



P.O. Box 949, Gig Harbor, WA 98335  
945 Fawcett Avenue  
Tacoma, WA 98402

Phone: 253-857-5454  
Fax: 253-509-0044  
Email: [info@contourpllc.com](mailto:info@contourpllc.com)

**CIVIL ENGINEERING ♦ SURVEYING ♦ LAND PLANNING**

March 13, 2026

City of Puyallup Permit Center  
333 S Meridian, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Puyallup, WA 98371

REGARDING: Civil Construction Permit #PRCCP20251209  
Bass Pro Shops Warehouse – Access Connection  
Contour Project #25-026:

To Whom it May Concern,

This letter is to address the Permit Review Correction Letter for the Civil Construction Permit referenced above. Comments are split up per document/sheet and reviewer with the original comment in black followed by Contour Engineering's response in red.

Below is a list of the documents included with this resubmittal package:

- 1.) One (1) copy of the Draft Easement Agreement for Access & Stormwater Runoff between Lots A & B, dated March 9, 2026.
- 2.) One (1) copy of the revised Civil Plans, prepared by Contour Engineering, LLC dated February 11, 2026.
- 3.) One (1) copy of the revised Drainage Report, prepared by Contour Engineering, LLC dated December 17, 2025.
- 4.) One (1) copy of the revised Engineering Cost Estimate, prepared by Contour Engineering, LLC dated January 6, 2026
- 5.) One (1) copy of the revised Landscape Plans, prepared by Nature By Design, Inc. dated January 5, 2026.
- 6.) One (1) copy of the Modified Gate Agreement dated December 1, 2025.

#### **Engineering Civil Review:**

- 1.) Additional Submittal Item Required: Submit a draft of an Easement with an agreement for "Lot A" Bass Pro to access "Lot B" and a reciprocal agreement that allows for stormwater runoff from Lot B to flow to Lot A. The access easement can be conditioned to end at the time of lease termination, but the storm runoff must be allowed to continue unless provisions are provided to require the physical removal of the access back to pre-lease conditions

A draft of the easement agreement for access & stormwater runoff between Lot A & Lot B has been prepared and included with this resubmittal package for review. Once reviewed/approved, it will be executed and recorded as a separate document at the Pierce County Auditors office, and the AFN # will be added to the civil plans.

#### **Sheet C1:**

- 1.) A lease agreement will be needed to allow access for Parcel A onto Parcel B. It should include permission to release stormwater runoff from new surfaces on Parcel B to flow to Parcel A and restoration conditions at the time the agreement ends.

This comment is acknowledged. In December 2025 it was discussed with and confirmed by the Civil reviewer that a copy of the lease agreement is not required to be submitted for review/approval. The previously mentioned draft easement agreement for access & stormwater

runoff between Lot A & Lot B has been prepared to address this comment and provide the necessary permissions, and submitted to city staff for review prior to executing and recording the easement.

**Sheet C2:**

- 1.) Silt fence does not work on pavement. Provide alternative equal (BMP C208 triangular silt dike or similar that can be used on pavement.

The silt fencing was removed over the paved area. The amount of runoff from the access is very small and should have little sediment runoff. Any sediment runoff can be handled by inlet protection which will be installed on all downstream inlets.

- 2.) Construction entrance is not in the legend or on the plans. This does not need to be quarry spall since the site disturbance is minimal and trucks will likely not be traveling on disturbed areas.

The existing Valley Avenue entrance area is to be used for construction. No tracking to public roads will be allowed, or is anticipated to occur as trucks will not be traveling over disturbed areas.

- 3.) Confirm callout is for construction access and revise accordingly.

This callout is for the clearing limits and is not a construction entrance.

**Sheet C4:**

- 1.) Where is the existing biopod filter that is mentioned in the storm report?

The existing utilities have been shown and a callout has been added for the biopod locations.

- 2.) Please add a notation that identifies the proposed height of the fence and gate at the connection between the two parcels, See CIVIL PLANS SET, sheet 4 of 4.

Added a callout with information for the fence and gate height.

- 3.) Call out maximum allowable cut slope (2:1 or less if preferred or recommended by Geotech).

Two callouts added for maximum allowable cut slope.

- 4.) What direction does the existing pavement slope? Provide slope arrows and grades to clarify there are no drainage implications to removing the curb from this site.

Added slope arrows and spot elevations to the detail. The existing pavement slope is 2-5.5% along the connection to the proposed paved area, therefore drainage implications from the curb removal should be minimal, if any at all.

- 5.) Add existing Utilities to this sheet.

Existing utilities have been added to this sheet.

- 6.) Provide lighting layout and confirm there are not conflicts between the footing and existing utilities such as the infiltration gallery.

Lighting layout has been added to the plans, and there is no conflict with any existing utilities.

**Drainage Report:**

**Sheet 6:**

- 1.) Provide documentation showing Pro Shops' system can handle the additional runoff and any runoff from the existing contractor yard.

We attempted to find the storm report for the bass pro site, but we were unable to locate a copy. However, the new improvements add a very small amount of additional runoff which has been calculated and included in the report. The amount of new runoff during the 100-year storm event is ~0.01 CFS in the 100-year event.

- 2.) The downstream path is not clear. Provide an exhibit showing the downstream path that shows the biopod filter catch basin mentioned. Since there are two parcels involved, the narrative needs to be clear which parcel the new runoff flows to and how it is being mitigated.

Included a Downstream Analysis map to better clarify where the flow path goes. See attached document in Appendix A.

### **Cost Estimate**

- 1.) Use Unaltered Cost Estimate. I can help you print to pdf the entire workbook if needed.  
The Engineers Cost Estimate form has been updated and included with this resubmittal package with all 0.00 lines shown.
- 2.) Add erosion control using disturbed area, rough grading using the cut/fill quantities, parking lot lights (this can either be street lights or misc item add-in), and private utility trenching for the parking lot power.  
The Engineers Cost Estimate form has been updated. Note: Parking Lot lights are proposed and will be permitted and installed under a separate permit; they have been added to the cost estimate as a miscellaneous add-in item as directed. Power is existing and was previously installed during the original development of the site.

### **Engineering/Traffic Review:**

- 1.) Awaiting final correction to the gate agreement, otherwise the permit is approvable for Traffic.  
The gate agreement has been revised as requested and is included with the resubmittal package.

### **Fire Review:**

- 1.) Provided the existing access does not change and the parcel only provides parking and access through the warehouse complex and not valley, there will be no other requires for access  
The existing access from Valley Avenue will not change; it will remain accessible for emergency vehicles.
- 2.) If electronic gates are used, you will be required to provide KNOX manual override with battery backup. You may be required to use OPTICOM or an equivalent system.  
Acknowledged. The existing gate on Valley Avenue is not electronic. There is an existing Knox box installed on/for the existing gate.
- 3.) The gate on Valley will be required to set back 45' to meet fire and traffic queuing requirements. This is a nonnegotiable number for the length of our fire trucks to safely pull out of traffic to unlock and lock the gate.  
The existing gate on Valley Avenue is not proposed to change. It is already set back the required 45 feet from the ROW.
- 4.) Gates must swing into property and not out towards Valley.  
The existing gate on Valley Avenue is a sliding gate; it will not change.
- 5.) Provide a layout for parking.  
As discussed with the Fire Reviewer, the proposed trailer parking layout, and the fire lane through the site have been shown on the revised plans.

### **Planning Review:**

- 1.) Please add a notation that identifies the proposed height of the fence and gate at the connection between the two parcels.  
Acknowledged. A note detailing the proposed height (7 feet max) of the fence/gate has been added onto the Civil plans as required.
- 2.) Make a new landscaping space on the west side of the parcel that is an equivalent square footage to the

removed landscaping in the proposed driveway. Replace (3) trees and other vegetation like-for-like in newly created landscape area

As discussed & confirmed with the planning reviewers, the required amount of replacement landscape area has been added to the northwest corner of the parcel. The replacement landscape area will be connected to the existing, to remain landscape areas. Up to 364 sq. ft. of internal landscape could be removed before like for like replacement of landscape area was required. A total of 1,702 sq. ft. of landscape area is proposed to be removed. Accounting for the allowed removal (364 sq. ft) a minimum of 1,338 sq. ft. of replacement LS area is required on the project site, and 1,374 sq. ft. of replacement landscaping area is proposed in the northwest corner.

Also, as discussed with the planning reviewers, the existing landscaping vegetation will be relocated within the new replacement landscape area, including one (1) tree. A note detailing the relocation of existing vegetation is provided on the revised landscape plans.

- 3.) Please clarify the intended use for the two bold sections near the entrance on the east side of the site. The "CIVIL PLANS SET" (sheet 1 of 4) identifies this space as "new landscape area", while the landscape plan identifies this space as asphalt.

The previously proposed replacement landscape areas on the east side of the project site have been removed, and those areas will remain in the existing condition (asphalt). All replacement landscaping is proposed in the northwest corner of the project site.

- 4.) Any landscaping to be removed and replaced on the west side of the parcel shall be replaced on the same side, rather than replaced elsewhere on the

Acknowledged. Replacement landscaping area is proposed in the northwest corner as required, and existing landscaping vegetation will be relocated into the replacement area.

- 5.) Please refer to page 44 of the VMS (Vegetation Management Standards) for parking lot light pole standards. Per 14.4, Type IV: Parking Lot Landscaping, Type IV Design Standards (E): "Internal parking lot lighting poles and fixtures shall be located to minimize future conflicts with parking lot trees -- parking lot lights shall be placed 10' from any parking lot tree required under the type IV standard."

The proposed light pole locations have been revised per this comment on the civil plans and the landscaping plans. All proposed light poles will be a minimum of 10 feet away from any tree.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at Patrick.Hopper@contourengineeringllc.com or (253) 236-3151. Thank you.

Sincerely,

*Patrick Hopper*

Patrick Hopper  
Land Planner II

CC: David Gouvion, Bass Pro Shops  
Brett Allen, PE, Contour Engineering, LLC  
Kyle Rose, PE, Contour Engineering, LLC  
Kathy Owens, Nature By Design, Inc.  
FILE