Galloway
5500 Greenwood Plaza Blvd., Suite 200
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
303.770.8884 • GallowayUS.com

May 25, 2023

City of Puyallup
Engineering Division
333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

RE: Comment Notice – Permit application #PRCCP20220035

COMMENT RESPONSES:

CIVIL

Comment: Update soil stabilization dates per section 501.5 for the COP standards. (SWPPP, Pages 15)

Response: Soil stabilization dates have been revised.

Comment: Revise from Keynote #3 to Keynote 25 for pavement removal. (CS1)
Response: Keynote has been revised.

Comment: Add north arrow to Ingress/Egress Detail. (CS1A)
Response: North arrow has been added to ingress/egress detail.

Comment: Call out property lines with bearing and dimensions in Ingress/Egress Detail (CS1A).
Response: Bearing and dimension added to property lines.

Comment: Add Street name in Ingress/Egress Detail (CS1A).
Response: Street names added where applicable.

Comment: Show top landing slope and add spot elevations. (CS3)
Response: Top landing slope and spot elevations added where needed.

Comment: Show bottom landing slope and add spot elevations. (CS3)
Response: Bottom landing slope and spot elevations added where needed.

Comment: Grade to have 2% max cross slope in crosswalk. (CS3)
Response: 2% max cross slope maintained across crosswalk.

Comment: Call out property lines with bearing and dimensions in Ingress/Egress Detail (CS3).
Response: Bearing and dimension added to property lines.

Comment: Add Street name in Ingress/Egress Detail (CS3).
Response: Street names added where applicable.

Comment: Show ramp cross slope. (CS3)
Response: Ramp cross slope shown.

Comment: Show wing slopes. (CS3)
Response: Wing slopes added.

Comment: Show flow line elevation. this appears to be a low-spot susceptible to ponding. (CS3)
Response: Flowline elevation shown.

Comment: ADA Ramp detail was removed from sheet CS3. Add ADA notes and details and Detectable warning notes and detail. (CS3)
Response: Necessary ramp details have been provided.

Comment: You provided Chapter 1 of the City Storm water standards and not the standard notes. Include City Standard Stormwater Notes per COP Standard Section 207 on the Storm plan. (CS4)
Response: City Standard Stormwater Notes have been added.

Comment: Remove duplicate notes. (CS6)
Response: Duplicate notes have been removed.

Comment: City standard minimum slope for storm pipe is 0.5%. Revise to increase slope to minimum. Existing invert may have to change to accomplish this.
Response: Slope of pipe and invert out of the existing structure has been revised to meet minimum slope standard.

Comment: This pipe connects to as shown with arrow, per the GIS. (CS7)
Response: Noted.

Comment: Include Standard Detail 02.07.05 (CS8)
Response: Sheet CS8 has been removed from the plan set. Standard detail 02.07.05 has been added to Utility Plan CS7.

Comment: Include existing and proposed contour labels. (CS8)
Response: Sheet CS8 has been removed from the plan set, reference Grading Plan CS4

Comment: Include all existing and proposed utilities. (CS8)
Response: Sheet CS8 has been removed from the plan set, reference Utility Plan CS7

Comment: Include individual site-specific flow control manhole details with exact inverts and elevations of flow control structures per the engineered design. (CS8)
Response: Site Specific flow control manhole details no longer needed for proposed design.

Comment: Show top of free board elevation and top of bank elevation for bioretention. (CS8)
Response: Top of free board and top of bank elevations are shown.

Comment: Show outfall protection at curb cuts that flow into bioretention. (CS8)
Response: Outfall protection has been added to the curb cuts leading to the bioretention area.

Comment: Label high points for all highpoint locations along bioretention gutter. (CS4)
Response: highpoints throughout the bioretention have been added.

Comment: slope arrow appears to be pointing up slope. (CS4)
Response: Slope arrows have been revised where necessary.

Comment: Add ADS details and shop drawings to Civil Plans. include site specific elevations in their section and profile view. (CS8) details.
Response: ADS system is no longer needed and has been removed from the plans.

Comment: Site specific weir details are required in site specific manhole detail. (CS8)
Response: Site specific weir detail is no longer necessary with the proposed design.

Comment: Show pavement spot elevations at each corner of chambers. (CS8)
Response: Chambers have been removed from the plans.

Comment: Include Standard Detail 02.01.08 (CS8)
Response: sheet CS8 has been removed from the plans, and flow restrictor manhole no longer needed for proposed design.

Comment: Delineate infiltration excavation limits and call out to be protected from compaction. (CS1)
Response: Underground system no longer needed for site design.

Comment: Protect this inlet too and all others in the vicinity of work area. (CS5)
Response: Inlet protection has been added to the inlet in question.

Comment: The size of the disturbed area has increased so two entrances no longer appear to be needed. Remove west construction entrance and change the other to metal grated entrance. include manufacturer and detail. Note: The entrance location may vary as needed during construction. Any changes during construction will need to be coordinated with city inspector. (CS5)
Response: Noted. The second construction entrance has been removed.

Comment: Include standard city detail for construction entrance. 05.01.02 (CS5)
Response: City detail 05.01.02 is for residential use. Detail 05.01.01 for temporary construction entrance has been included in lieu.

Comment: Discussions about BMPs past the feasible BMP is not needed and may be removed from report. (Storm Report, Pg 12)
Response: discussions about non-feasible BMPs have been removed.

Comment: I will review WWHM when finalized. Please call me to discuss so I can gain clarification on your storm design intentions. I think I may know the error you are receiving, and you may not need to design for storm tech chambers. Flow control requirements can be satisfied by 100% infiltration.
Response: We discussed our model results and issues with Lance upon receiving his comments. Please find the WWHM results at the end of the stormwater report.

Comment: Update Soil stabilization dates per Section 501.5 for the COP Standards. (SWPPP, Pg 16)
Response: Soil stabilization dates have been revised.

Comment: Place this in element #5. (SWPPP, Pg 14)
Response: Soil stabilization dates have been added to element #5.

Comment: Please submit soils report separately on next submittal. (Storm Report, Pg 18)
Response: Soil and Geotechnical report have been submitted as supplement documents to the report.

Comment: Provide a blank copy of the maintenance log in the Maintenance Manual. (Storm Report, Pg 13)
Response: Blank maintenance log has been provided.

Comment: Add inspection report form to SWPPP. (SWPPP, Pg 17)
Response: Inspection Report for added.

Comment: For MR7; Flow control requirements can be met if Bioretention infiltrates 100%. Disregard all chamber and flow control device comments if this will be the outcome.
Response: Bioretention is now being used for full flow control to meet MR7.

Comment: Limit to one construction access. Rubber track out mats have not been accepted in the past. The city has accepted metal grate track out mats to protect subgrade. state Manufacture and provide a detail on the TESC plan. (SWPPP, Pg 15)
Response: We are proposing the FODS construction entrance system which is an HDPE plastic track out mat with rigid pyramid shapes to prevent sediment track out from tires. Details provided.

Comment: verify Property line location. Our GIS indicates the ROW goes to the back of sidewalk along the road which is standard in the city. (CS7)
Response: The property line shown was collected by a professional land surveyor. This is shown accurately based on property corners and benchmark data collected by surveyor.

Comment: Scale on sheet CS8 is wrong.
Response: Sheet CS8 has been removed.

Comment: Is it possible to move the proposed storm line from the vault to the existing storm line such that it does not flow under the landscape bed and interfere with tree planting?
Response: This design is no longer required.

LANDSCAPING

Comment responses by Troy Noser – Galloway – 303.770.8884

Comment: Picea Pungens is not listed as an approved tree species in the City's VMS, select an alternative appropriate evergreen tree species. Civil Plan, Sheet L1.0. According to comment response letter from applicant, Picea Pungens was removed from resubmittal package submitted on 2.27.2023. However, review of sheet L1.0 showed that this tree is still listed and has not been replaced with an approved species from the VMS.
Response: Blue Spruce has been replaced with the class 4 ponderosa pine.

Comment: Internal Landscape islands shall be planted with Medium (Class III) or Large (Class IV) street trees selected from the approved VMS street tree list. Civil Plans, Sheet L1.0. Revised landscape plan submitted 2/28/2023 still includes Picea pungens which is a Class I tree instead of a Class III or Class IV tree. Please select another evergreen tree from approved Class III or Class IV list in the VMS.
Response: Blue Spruce has been replaced with the class 4 ponderosa pine.

Comment: It has been determined that Structural soil cells are not rated for drive lanes. Revise plane to remove cells in drive isles. All other soil cells to remain.
Response: All soil cells have been removed from drive isles.

Comment: The following standard has been added the Sheet L1 successfully: "A minimum of eight (8) inches of topsoil, containing ten percent dry weight in planting beds, and 5% organic matter content in turf areas, and a pH from 6.0 to 8.0 or matching the pH of the original undisturbed soil. The topsoil layer shall have a minimum depth of eight inches (8”) except where tree roots limit the depth of incorporation of amendments needed to meet the criteria. Subsoils below the topsoil layer should be scarified at least 6 inches with some incorporation of the upper material to avoid stratified layers, where feasible. Installation of the eight inches (8”) of topsoil, as described above, shall generally be achieved by placing five inches (5”) of imported sandy-loam top soil into planned landscape areas (sub-base scarified four inches (4”)) with a three-inch (3”) layer of compost tilled into the entire depth". Please estimate the total topsoil required to meet the standard in cubic yards. The contractor will be required to submit delivery sheets and demonstrate compliance with topsoil required and specified on plans at the time of final inspection. Item 4 on sheet L1.1 needs to be replaced with required description of 8" topsoil minimum requirement. Alternatively clarify that 4" of topsoil is allowed as a topdressing in existing landscape beds, but 8" will be required in all newly planted beds.
Response: This note has been revised. Topsoil amount has been added to the planting legend.

Comment: A minimum of 25 percent of the shrubs and ground covers used in projects under the requirements of the PMC and the VMS shall be native to the Puget Sound region. Please call out natives on the plant schedule for easy identification. 100% of landscape plants used in the bioretention area/raingarden must be native to the Puget sound region. Response letter indicated that native plan identification had been added to plan, but review of planting table did not show native plant ID.
Response: A column has been added to the planting legend for native plant designation.

Comment: Root barriers: Add city standards #01.02.05, #01.02.08A, #01.02.08 and #01.02.03 to landscape plans.
Response: These details have been added.

Comment: Confirm that lonicera pileata is native to the Pacific Northwest. If it is not, replace with Lonicera Ciliosa or other PNW Native alternative. All plants with the bioretention area must be native to the pacific northwest.
Response: This plant has been replaced with the native Douglas Spirea species.

Comment: Add a PNW Native shrub or groundcover species to bioretention area that blooms late in the season (Sept/Aug).

Response: Douglas Spirea has been added to the bioretention area which blooms in Aug/Sept.

Comment: Add two rows of silva cells around all edges of planter islands where they touch parking stalls. See purple lines around stalls 26-30 for example configuration of silva cells. (L1.0)

Response: Silva cells have been added adjacent to tree species that require a wider planter strip width than provided per the vegetation management standards dated November 2022. I looked into the code and couldn't find a section that requires silva sells or additional soil volume for the plant material specified on the plan. Planter island adjacent to shrubs, grasses and perennials will not need silva sells based on the soil volume being provided in the landscape island. (Called Rachael Brown on 5/26 and 5/31 and sent an email on 5/26 to discuss this comment and received no response. Will continue to coordinate during this review)

Comment: Silva cells must be placed under entire walkway to create a continuous soil window between planting strips.
Response: A third row of Silva Cells have been added under the sidewalk.

Comment: Please spec the on-center spacing for all landscape areas.
Response: (Called Rachael Brown on 5/26 and 5/31 and sent an email on 5/26 to get clarification on this comment with no response.)

Comment: Move lighting poles where they conflict with required tree placement
Response: Tree light conflicts have been revised.

Comment: Trees are required in zone 3 of rain garden, specifically one tree in each of the internal landscape islands. In last submittal trees where shown in each of these landscape islands, they have now been remove, please put them back on the plans.
Response: Native trees have been added back to zone 3 of the bio retention area.