



# Comment Notice

## Permit Application # E-21-0313

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: Mark Higginson, (253)841-5559, MHigginson@PuyallupWA.gov)

- ◆ The City will adopt the 2019 Ecology Manual July 1st, 2022. Any projects not vested (Building Permits and Subdivision Applications) and not permitted by the close of business on June 30th, shall incorporate the provisions of the 2019 Ecology Manual. [Storm Report; Pg 1 of 347]
- ◆ Provide a DRAFT version of the City's Stormwater Facilities Agreement for review. (Note: this is not a condition of permit issuance)[Storm Report; Pg 1 of 347]
- ◆ Executed and record the City's Stormwater Facilities Agreement prior to permit closeout.[Storm Report; Pg 1 of 347]
- ◆ If the current stormwater design complies with the 2019 Ecology Manual, then an acknowledgment letter from the design engineer will suffice for permit issuance. [Storm Report; Pg 1 of 347]
- ◆ Revise statement to reflect the wetland basin which is tributary to the detention facility. See comments in Section 7.7. [Storm Report; Pg 9 of 347]
- ◆ Due to the grades associated with the project, provide a letter from a licensed geotechnical engineer assessing the potential for lateral flow of the infiltrated runoff and whether any lateral flow will impact the proposed conventional paving and/or existing structures. If there are concerns due to lateral flow of the infiltrated runoff, redesign accordingly. [Storm Report; Pg 14 of 347]
- ◆ In the pre-developed condition, there is one threshold discharge area (TDA) and subsequently one Point-of-Compliance (POC). As a result, the post-developed scenario must be addressed holistically as one POC. That is, either the entire proposed area of disturbance complies with the LID Performance Standard or List 2 applies to the whole. It is not appropriate to breakdown a given TDA into smaller portions in an effort to meet MR5 requirements. Since the LID Performance Standard cannot be met for the TDA, List 2 must be evaluated for DB-B, in addition to DB-A, and Permeable Pavement feasibility addressed since it is a higher BMP than the proposed Bioretention BMP under the Other Hard Surfaces category. (See Ecology, Vol. V, Pg 5-20 for infeasibility criteria for permeable pavement related to slope). [Storm Report; Pg 20 of 347]
- ◆ Enhanced Treatment required (commercial site tributary to freshwater supporting aquatic life). [Storm Report; Pg 20 of 347]
- ◆ See Section 4.1.2 comment regarding lateral flow. [Storm Report; Pg 21 of 347]
- ◆ See Section 7.5 regarding the feasibility of using Permeable Pavement before Bioretention. [Storm Report; Pg 21 of 347]
- ◆ In the Mitigated scenario, the Wetland Basin is tributary to the storm collection system. Per Ecology, if the Wetland Basin 100yr peak flow is greater than 50% of the project's post-development undetained flow (WWHM 701), then the runoff MUST bypass the storm facility. If less than 50% and the runoff is not bypassed, then the storm facility must be sized to account for the additional offsite inflow/runon. [Storm Report; Pg 21 of 347]
- ◆ Please label as subbasins. [Storm Report; Pg 23 of 347]
- ◆ and replaced [Storm Report; Pg 23 of 347]
- ◆ 6.83 per Basin Exhibit, but need to include wetland basin too. [Storm Report; Pg 23 of 347]
- ◆ 3.05 per Basin Exhibit. [Storm Report; Pg 23 of 347]



- ◆ Verify-Does not appear that this area is tributary to the Wetland. [Storm Report; Pg 27 of 347]
- ◆ Verify-Does not appear that this area is tributary to the Wetland. [Storm Report; Pg 28 of 347]
- ◆ The WWHM output indicates 0.15ac of lawn tributary to the wetland. Where does this occur? (regraded areas appear tributary to the parking)[Storm Report; Pg 28 of 347]
- ◆ In the Mitigated scenario, the Wetland Basin is tributary to the storm collection system. Per Ecology, if the Wetland Basin 100yr peak flow is greater than 50% of the project's post-development undetained flow (WWHM 701), then the runoff MUST bypass the storm facility. If less than 50% and the runoff is not bypassed, then the storm facility must be sized to account for the additional offsite inflow/runon. [Storm Report; Pg 28 of 347]
- ◆ Provide the 100yr peak flow comparison between the Wetland Basin and the post-development undetained flow (WWHM 701). [Storm Report; Pg 28 of 347]
- ◆ Based on the contours, it does not appear that runoff from this area reaches the wetland in the post-developed condition. [Storm Report; Pg 28 of 347]
- ◆ Please label as Figure 3 [Storm Report; Pg 29 of 347]
- ◆ Provide the 100yr peak flow comparison between the Wetland Basin and the post-development undetained flow (WWHM 701). [Storm Report; Pg 245 of 347]
- ◆ In the Mitigated scenario, the Wetland Basin is tributary to the storm collection system. Per Ecology, if the Wetland Basin 100yr peak flow is greater than 50% of the project's post-development undetained flow (WWHM 701), then the runoff MUST bypass the storm facility. If less than 50% and the runoff is not bypassed, then the storm facility must be sized to account for the additional offsite inflow/runon. If not bypassed, include the groundwater component that was used for the wetland analysis in the modeling of the detention facility.[Storm Report; Pg 245 of 347]
- ◆ Clarify-why is the precipitation scale adjusted? This is a default setting in WWHM. [Storm Report; Pg 246 of 347]
- ◆ Provide Gage Information [Storm Report; Pg 246 of 347]
- ◆ In the Mitigated scenario, the Wetland Basin is tributary to the storm collection system. Per Ecology, if the Wetland Basin 100yr peak flow is greater than 50% of the project's post-development undetained flow (WWHM 701), then the runoff MUST bypass the storm facility. If less than 50% and the runoff is not bypassed, then the storm facility must be sized to account for the additional offsite inflow/runon. If not bypassed, include the groundwater component that was used for the wetland analysis in the modeling of the detention facility.[Storm Report; Pg 247 of 347]
- ◆ Confirm-shouldn't mulch layer be included in the WWHM model. [Storm Report; Pg 251 of 347]
- ◆ Verify-Section 2/TS-01 indicates 18 inches of gravel. [Storm Report; Pg 255 of 347]
- ◆ What about the entrance road grassy swale? See comments Sheet SD-03. [Storm Report; Pg 255 of 347]
- ◆ Confirm-0.5 offset per 2/TS-01 [Storm Report; Pg 255 of 347]
- ◆ See Comment Pg 245 regarding Wetland bypass.[Storm Report; Pg 276 of 347]
- ◆ 3/TS-01 indicates 4-in mulch layer. Shouldn't that be included in the analysis? [Storm Report; Pg 277 of 347]
- ◆ Provide screenshot of Mitigated design inputs for the bioswale. Ensure the bottom slope of the facility is accounted for. [Storm Report; Pg 277 of 347]
- ◆ Provide Gage Information [Storm Report; Pg 297 of 347]
- ◆ Based on the Basin Map, Figure 2, it is unclear what changed in the post-developed condition that implies 0.15ac of lawn tributary to the wetland. Show on the Basin Map where this applies for Wetland F (see Basin Map Comments also) [Storm Report; Pg 299 of 347]
- ◆ Provide underdrain sizing calcs (length and perforations) for Alignment H considering tributary area to bioswale and Ecology requirement to drain the BSM within 48 hours. [Storm Report; Pg 337 of 347]
- ◆ Engr Clarify-CB1 thru CB3 will be under backwater influence during large storm events (top of riser at EL 481.51). Is there a concern for localized flooding due to the backwater condition? [Storm Report; Pg 337 of 347]



City of Puyallup

**Engineering Division**

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

- ◆ Use correct approval block. (Typ. All Sheets)[Plans; Sht G-0.1]
- ◆ Use complete City Std Notes (missing original Note 15) [Plans; Sht G-03]
- ◆ Also shown on Sheet WA-02. [Plans; Sht G-03]
- ◆ Per Ecology, the 1-in drop is at the face of curb (abutting the hard surface). Revise accordingly. [Plans; Sht TS-01]
- ◆ Per Ecology, the 1-in drop is at the face of curb (abutting the hard surface). Revise accordingly. [Plans; Sht TS-01]
- ◆ Confirm-shouldn't mulch layer be included in the WWHM model. [Plans; Sht TS-01]
- ◆ Callout 6-in (freeboard). [Plans; Sht TS-01]
- ◆ Verify-46-in max places bottom of footing exactly at bottom of biocell. ( $H=0.5+1.5+0.33+1+0.5 = 45.96$ inches) [Plans; Sht TS-01]
- ◆ Provide underdrain sizing calcs (length and perforations) in the storm report for Alignment H considering tributary area to bioswale and Ecology requirement to drain the BSM within 48 hours. [Plans; Sht TS-01]
- ◆ Per prior comment, provide Construction Sequence per CS Section 501.6. Below is an example... [Plans; Sht DM-00]
- ◆ Per Ecology, Sediment Traps are limited to 3ac tributary area. Clarify why the Sediment Pond BMP is not being used. [Plans; Sht DM-01]
- ◆ Per prior comment...is this not the roof drain and should be preserved? Clarify. [Plans; Sht DM-03]
- ◆ Per prior comment...was the Fire Code Official consulted to ensure that there adequate hydrants to serve the building upon removal? [Plans; Sht DM-03]
- ◆ Clearly identify the FDC, PIV, and DDCVA serving the building. [Plans; DM-03]
- ◆ Per Ecology, callout a staff gauge with a prominent mark 1-ft above the bottom of the trap/pond. [Plans; Sht DM-06]
- ◆ Does not appear on Sht SD-07. [Plans; Sht SD-00]
- ◆ Does not appear on Sht SD-07. [Plans; Sht SD-00]
- ◆ Per prior comment, confirm callout. [Plans; Sht SD-00]
- ◆ Please add "slotted" to callout. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Confirm invert and/or pipe slope.[Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Verify-Rim Elev w/ 2/TS-01 [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Confirm invert and/or pipe slope.[Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Please add "slotted" to callout. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Verify-Rim Elev w/ 2/TS-01 [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Confirm-Storm Note 2?[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Verify-EL 477.00 per Sht SD-09. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ This callout should reference Std. Detail 02.01.06 Sheet SD-07. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Engr Clarify-CB1 thru CB3 will be under backwater influence during large storm events (top of riser at EL 481.51). Is there a concern for localized flooding due to the backwater condition? [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Clarify-Saddle MH? Existing In/Out inverts. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Callout Cross-Section of bioswale. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Confirm callout.[Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Please add "slotted" to callout. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Clarify-less than 12-in ponding provided. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Please add "slotted" to callout. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Verify-Rim Elev w/ 2/TS-01 [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Confirm invert and/or pipe slope.[Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Confirm invert and/or pipe slope.[Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Verify-does there need to be erosion protection btwn the curb inlet and the bioswale? (6 Plcs) [Plans; Sht



City of Puyallup

**Engineering Division**

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

SD-01]

- ◆ Confirm-Storm Note 2?[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Confirm-Storm Note 2?[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Verify-EL 480.25 per Sht SD-09. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Verify-EL 477.00 per Sht SD-09. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Revise Notes per comments on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ See comment on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Please provide a x-section thru stair-gutter-sidewalk transition for clarity. (3 plcs)[Plans; Sht SD-02]
- ◆ Verify-Callout 9 is for gutter to run behind island (no gutter shown). (3 plcs)[Plans; Sht SD-02]
- ◆ Verify-callout is for the gutter to run behind island? [Plans; Sht SD-02]
- ◆ Revise Notes per comments on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-02]
- ◆ See comment on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-02]
- ◆ Verify callout.[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Verify-Rim Elev w/ 2/TS-01 [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Confirm callout.[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Verify-Rim Elev w/ 2/TS-01 [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Confirm invert and/or pipe slope.[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Confirm invert and/or pipe slope.[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Confirm-Storm Note 2?[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Verify-EL 480.25 per Sht SD-09. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Verify callout.[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Callout Cross-Section of bioswale. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Callout Cross-Section of bioswale. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Please add "slotted" to callout. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Please add "slotted" to callout. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Confirm-Storm Note 2?[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Clarify that this is a Traffic Curb per Roadway Construction Note 2. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Revise Notes per comments on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ See comment on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Clarify this swale design. Is it purely conveyance? If so, how is the entrance road being treated? Is the intent to use Section 1/TS-01? Swale does not appear to be same width (11ft) as the drive aisle biocells and if it is designed solely as conveyance, then a majority of the road is not being treated. If it is intended to function as a biocell by filtering through soil mix (which would capture all of the road runoff for treatment), then shouldn't there be an underdrain to capture the treated effluent? Lastly, if the swale is intended as a treatment facility, what affect does the runoff from the wetland basin have on the swale (saturation of the BSM and Ecology requirement to drain within 24 hours). [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Clarify-is this inlet at the bottom of swale? Is it overflow? See comment below. [Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ In the Mitigated scenario, the Wetland Basin is tributary to the storm collection system. Per Ecology, if the Wetland Basin 100yr peak flow is greater than 50% of the project's post-development undetained flow (WWHM 701), then the runoff MUST bypass the storm facility. If less than 50% and the runoff is not bypassed, then the storm facility must be sized to account for the additional offsite inflow/runon. If not bypassed, include the groundwater component that was used for the wetland analysis in the modeling of the detention facility.[Plans; Sht SD-03]
- ◆ Clarify that this is a Traffic Curb per Roadway Construction Note 2. [Plans; Sht SD-04]
- ◆ Verify-Callout 9 is for gutter to run behind island (no gutter shown).[Plans; Sht SD-04]
- ◆ Revise Notes per comments on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-04]
- ◆ See comment on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-04]



- ◆ Verify-callout is for the gutter to run behind island? [Plans; Sht SD-04]
- ◆ Verify-Callout 9 is for gutter to run behind island (no gutter shown).[Plans; Sht SD-04]
- ◆ Revise Notes per comments on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-05]
- ◆ See comment on Sht SD-00. [Plans; Sht SD-05]
- ◆ Does this note apply? If the referenced detail (P-540) applies, please provide. [Plans; Sht SD-06]
- ◆ This is exceeded at multiple locations based on the GR sheets at the Infiltration Planters. See comments on GR sheets. [Plans; Sht SD-06]
- ◆ Add City Std Details: 02.01.02 // 02.01.04 // 02.01.08 // 06.01.01 // 06.01.02 // 06.01.03[Plans; Sht SD-07]
- ◆ Verify-EL 478.50 per Sht SD-01. [Plans; Sht SD-09]
- ◆ Verify-EL 476.50 per Sht SD-01. [Plans; Sht SD-09]
- ◆ Confirm-Only four inflow locations indicated (5 per Sht SD-01. [Plans; Sht SD-09]
- ◆ Confirm-Inflow location per Sht SD-01. [Plans; Sht SD-09]
- ◆ Verify Callout. [Plans; Sht SD-01]
- ◆ Verify flow direction. [Plans; Sht GR-01]
- ◆ Verify flow direction. [Plans; Sht GR-01]
- ◆ Verify flow direction. [Plans; Sht GR-01]
- ◆ Verify flow direction. [Plans; Sht GR-01]
- ◆ Identify contours [Plans; Sht GR-01]
- ◆ Verify-is this flowline per Pt 315 note, or splash pad? This elevation indicates a 1.2ft drop from the corner (Pt 314). Based on Detail 1/SD-06 (right), max drop from depressed gutter to top of splash pad is 6in. resulting in a top of pad at EI 512.5. [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ See comment on Sht SD-02.[Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Using Detail 3/TS-01:Top of spash pad =  $509.89+0.5+1.5+0.33+0.33 = 512.55$ which is higher than Pt 315.[Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify per Pt 315 comment. [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify per Pt 315 comment. [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify per Pt 315 comment. [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 505.98 and top of splash pad EI 506.31 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 505.98 and top of splash pad EI 506.31 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ See comment on Sht SD-02.[Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ See comment on Sht SD-02.[Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 499.19 and top of splash pad EI 499.52 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 499.19 and top of splash pad EI 499.52 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 513.41 and top of splash pad EI 513.74 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 505.66 and top of splash pad EI 505.99 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-3.5ft elevation difference in less than 12-inches? Does not work with Detail 1/SD-06.[Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 500.68 and top of splash pad EI 501.01 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-flow direction arrow.[Plans; Sht GR-03]
- ◆ Verify-flow direction arrow.[Plans; Sht GR-03]
- ◆ Provide spot elevations at ends of swale and every 100-ft between. [Plans; Sht GR-05]
- ◆ Verify-elevation (BFC) is higher than grades to the west. [Plans; Sht GR-05]
- ◆ Verify-elevation (BFC) is higher than grades to the west. [Plans; Sht GR-05]
- ◆ Assuming the gutter is not intended to run behind island (See comments on SD sheets), confirm that a slightly lower elevation is desired here (ponding). [Plans; Sht GR-04]
- ◆ Verify-is gutter intended to run behind island (See comments on SD sheets). Confirm gutter flow. [Plans; Sht GR-04]



City of Puyallup

**Engineering Division**

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

- ◆ Verify-if gutter does not run past, ponding at this location. [Plans; Sht GR-04]
- ◆ Verify-0% gutter slope at this location. [Plans; Sht GR-04]
- ◆ Verify-0% gutter slope at this location. [Plans; Sht GR-04]
- ◆ Provide spot elevations at ends of swale and every 100-ft between. [Plans; Sht GR-05]
- ◆ Please provide a x-section thru stair-gutter-sidewalk transition for clarity. [Plans; Sht GR-15]
- ◆ From Sheet GR-02 comment: Verify-is this flowline per Pt 315 note, or splash pad? This elevation indicates a 1.2ft drop from the corner (Pt 314). Based on Detail 1/SD-06, max drop from depressed gutter to top of splash pad is 6in. resulting in a top of pad at EI 512.5. [Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ See Pt 315 Comment. [Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ See Pt 315 Comment. [Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ See Pt 315 Comment. [Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 513.41 and top of splash pad EI 513.74 [Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 505.66 and top of splash pad EI 505.99 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-3.5ft elevation difference in less than 12-inches? Does not work with Detail 1/SD-06.[Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 500.68 and top of splash pad EI 501.01 [Plans; Sht GR-02]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 505.98 and top of splash pad EI 506.31 [Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 505.98 and top of splash pad EI 506.31 [Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ Verify-top of planter EI 499.19 and top of splash pad EI 499.52 [Plans; Sht GR-17]
- ◆ Verify-see comment Sheet GR-05. [Plans; Sht GR-18]
- ◆ Verify-see comment Sheet GR-05. [Plans; Sht GR-18]
- ◆ Verify. [Plans; Sht GR-19]
- ◆ See comment Sht GR-04. [Plans; Sht GR-19]
- ◆ Verify-0% gutter slope at this location. [Plans; Sht GR-19]
- ◆ Verify-0% gutter slope at this location. [Plans; Sht GR-19]
- ◆ Indicate thrust Blk'g.[Plans; Sht WA-01]
- ◆ Use City Standard DI CI 52 pipe[Plans; Sht WA-01]
- ◆ Indicate thrust Blk'g.[Plans; Sht WA-01]
- ◆ Clarify-abandon existing main? [Plans; Sht WA-01]
- ◆ Remove Approval Block from Landscape Plans. Typ. all landscape sheets.[Plans; Sht LS-00]

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

- ◆ Per previous comments:

The existing eastern most driveway on 39th Avenue SE will be required to limit turning movements to right-in, right-out only. Signage, a raised channelization device (raised porkchop island), and striping will likely be required to assure left turns into and out of the site cannot circumvent the restriction.

Existing driveway location along 39th Ave SE does not meet current driveway separation standards (300ft for Major Arterial Roadways). This separation requirement applies to driveways located on both sides of the street. The required access restriction (right-in/right-out) will help mitigate deficient driveway spacing standards.

Currently, this intersection does not restrict left turns.

**Planning Review** (Reviewed By: Rachael N. Brown, (253)770-3363, RNBrown@PuyallupWA.gov)



City of Puyallup

**Engineering Division**

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

www.cityofpuyallup.org

◆ NO COMMENTS AVAILABLE

- ◆ Sheet IL-00 does not appear to match the design of the rest of the sheets. Revise Illumination plan to match the final submitted design.
- ◆ Protective fence should be set back 10' from wetland edge where possible, [Civil Plan, DM-03]
- ◆ Landscape plan sheets need to include utility overlays. Utilities shall not conflict with required landscaping areas. See Vegetation Management Standards manual pg. 25 for utility spacing requirements from street trees (also required for landscape trees).
- ◆ SEPA Condition #2 Environmental Health: The rationale provided by Parametrix in their March 3, 2022 memo, for forgoing the testing requirements outlined in the SEPA MDNS issued January 18, 2022 Mitigation Requirement #2 is acceptable. Contamination at the facility known to Ecology is not located where the parking lot is proposed. In addition, groundwater in the area of known site contamination appears to be flowing away from the proposed parking lot location.

However, Toxics Cleanup Program (TCP) comments provided on the SEPA checklist are still applicable to the project. If soil or groundwater contamination is encountered during parking lot construction, Ecology must be notified by contacting the ERTS (Environmental Report Tracking System) coordinator at 360.407.6300.

- ◆ Blank areas around wetland need a landscape plan, especially the western side where the existing gravel area is being removed, [Civil Plan, LS-03]
- ◆ Per updated wetland rating forms dated Oct. 6, 2021, wetland F is a depressional wetland, not a slope wetland, please revise and include updated wetland rating forms in storm report, [Storm Report, Pg. 5].
- ◆ Please clarify how water line is being removed from under wetland [Civil Plan, DM-03]

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

- ◆ Civil & Landscape Plans Sheet 49: This tee is feeding a 2-inch irrigation service. Consider reducing size to at least an 8"x4" tee.
- ◆ Civil & Landscape Plans Sheet 49: The new private water main shall be 8-inch Ductile Iron CI 52 pipe.
- ◆ Civil & Landscape Plans Sheet 49: The existing water main that will be exposed and removed could be asbestos cement (A.C.) pipe. Use caution and dispose of per State Regulations.

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

- ◆ Show F.D.C, P.I.V, and Fire Hydrant Locations, As per both P Permits below Fire Hydrants may be required. A 26' wide fire lane is required in front of Fire Hydrants. Existing P.I.V. is East of the building in the tree line. This needs to be addressed on the plans for code compliance. Provide a Fire Lane / No Parking signage site plan. Provide Auto-turn or equivalent program for Fire Apparatus maneuverability. Notes below are the original notes not addressed.

Per previous pre-application meeting P-14-0082: Bob Fore

Show existing fire hydrant locations and a decision will be made if any need to be added.

Fire access to hydrants and building circulation required to include fire lane stripping

A 26' fire lane is required in front of fire hydrants

Per previous pre-application meeting P-20-0040: David Drake



City of Puyallup

**Engineering Division**

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

[www.cityofpuyallup.org](http://www.cityofpuyallup.org)

---

Fire hydrants will be required. Please submit a plan showing hydrant locations.

26' Minimum fire lane widths.

Provide Auto-turn showing turning radiuses.

Resubmittal of plan required for review.

To resubmit, you must address all comments and complete the [resubmittal form](#). When you are ready to resubmit, you can do so using the customer portal, by uploading a “new version” of the submittal requirement. 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](mailto:permitcenter@puyallupwa.gov)