future report. The modeling parameters and sketches are contained in Appendix A.

Table 2 - San Francisco Bay Model Outfall Existing Results

	Outfall A (30")	Outfall B (42")	Outfall IJKL (42")	Outfall 15 (42")
Subcatchment Area (ac)	10.57	58.46	74.36	189.87
SCS Curve Number	87	88	73	80
Time of Concentration (min)	Unknown	Blocked	70.74	71.76
Design Tailwater Elevation (+ft)	5.8		5.8	5.8
Flow Line Elevation at Outfall (+ft)	0		0	0
Slope	1%		0.6%	10%
Capacity (cfs)	Information not provided in this report		75	329
5-year (cfs)			37	97
10-year (cfs)			46	121
25-year (cfs)			58	150
100-year (cfs)			76	164

The results show that Outfall IJKL has existing capacity for all storm events below the 100-year event.

Preliminary survey of Outfall IJKL was unable to definitively determine the size of the outfall. This uncertainty is most likely attributed to the Outfall being partially blocked with sands due to tidal activity. At Mason Street the survey has indicated that the Outfall is 42" and thus this assumption has been made for the entire run of the outfall. It is possible that the outfall pipe is actually reduced to 36" and even potentially 30" as it approaches San Francisco Bay. Follow up survey will be conducted in the future to verify these preliminary results.

3.2 Crissy Marsh Model

There are four outfalls associated with the Crissy Marsh Model, as shown in Appendix A 3.2. Outfall C drains OF 4A, Outfall D drains OF 4B, Outfall F drains OF 4C, and Outfall G drains OF 4D. Figure 12 shows an excerpt of San Francisco Bay Model from Appendix A 3.2.

Figure 12 – Crissy Marsh Model (Excerpt from Appendix A 3.2)




Table 3 summarizes the existing capacity and peak flows to the outfalls. The modeling parameters and sketches are contained in Appendix A.

Table 3 - Crissy Marsh Model Bay Model Existing Outfall Results

	Outfall C (18")	Outfall D (72")	Outfall F (24")	Outfall G (30")
Subcatchment Area (ac)	6.48	280.00	121.31	114.73
SCS Curve Number	94	86	96	86
Time of Concentration (min)	31.86	90.18	64.02	70.32
Design Tailwater Elevation (+ft)	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8
Flow Line Elevation at Outfall (+ft)	0	0	0	0
Slope	1.1%	1.1%	1.8%	3.0%
Capacity (cfs)	11	439	54	71
5-year (cfs)	4	141	64	37
10-year (cfs)	5	164	67	40
25-year (cfs)	6	185	71	43
100-year (cfs)	8	212	74	48

Previously, in the Contract 3 Storm Drainage Report the pipe slopes were reported incorrectly within this Table. They were modeled per the available survey information at the time of the Contract 3 submission. The results within this report are accurate for the survey information known to date. The main analysis parameter changes are the size of Outfall C has been confirmed to be 18", the slopes of the outfalls have been confirmed per survey data, and the subdrainage system at Crissy Field has been modeled as an underground storage tank to better represent the site parameters. The data within this Table is now accurate as well as the modeling parameters and results quoted in the Appendix.

3.3 Results Discussion

The results documented within this report are different from those previously submitted in the 35% Report due to the differences in modeling capabilities. The variations in the capacity and peak flow numbers between this and the previous model in the 35% Report can be directly attributed to the fact that the outfalls have been modeled as pipes instead of channels. As a result, flow is restricted from going through the outfalls and the peak flow results are reduced.

These outfall maximum flow results will be used to establish the baseline hydraulic condition of the Project. The goal for the Project is to either maintain or lower the maximum flow to the outfalls for the 25-year event, or increase outfall capacity such that the maximum flow can be conveyed. The existing dynamic model will be updated at each stage of the contract to reflect collected information via survey, the Presidio Trust, and other credible sources.

4 Proposed Design

4.1 Roadway Results Discussion

The design parameters presented within section 2 have been used with the Hydraflow model to size the storm drainage pipes and determine inlet spacing. The designed system meets the criteria and the hydraulic profile (HGL) show that for the 25-year event the highway will be safe for travel. The design of the system has been shown in the construction documents. The analysis associated with how the drainage from the roadway drainage system will be conveyed to the outfalls, and impact this drainage will have on the Offsite Drainage systems will be discussed later in this section. The associated computations and profiles with HGL's are available in Appendix B and the construction documents are presented in Appendix E.

Lincoln Boulevard Stormwater Infrastructure Discussion

During the consultation and coordination period of Package 2C, as part of Contract 2 – Utilities, it was briefly discussed that the utilities contractor should install the storm drainage infrastructure while installing the electrical, telecomm, and water lines within this area. After much debate and coordination it was decided that this stormwater infrastructure should remain in Contract 4. The Utilities contractor will be instructed by Caltrans to install the utilities in this area and the necessary location and elevation to allow for future construction of stormwater pipes, inlets, and manholes by the Contract 4 Contractor. The Contract 4 Contractor should consult the Contract 2 – Package 2C as built to ensure that while working on the Lincoln Blvd, they do not damage recently installed utility infrastructure.

4.2 Temporary Detour Roadway Results Discussion

The design parameters presented have been used to size the storm drainage pipes, determine inlet spacing, and for channel design associated with the temporary detour. The designed system meets the criteria that for the 5-year event the temporary detour roadway will be safe for travel. The design of the system has been shown in the construction documents within the temporary drainage sheets.

The analysis associated with the drainage from the temporary detour roadway drainage system will be conveyed to the outfalls, and the impact this drainage will have on the Offsite Drainage systems as a temporary case and does not affect the ultimate outfall conditions of the project. Furthermore, the land use of the temporary detour and the impact it has on the curve numbers of the watersheds has not been incorporated into the dynamic model. The associated computations are available in Appendix D and the construction documents are presented in Appendix E.

4.3 Offsite Drainage System

The changes in pipe alignment and flow routing of the offsite system have slightly changed the way the existing system conveys flow and will have an affect on the results of the Proposed System Dynamic Model. For example, it was mentioned previously that four crossings have been combined to one single crossing to avoid multiple deep systems. This rerouting of flow and stormwater systems will have an affect on the dynamic model and have been included in the analysis.

Outfall F Reconfiguration

During the consultation and coordination period of Package 2C, as part of Contract 2 – Utilities, it was decided upon to build part of the Outfall F storm drainage reconfiguration to avoid construction difficulties when the Contract 4 temporary detour is in operation. This stretch of installed pipe will not be active until the complete Outfall F reconfiguration is complete as part of Contract 5.

4.4 Presidio Trust Detention Devices/BMP's

At this time there are no areas within Contract 4 limit of work that the Presidio Trust have identified as potential locations to build detention devices to attenuate flow before discharge to the outfalls or stormwater BMP's for treatment purposes. Detention devices and BMP's throughout the Presidio lands are currently under investigation by the Presidio Trust and if applicable to the Roadway or Offsite Drainage Systems, they may be incorporated in future hydraulic studies.

4.5 Roadway Stormwater Detention Devices/BMP's

At this time there are no plans to implement detention devices in Contract 4. Permanent stormwater BMP's for the Contract 4 area will be constructed as part of future contracts as they are likely to be damaged due to future construction disturbance. The potential detention advantage of stormwater BMP's to attenuate flow prior to discharge to the outfalls is currently under evaluation and will be discussed in subsequent submissions.

4.6 Stormwater Pump Stations

In the ultimate condition stormwater from the Contract 4 area will be conveyed to a pump station and ultimately discharged to Outfall A. As Contract 4 is an interim condition of the project there are no plans to construct a stormwater pump station within the description of work for the Contract 4 area.

4.7 Dynamic Modeling

During the modeling process it is important to evaluate the results of the system after each contract so the impacts on the outfall can be measured. The end of Contract 4 represents a temporary condition of the project and dictates that a separate stormwater drainage system be implemented to collect drainage from the roadway and then ultimately discharge it to the Presidio Trust network out to San Francisco Bay. The roadway drainage must be treated via BMP's in the permanent condition, but not in the temporary case as such with Contract 4. The design of the stormwater BMP's associated with the Roadway systems in Contract 4 will be completed as part of Contract 6.

The discharge rate to the outfalls of the Roadway Drainage in Contract 4 represents an interim condition of the project. Caltrans hydraulics officials have advised that the drainage criteria for temporary drainage should be no less than twice the expected life of the temporary facility. The Design Team has decided that using the criteria of the 5-year event for the evaluation of the outfalls in the temporary condition of Contract 4 would be appropriate. The Roadway system represents a permanent condition and was sized to the 25-year event per Caltrans standards. The roadway drainage design and transverse drainage crossings design discussed above represent the items that will be implemented in Contract 4. Items such as offsite detention devices/BMP's, Roadway detention

devices/BMP's, stormwater pump station are not part of Contract 4 and thus will not be incorporated into the model.

In future contracts the dynamic model will be used to analyze the variability in flow while it is routed to stormwater detention devices, BMP's, storage devices, and pumping configurations. The model's analytic capability will aid in understanding the impact on the outfall hydrographs with different detention devices, BMP, storage tanks and pumping configurations. This will be discussed in further detail in later contract drainage report submittals.

4.7.1 Incorporation of Roadway Drainage Static Modeling Results


The output parameters from the Static model using Hydraflow have been incorporated into the Infoworks dynamic model to perform the routing exercise of discharge to the outfalls. These output parameters include subcatchment area, time of concentration, curve numbers, pipe inverts, pipe sizes, etc. Appendix C contains detailed information and a sketch that demonstrates the modeling parameters used.

4.7.2 Land Use Changes

The existing subcatchment areas and volume runoff SCS curve number definition included areas of the current Doyle Drive Roadway. The proposed model takes these areas into account separately as described in Section 4, thus the existing subcatchment information has been modified to reflect this change. Figure 13 shows those areas of the entire alignment that have been modeled in relation to the existing watersheds in blue and green. The green of Contract 4 have been subtracted from the existing subcatchments and the calculations can be shown in further detail in Appendix C. Also, the top of the tunnel will be a landscaped area which has a different curve number compared to a completely pervious surface. These adjustments have also been made within the modeling parameters.

Where a watershed in the Presidio has not been modified or where the fundamental function of the watershed will not be affected or changed, analysis of these areas has not been undertaken.

Figure 13 – Existing Watersheds with the Proposed Doyle Drive Highway Watersheds



4.7.3 San Francisco Bay Model

Contract 4 does not significantly affect those onsite or offsite areas associated with the San Francisco Bay Model. The results presented in the Contract 3 Drainage Report dated July 2009 are still valid with respect to the San Francisco Bay Model.

4.7.4 Crissy Marsh Model

Contract 4 only has impacts on Outfall F and Outfall G within the Crissy Marsh Model.

Table 4 summarizes the peak flows to the outfalls as a result of this Contract. The modeling parameters and sketches are contained in Appendix C

Table 4 - San Francisco Bay Model Outfall Interim Results

	Outfall C (18")	Outfall D (72")	Outfall F (24")	Outfall G (30")
Subcatchment Area (ac)	6.48	280.00	120.92	113.61
Doyle Drive Roadway Area (ac)	0	0	1.51	0
SCS Curve Number	94	86	96	86
Time of Concentration (min)	31.86	90.18	64.02	70.32
Design Tailwater Elevation (+ft)	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8
Flow Line Elevation at Outfall (+ft)	0	0	0	0
Slope	1.3%	1.1%	1.8%	3.0%
Capacity (cfs)	11	439	54	71
5-year (cfs)	4	133	80	35
10-year (cfs)	5	158	83	38
25-year (cfs)	6	180	86	41
100-year (cfs)	8	207	89	46

As shown in the Table, the peak flows for Outfall C and Outfall D are nearly similar to the results of the existing model baseline for all rainfall events. The peak flows for Outfall F are higher when compared to the existing model results and Outfall G's results are much lower for the proposed interim condition of Contract 4 when compared to the existing model baseline results. The results of Outfall F will be further discussed with the Trust.

4.8 Outfall Results

In the temporary condition of Contract 4 It is expected that the impact on the existing Presidio Trust Network will be minimal as only minor flooding will occur as a result of the increased flows at Outfall F. Measures will be investigated to mitigate this flooding and to avoid any damage on Trust Lands. It is unlikely that a significant storm event will occur during the temporary condition of Contract 4 in relation to the Project as a whole.

4.9 Construction Drawings Supporting Information

The supporting information and calculations to the items presented in the Quantities Table in the Construction Drawings are as follows:

The APC table shown and the CSP pipe types have been used based on the recommendations by Caltrans in a letter dated, April 25th, 2009. Please see Appendix D 1.1.

Appendix D 2.1 contains methodology and calculations for the design of the deep manhole as part of Drainage System 5 unit e.

Appendix D 2.2 contains methodology and calculations for the design of the transverse crossing Drainage System 5.

Appendix D 2.3 contains methodology and calculations for the design of the temporary channels Drainage System 27.

Appendix D 2.4 contains methodology and calculations for the design of the temporary underdrain pipe as part of Drainage System 42.