

Comment Notice

Permit Application # PRCCP20220189

The City has completed the review of the above-mentioned permit submittal. Below please find the permit submittal review comments from your review team. Should you have any questions regarding the review comments, please contact the plan reviewer associated with the comment listed below.

Engineering Civil Review (Reviewed By: Anthony Hulse, (253)841-5553, AHulse@PuyallupWA.gov)

- Provide the proposed cut/fill amounts in cubic yards. [civils, pg 2]
- Clearly show where the work on this sheet is on the site. [civil plans, pg 3]
- Remove items from the legend that are not shown on this [civil plans, pg 3]

• Is this an existing or proposed storm line or is this the drainage swale and the legend is missing this info? [civil plans, pg 3]

- Clearly show where this area is on a vicinity map [civil plans, pg 4]
- typo [civil plans, pg 8]
- NO COMMENTS AVAILABLE
- NO COMMENTS AVAILABLE

• Show where this location is on a vicinity map, it is not clear where this work is being conducted on the site. [civil plans, pg 3]

- Add this linetype to the legend [civil plans, pg 3]
- Include a section discussing the temporary stormwater mitigation while the project is under construction. [drainage report, pg 3]
- Provide the diameter, slope and size for the proposed drain line [civils plans, pg 4]
- The swale and drain line appear to intersect. How will this be constructed? [civil plans, pg 4]
- Add existing utilities to the legend on this sheet [civil plans, pg 4]
- Show grading on this sheet showing that the area will be directed to the temporary sediment pond. Existing conditions show the land would collect/pond in this area [civil plans, pg 4]
- Provide a minimum 1.5' tall berm [civil plans, pg 8]
- Provide a note that the max slope of the swale is 5% [civil plans, pg 8]
- Provide a design calculation for the proposed temporary sediment pond with storage equal to a 100-year/24hour storm event. [civil plans, pg 4]
- Proposed drainage pipe? Add to legend, include pipe diameter, slope, cover and material. [civil plans, pg 5]
- Replace with city standard 02.03.02 [civil plans, pg 7]
- Show were the check dams are proposed on the site. [civil plans, pg 8]
- Typo [civils, pg 8]
- remove if not proposed to avoid confusion [civil plans, pg 10]
- Reference 1/C4.1 and 2/C4.2 [civil plans, pg 10]
- CPEP pipe doesn't meet current city standards. What is the pipe manufacturer's minimum pipe cover allowance? Is there curb/gutter along this roadway such that a vehicle will likely never drive over this pipe? [civil plans, pg 10]
- Include city standard 02.01.01 Storm Sewer Manhole or 02.01.04 catch basin type II [civil plans, pg 16]
- Provide storm pipe diameter, material, slope and cover [civil plans, pg 9]
- Reference the detail and page number for the type 2 CB [civil plans, pg 10]
- Provide the prevolus work in this vicinity as part of the re-submittal package that proves the seasonal high



groundwater in this area will not reduce capacity of the NW detention pond. [drainage report, pg 159] • Was groundwater continously monitored for TP-2 between December 21st and March 21st? [Drainage report, pg 172]

• Add hatch to legend [civil plans, pg 9]

• How is stormwater being collected and filtered through the bioretention cell? Provide catch basins and pipes to the bioretention media to avoid ponding in the parking lot [civil plans, pg 9]

• Reference this will be and gutter and provide a detail [civil plans, pg 9]

• Provide fencing around the pond per Ecology's requirements provide a detail on a separate sheet [civil plans, pg 9]

- Add the access hatch road to the legend. Provide a detail for the access road. [civil plans, pg 9]
- Silt fence? When is this to be removed? [civil plans, pg 9]
- The pre-developed basin map for parking lot A states the pre-developed basin is 1.86 acres, whereas the proposed basin area states 1.92 acres. Please address this discrepancy [Drainage Report, pg 21]
- Provide bottom width per WWHM calculation sizing [civil plans, pg 20]
- Create a note to scarify the sub-grade a minimum 3in before placing the Bioretention soil [civil plans, pg 20]
 It appears the last page of the WWHM report speaking to the treatment passing for MR 6 is missing from the
- continuous modeling calculation. Generally this speaks to online and offline flows. [drainage plans, pg 67]
- To meet the full dispersion requirement for list #2 which portion(s) of the site will be retained in a tract to protect at least 65% of the site. Include more information within the drainage report [civil plans, pg 12]
- It does not appear that BMP T5.11 is proposed nor met per the Ecology manual. This BMP requires a berm or drain for every 700SF of area sent to a singular vegetated flow path. The site plan shows the new parking area sheet flowing to catch basins within the road which is being discharged to a singlular dispersion trench/vegetated flow path. Update the site plan and context of the drainage report (page 9 in the SSP) accordingly. [civil plans, pg 12]
- Replace the shear gate with a removable gasketed plug per CS 02.01.07 [civil plans, pg 19]
- This reference is now show on sheet C2.4. Revise accordingly. [civil plans, pg 19]

• The northern section of the parking lot is not being treated. Add an additional treatment BMP for this section or revise the design. [civil plans, pg 12]

• A single bio-retention detail is being used for multiple locations on the plans. Provide specific information on those sheets rather than referencing this detail or provide a separate detail for each specific bio-retention cell proposed. [civil plans, pg 20]

• It's too busy to read the bio-retention information here. Provide a screenshot of this at a smaller scale. [civil plans, pg 12]

- This pipe is designed at a .36% slope. City standard minimum is 0.5% [civil plans, pg 12]
- The bioretention IE for the inlet does not match plans vs the storm structure table. [civil plans, pg 12]

• How come this isn't being placed to collect water? The minimum pipe cover on CPEP is 3ft. Revise accordingly [civil plans, pg 12]

- Provide pipe crossing information [civil plans, pg 12]
- Add hatching to the legend. Reference 2/C4.2 assuming this will be asphalt. [civil plans, pg 12]
- The size of the pre-developed and post-developed basins for parking lot C do not match. Revise accordingly [civil plans, pg 23]
- Modeling for slopes 5-15% are considered moderate. [drainage report, pg 107]
- The mitigation techniques proposed contradict each other. The first paragraph mentions sheet flow dispersion will be used whereas the second paragraph references a dispersion trench. The site plan shows a dispersion trench proposed. Update this section to be clear as to what is proposed. [drainage report, pg 9]
- Add various hatch types to the legend. [civil plans, pg 11]
- Provide a storm conveyance system within the parking lot to catch and detain the stormwater runoff to the



bioretention system. [civil plans, pg 11]

- See comment on sheet C4.5 regarding bioretention detail [civil plans, pg 11]
- Provide/reference a detail for the proposed wall. [civil plans, pg 11]
- Provide contour elevations for the bioretention facilities. [civil plans, pg 11]
- It would be helpful to have these in numerical order rather than randomly mixed together [civil plans, pg 11]
- Provide existing and proposed roadway widening impervious surfaces on this sheet. [civil plans, pg 12]
- Include the note from the Geotech report regarding the parking lot C dispersion area. It is recommended this area be inspected yearly, during the rain season after heavy precipitation event to evaluate if maintenance is necessary. Also add the Geotech's ersosion control fixes to this note. [drainage report, pg 302]
- What does OVERBUILD EXIST mean? CPEP pipe requires a minimum 3' of cover. [civil plans, pg 11]
- It does not appear that CB 201 should be a type 2 catch basin based on the Rim and pipe depth being less than 5 feet. [civil plans, pg 11]
- Add the assess riser symbol to the legend. [civil plans, pg 11]
- Provide a profile view showing the detention pipes. Provide the elevations of the top of the pipe showing a minimum 18" of cover. [civil plans, pg 11]
- It does not appear that the flow control manhole is shown on this sheet. Provide the flow control manhole sized per the WWHM Calculations [civil plans, pg 11]
- The WWHM calculation states Orifice 1 is at 0.5 feet elevation, this conflicts with this details states a minimum 2 feet to the bottom of the tee. Provide this orifice elevation as letter "K" [civil plans, pg 18]
- 12" per the storm structure table on sheet C2.3. [civil plans, pg 18]
- Provide a removable gasketed end plug per city standards [civil plans, pg 18]
- The elevations provided on the plans for the flow control manhole do not match the flow control modeling WWHM calculation. [civil plans, pg 18]
- During the next submission, ensure the CSWPP does not have track changes on. [CSWPP, pg 6]
- Explain the proposed temporary sediment pond and how this project will be not increasing speed or volume of stormwater discharges from the site during construction. [CSWPPP, pg 8]
- Speak to how the project will be protecting the slopes during construction of parking lot C and the dispersion trench on the slope. [CSWPPP, pg 8]
- Update these times per Element 5 of the Ecology Manual [CSWPP, pg 8]
- The geotech report speaks to the potential of perched groundwater. Have a relative plan as to how dewatering would occur if encountered. [CSWPPP, pg 10]
- Are there any structures west of this area that will be affected by the re-grading of this area due to any stormwater runoff? [civil plans, pg 9]
- Provide permanent fencing around the pond per Ecology's standards. Reference and provide a detail for this fence. [civil plans, pg 9]
- Illegible [civil plans, pg 9]
- Where does the protection come into place? This appears to be a detail for for the pipe outfall. The outfall pipe is at a 0% slope on the plans, whereas the detail shows it at a sloped rate. Provide clarity [civil plans, pg 17]
- Provide calculations per design standard 204.1 [drainage report, pg 11]
- Per city records the storm pipe in College Way is 24" [drainage report, pg 11]
- Per Figure I-2.4.2, the treatment requirement applies to all new hard surfaces and the converted vegetation areas. Provide treatment for the easterly portion of the Parking C lot. [drainage plans, pg 13]
- Make note that parking lot 1 has the worst case scenario (largest area leading to a pipe conveyance system). [drainage report, pg 139]
- Provide a drain for the proposed keystone wall. [civil plans, pg 12]
- Per Minimum Requirement #6 of the Ecology Manual, the size of the stormwater treatment facility shall be for



the entire area that drains to the, even if some of those areas are not pollution-generating. [drainage report, 106]

- Provide a drain for the wall. [civil plans, pg 19]
- Show the proposed overflow structures within the bioretention detail. [civil plans, pg 20]

Engineering Traffic Review (Reviewed By: Bryan Roberts, (253)841-5542, broberts@PuyallupWA.gov)

- The gate need to be be fully retrorefectorized on both sides with vertical stripes alternately red and white at 16-inch intervals measured horizontally. This guidance comes directly from the MUTCD (Section 2B.68).
- Access shall meet AASHTO standards for ESD (280ft @ 25mph). Modify parking spots accordingly.

AASHTO is the industry standard for roadway/intersection geometric design & best practices. Remove parking spaces as needed to meet sight distance standards.

- parking spaces should be setback farther from the roadway to accommodate future pedestrian path/sidewalk.
- Provide an AutoTurn analysis for the largest anticipated design vehicle
- Access shall meet AASHTO standards for ESD (280ft @ 25mph). Modify parking spots accordingly.

AASHTO is the industry standard for roadway/intersection geometric design & best practices. Remove parking spaces as needed to meet sight distance standards.

• Access shall meet AASHTO standards for ESD (280ft @ 25mph). Modify parking spots accordingly. AASHTO is the industry standard for roadway/intersection geometric design & best practices. Remove parking spaces as needed to meet sight distance standards.

- Provide an AutoTurn analysis for the largest anticipated design vehicle
- Geometry must meet AASHTO SSD standards for approaching vehicles. Assume 25mph design speed
- (155ft). AASHTO is the industry standard for roadway/intersection geometric design & best practices
- Modify landscaping design as needed to meet sight distance standards
- Modify landscaping design as needed to meet sight distance standards
- Modify landscaping design as needed to meet sight distance standards
- Modify landscaping design as needed to meet sight distance standards

Fire Review (Reviewed By: David Drake, (253)864-4171, DDrake@PuyallupWA.gov)

• 1. Provide Fire Hydrant at new proposed North parking lot prior to proposed new gate.

2. Provide Fire Lane / No Parking Signage sheet with details. Any area that a vehicle can park that is not designated as an approved parking spot will be required to have painted curb / stenciled and No Parking signage.

Planning Review (Reviewed By: Chris Beale, (253)841-5418, CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov)

- Tree protection and removal plan needs companion arborist report. [sheet L1.0-1.2]
- Provider spec and manufacturer installation detail for all structural soil cells [sheet L2.0-2.2]

• All landscape islands must contain large canopy (50'+) trees from the city's VMS type I street tree list. NW is a small to medium tree [sheet L3.0]

• All storm ponds must be landscaped in accordance with SLD-02 design requirements from city VMS manual (section 14.5) [sheet L3.0]

• There is a SD pipe shown on sheet C2.1 - space trees offset to 10 ft or adjust SD pipe on sheet C2.1 [sheet L3.0]

• All landscape islands must contain large canopy (50'+) trees from the city's VMS type I street tree list. PV is a small to medium tree [sheet L3.2]

- SD drain pipe under this tree space to meet 10 ft offset or adjust SD pipe on sheet 2.4 [sheet L3.2]
- ٠



Wetland report is being peer reviewed by city's on call wetlands consultant. Report will be sent under a separate cover.

• Applicant needs to supply an arborist report for all significant trees.

Public Works Collection Review (Reviewed By: Josh Grbich, (253)841-5560, JGrbich@PuyallupWA.gov)

• The CoP stormwater notes are not current; refer to engineering standards on website for the most updated version. [PIERCE COLLEGE PARKING IMPROVEMENTS combined - sheet 4.1]

• The stormwater facility sign standard is for use with publicly owned/maintained facilities. [PIERCE COLLEGE PARKING IMPROVEMENTS combined - sheet 4.1]

Public Works Water Review (Reviewed By: Brian Johnson, (253)841-5442, BrianJ@PuyallupWA.gov)

• PIERCE COLLEGE PARKING IMPROVEMENTS-combined Sheet C1.2: This value is for a water blow-off located 28.5-feet to the south. Protect this existing utility.

PIERCE COLLEGE PARKING IMPROVEMENTS-combined Sheet C3.1: Adjust water blow-off box to grade.
 PIERCE COLLEGE PARKING IMPROVEMENTS-combined Sheet L3.0: If water blow-off box sits in planting area, provide 3-foot clear zone around box.

• PIERCE COLLEGE PARKING IMPROVEMENTS-combined Sheet L3.1: Maintain a 3-foot clear zone around fire hydrant, water meter and DCVA boxes. No trees within 10-feet of water features.

To resubmit, you must address all comments and complete the <u>resubmittal form</u>. Please note, partial resubmittals will be deemed incomplete and returned.

If you need assistance with resubmitting your corrections, please contact the Permit Center.

Sincerely, City of Puyallup Permit Center (253) 864-4165 option 1 permitcenter@puyallupwa.gov