

**CES ♦ NW**  
INCORPORATED  
CIVIL ENGINEERING & SURVEYING

April 25, 2025

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

**RE:      Response to Comments for BPLC North (PRCCP20250096)  
             (CES #20083)**

Dear City of Puyallup,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the City's comments for the BPLC North site development application. Below are the review comments with a response on how each comment has been addressed.

**Engineering Civil Review Comments**

- Attention to the provision in Detail 01.01.20 that specifies no longitudinal joints in wheel path.  
**Response: No longitudinal joints are proposed within the wheel path since the roadway is being overlaid.**
- Refer this note and all other mentions of Grind and Overlay to Detail A, Sheet C4.  
**Response: The callout has been revised as requested.**
- Provide downturned elbow in new CB to minimize pollutants.  
**Response: A downturned elbow is provided on EXCB#4 and a detail has been added to Sheet C4.**
- Custom detail for off-site paving OK. See also WSDOT Spec 5-04. These notes come directly from the city's "ROADWAY WIDENING" Detail 01.01.18. Although most of the notes are appropriate, it should be known that Note #1 refers to the minimum 36 inch asphalt widening from existing asphalt to curb. It should refer the contractor to Detail 01.01.20 #6 where it prohibits longitudinal joints in the wheel path or be removed. Alternatively, include Detail 01.01.19 instead and specify a 4 inch top layer.  
**Response: A reference to city detail 01.01.20 #6 has been added to note 1 of the Inter Ave typical section.**
- Include note that says: 'Gutter edge must be tack sealed with AR4000'.  
**Response: Note 1 of the Inter Ave typical section as been revised accordingly.**
- Refer the contractor to Detail 03.01.03-1.  
**Response: The callout has been revised accordingly.**

- Technically the frontage and the proposed road repair (OFF SITE) exceeds 2,000 square feet and could require SW Management (List #1 or LID standard - Min Req #5). A suggestion would be to use BMP T5.18 – Reverse Slope Sidewalk to mitigate the walking area. The required 10 foot vegetated area behind the sidewalk is already proposed in your design. This would leave the replaced area in the ROW under 2,000 square feet (~1640 sq ft) as proposed. Considering the desperate need for improvement of this area, the city will not require SW Management (Min Req #5) should the area of full depth improvement be enlarged during construction due to the inability to achieve grind and overlay in all areas.

**Response:** As shown in the stormwater modeling and discussed in Section 5 of the report, the project achieves the LID Performance standard; therefore, List #1 or #2 BMPs are not necessary.

- Drainage Report
  - a. Page 1 refers to the 2014 manual. Puyallup uses the 2019 Manual currently.
  - b. -This project triggers the requirement for a CGSWP issued by Ecology.

**Response:** The manual reference has been updated in the report. As discussed in Section 6 of the report, a CGSWP will be obtained from the Department of Ecology for construction.

- Pervious Concrete Pavement Design Memo:
  - a. Memo says pervious concrete and civil plans call for permeable asphalt. Verify material and make consistent across all documents.
  - b. Memo recommends 8 inch pervious pavement section with 7.5 inches of CSTC. Civil plans show 6.5 inches of each. Report calls thicknesses recommendations but only refers to exceeding the recommended thicknesses based on engineering analysis, leading reviewers to interpret these thicknesses as a minimum. Provide recommended minimum thicknesses or sound engineering rationale for not taking the Geotechnical Engineer's recommendation.

**Response:** The geotechnical memo has been updated for an asphalt section and the plans have been updated to match.

- Cost Estimate Off-site
  - a. INCLUDE Roadway Excavation/Haul
  - b. INCLUDE existing utilities to be brought to grade
  - c. INCLUDE approx. 48 feet of new water pipe in ROW
  - d. Double Check Valve Assembly line is provided under the WATER section for almost the same unit price as was provided in the MISCELLANEOUS section. Result is the same.
  - e. New version of cost estimate with better formatting available here:  
<https://www.cityofpuyallup.org/1591/Master-Document-List>

**Response:** The cost estimate has been revised as requested with the new form.

- Cost Estimate On-site
  - a. We would usually instruct designers to REMOVE GRAVEL BASE, TOP COURSE, and ASPHALT from estimate. Inspector will not focus on private paving areas except that the performance of the Pervious Lot impacts the city in case of failure. Move totals to MISC section and indicate that they are for the pervious lot by labeling each section to correspond with the layers of the pervious lot.
  - b. INCLUDE No Parking Signs under STREET section
  - c. INCLUDE lineal feet of curb under STREET section

**Response: The cost estimate has been revised as requested.**

- Operations and Maintenance Manual
  - a. use the relevant portions of the city's new page (<https://www.cityofpuyallup.org/2157/Operations-and-Maintenance>) to populate the sections of the O&M Manual. Retain the project description. The Site Address, Parcel Number and Ownership are all incorrect. Check the remainder of the manual for accuracy and be sure totals match the most current plans and drainage report.

**Response: The O&M Manual has been updated accordingly.**

- SWPPP
  - a. include CESCL and contact info or blank space to fill in CESCL and contact info.

**Response: The SWPPP has been updated accordingly. Please see section 1.12 of the SWPPP.**

### **Engineering Traffic Review Comments**

- Per Traffic Scoping Document, submitted for permit E-21-0071:  
 Trips calculated using ITE LUC 180 "Specialty Trade Contractor"  
 Building area calculated for TIF is 4,774 sqft (2,602 + 300 + 1,872)  
 PM peak trips will be 8.3  $((4.774 * 1.93 = 9.2) - 0.9) * \$4500 = \$37,350$  traffic impact fee  
 Is a building permit/TI anticipated to accompany this civil permit? If Not, Traffic Impact fees will be required as a condition of permit approval, due to previous unpermitted work  
 Park Impact fees:  
 For ML zoning, Park impact fees are required. This will be \$0.87 per sqft.  
 $4,774 \text{ sqft} * 0.87 = \$4,153.88$

**Response: The required impact fees will be paid with the building permit application.**

### **Fire Review Comments**

- 1. On 3/11 I was contacted by Tom with Washington Underground who needed to add the fire line information on the Civils. The Civils are required to reflect this work and all underground will be reviewed under this permit..

**Response: The fire lines have been updated on the revised plans, please see sheet C3.**

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

*Jennifer Caldwell*

Jennifer Caldwell, Planning Manager