



City of Puyallup

**Planning Division**

333 S. Meridian, Puyallup, WA 98371

(253) 864-4165

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

March 20, 2023

VECTOR DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

11411 NE 124TH ST

KIRKLAND, WA 98034

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM (DRT) LETTER	
DRT #	2
PERMIT #	P-21-0136
PROJECT NAME	4723 FREEMAN RD E
PERMIT TYPE	Preliminary Site Plan
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FREEMAN ROAD LOGISTICS / VECTOR DEVELOPMENT
SITE ADDRESS	4723 FREEMAN RD E, PUYALLUP, WA 98371;
PARCEL #	0420174075; 0420201027; 0420201034; 0420201036; 0420201039; 0420201040; 0420201042; 0420201045; 0420201052; 0420201066; 0420201101; 0420205003; 0420205004; 0420205016; 0420205017;
ASSOCIATED LAND USE PERMIT(S)	P-21-0011
APPLICATION DATE	November 02, 2021
APPLICATION COMPLETE DATE	
PROJECT STATUS	<b>Active Development Review Team (DRT) review case – resubmittal required.</b> Please address review comments below and resubmit revised permit materials and by responding in writing to the remaining items that need to be addressed.
APPROVAL EXPIRATION	<b>N/A</b> – Active permit application, not approved
CONDITIONS	<b>Active permit application, not approved;</b>  Pursuant to PMC 20.11.022 regarding inactive applications, any and all pending land use applications or plat applications shall be deemed null and void unless a timely re-submittal is made to the City within 1 year of issuance of this Development Review Team (DRT) comment letter.  DRT review letters typically identify requested corrections, studies or other additional required pieces of information necessary to demonstrate conformance with the City's adopted development standards and codes.

Subsequent applicant re-submittals shall make a good faith effort to respond to each request from this letter in order for the application to remain active.

The failure to provide timely responses or lack of providing the requested material(s) within the 1-year window following DRT comment letter issuance shall be grounds for expiration, thus deeming the pending application null and void with or without a full or partial refund of application fees.

## HOW TO USE THIS LETTER

This review letter includes two sections: **“Action Items”** and **“Conditions”**.

The **“Action Items”** section includes all items that the applicant must address to comply with the Puyallup Municipal Code (PMC) and city standards. Items listed in under **Action Items** require a resubmittal under this permit for further review by the Development Review Team (DRT); your application is not approved. Please make those updates to the proposed plans and resubmit for review. Please include a response letter outlining how you have revised your proposal to meet these items for ease of plan check by DRT members.

The **“Conditions”** are items that will govern the final permit submittal(s) for the project. Please be aware that these conditions will become conditions of the final permits and/or recommendations to the Hearing Examiner, if applicable.

If you have questions regarding the action items or conditions outlined in this letter, please contact the appropriate staff member directly using the phone number and/or email provided.

---

## **ACTION ITEMS**

**Engineering Review** - Jamie Carter; (253) 435-3616; JCarter@puyallupwa.gov

- STORM

- As explained during pre-application and during Preliminary Site Plan 1st review in order to illustrate actual infeasibility of infiltration and to determine the actual wet season maximum ground water level the following in-situ testing is required by City of Puyallup:

- o Preliminary feasibility/infeasibility testing for infiltration facilities shall be in accordance with the site analysis requirements of the Ecology Manual, Volume III, Chapter 3.2, specifically:

- o Groundwater evaluation, continuous monitoring well (MR1-9) during the wet weather months (December 1 through April 1). NOT COMPLETED. MUST ASSESS ACTUAL GROUNDWATER LEVELS AND TRUE INFILTRATION CAPACITY. THE INFEASIBILITY OF INFILTRATION BMPS SHALL BE DOCUMENTED THROUGH IN-SITU CONTINUOUS WET-WEATHER TESTING. Further, from the Storm Water Manual for Western Washington, "If the general site assessment cannot confirm that the seasonal high ground water or hydraulic restricting layer will be greater than 3 feet below the bottom of BMP T7.30: Bioretention, or greater than 1 foot below the bottom of the lowest gravel base course of BMP T5.15: Permeable Pavements, or greater than 5 feet below BMPT7.10: Infiltration Basins, monitoring wells or excavated pits should be placed strategically to assess depth to groundwater." In Puyallup this is a requirement for demonstrating infeasibility of infiltrative BMPs and actual maximum groundwater levels. The Wet Weather Testing must be performed this winter.

- o Hydraulic conductivity testing:

- If the development triggers Minimum Requirement #7 (flow control), if the site soils are consolidated, or is encumbered by a critical area then Small-Scale Pilot Infiltration Tests (PIT) during the wet weather months (December 1 through April 1) are required for properties under 1 acre. Properties that are over 1 acre that have predicted low infiltration rates should perform Large Scale PIT Tests for better accuracy. TEST PITS COMPLETED. ENSURE RESULTS ARE INCORPORATED INTO DESIGN WHERE APPLICABLE.

- o Testing to determine the hydraulic restriction layer.

- o Mounding analysis may be required in accordance with Ecology Volume V Section 5.2.7.

- o Upon submission of the geotechnical infiltration testing, appropriate long-term correction factors shall be noted for any areas utilizing infiltration into the underlying native soils in accordance with the Ecology Manual. Provide the long-term infiltration rate calculation in the stormwater report.

- The plans show a storm pipe continuing in the ditch to the north on the west side of Freeman Road that appears to end in a rock pad 65 feet north of proposed CB 27R. Is this to be a buried pipe? Is the ditch to be filled at all? Are existing flows in this ditch to be captured or accounted for? Provide details of the final release from the proposed system and final build out of the west side ditch and roadside with the civil submittal considering City of Fife's standards and input.

- For civil submittal include details and modeling for all post-vault structures and systems in order to analyze the regulated release and to confirm the 'no-rise' analysis of receiving waters and to confirm that no adverse changes to wetland hydroperiod will occur due to the release of runoff from the project. These analyses shall be in accordance with the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, City of Fife Standards, and property owner concurrence including the Puyallup Tribe of Indians.

- Pump Valve Vaults and Storm Lift Station Manholes are in conflict with landscape. Create clear area around these lids for access and maintenance.
- Represent vaults and all structures in models as they are proposed to be, i.e. vault volumes are not exact and the square dimensions used, while they may yield similar results, are not correct.
- The plans show all of the ROW (Freeman Rd and 22nd Ave NW) drainage being collected and then conveyed to the on-site vaults. (From the pre-application notes: Public right-of-way runoff shall be detained and treated independently from proposed private stormwater facilities. This shall be accomplished by providing separate publicly maintained storm facilities within a tract or dedicated right-of-way; enlarging the private facilities to account for bypass runoff; or other methods as approved by the City Engineer. [PMC 21.10.190]) Revise the plans to correspond with the separation of on- and off-site drainage in conformance with the SWMMWW.

- SEWER

- Because this property is over 300 feet from a public sewer connection, the applicant has the option to install an on-site septic system. If that option is not exercised then a public connection that satisfies all applicable standards and regulations shall be submitted for review by development engineering and operations staff. The current proposal/routing has the potential to be approved. It is incumbent on the applicant to show the permissions, conforming design, and restoration details throughout the rest of the permitting process.

- WATER

- Proposed concept seems reasonable, and the City of Puyallup Water Department has tentatively accepted the concept of the public water main across private property within 40-foot easements granted to the City. It is the responsibility of the applicant to negotiate all easements with the private property owners. If all of the necessary easements are not procured prior to Civil Approval, then the design shall be reconsidered and redrawn at the applicant's expense. At no time shall the applicant's inability to procure the proper easements become a burden to the City and at no time shall the City be liable in any way for delays brought to the project timeline due to the applicant's inability to procure the proper easements or to build the water system to all applicable standards. All proposed construction within easements will be subject to review for impacts to critical areas, existing infrastructure and for restoration details.

- FIFE

COMMENTS

- Sheets C14-15 – The Cities are currently looking into whether or not the water main will be allowed to be installed in the ROW. Generally, one City's water line should not be buried in another City's ROW. In this case there are possible benefits to both Cities including a future intertie and expansion of the system. If it is to be allowed in the Right of Way it would be required to be placed as far to the east as possible to avoid existing and future City of Fife utilities.

- Sheet C20 – Show existing ROW lines and planned dedication(s) for Levee/Freeman intersection. Also provide more details about permanent stormwater controls and discharge of runoff from Levee/Freeman intersection improvements.
- Sheet C20 – Provide elevations and grading information to verify no ponding due to the added pavement. Can be addressed at the time of civil submittal.
- Sheet C20 – The Cities have serious concerns about a proposal to bury large pipes in close proximity to, or under Levee Road. Any work done within these areas will require reviews at the highest levels including, but not limited to, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Puyallup Tribe of Indians.
- Sheet C21 - Turn pocket length shall be based on the approved traffic study.
- GENERAL – Define/locate property lines and Right of Way for entire project.
- GENERAL – Provide channelization plan for all off-site areas. Can be addressed at the time of civil submittal.
- GENERAL – Show the final lift of pavement as continuous with seams based on paver dimensions and not sawcut locations for all off-site. Can be addressed at the time of civil submittal.
- GENERAL – Fife code requires undergrounding of power along frontage areas.
- GENERAL – Street lighting design to conform to City of Fife standards. Should be addressed/shown for this submittal and can be refined and approved during civil submittal.
- GENERAL – Show tie-ins to driveway approaches.
- GENERAL – Provide details of proposed curb and drainage on west side of Freeman Rd.
- GENERAL – In addition to signage, physical controls of vehicle movements will be required.
- GENERAL – Plans and reports should be updated to address dual lead agency. Add City of Fife notes to plans and clearly delineate which jurisdiction's standards control for each area/process/design component.

**Fire Review** - David Drake; (253) 864-4171; DDrake@PuyallupWA.gov

- Based on City of Puyallup Municipal Codes fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems shall be required. The fire sprinkler system shall be designed and install per NFPA 13, 2016 Edition. The City of Puyallup Municipal Code requires the fire alarm system to be designed and installed to "Total Coverage" per NFPA 72, 2016 Edition. A UL Certificate shall be required on the fire alarm system. A Water Availability/ Fire flow Letter shall be required. Structures requiring more than 2500 GPM require the fire mains to be looped. Show Riser Rooms, FDC's, P.I.V's, and all Fire Hydrants on site plan. Fire hydrants to reach all points of the structure within 400'. Fire Hydrants shall be at least 50' from the structure and the FDC supporting the fire sprinkler system shall be no closer than 10' and no greater than 15' from the hydrant. 26' wide required in front of fire hydrants. Do not block FDC's, P.I.V's, and all Fire Hydrants with a parking stall. All must be placed in parking islands away from building. Frontage on Freeman Rd will require Fire Hydrants. The fire access road (lane) shall be a minimum of 26'. Provide all site plan dimensions. At this time the 2018 IFC and referenced standards shall be utilized. The entrances shall meet ladder truck fire apparatus truck turning radiuses and approval of the angle of inclination. Auto-turn or equivalent program required to demonstrate fire apparatus turning radiuses. Maximum road grade shall be 10%. The Length of building A westside, has no path for Exiting the building at all required Exits. Southwest Trailer parking lot (32) will be required to meet 2018 IFC Appendix D turn-around dimensions. Show on site plan. Provide more detail on 20' private alley with dimensions around it. Fire lane / Street between Bld A and Bld B, provide more clarification for access. Dimensions, sidewalks, lanes, and intersection to enter the complex. This is not a full review. More information is required to complete.
- 1. Fire access gate will be required to be electronic with Opticom and manual override. A manual gate will not be allowed.

**Engineering Traffic Review** - Bryan Roberts; (253) 841-5542; broberts@PuyallupWA.gov

- Radius does not meet City standards. Will not accommodate safe future turning movement heading north on Freeman Rd. Revise to meet City standards. [Site Plan]
- Straight taper intersection design does not meet City standards [Site Plan]
- Identify area where sight lines cross private property. These locations will require easements or property acquisition to ensure clear sight lines will be maintained. [Site Plan]
- Remove parking stalls located within the driveway throat (related terms include the driveway connection depth, reservoir length, stacking distance, storage length etc.). The proposed parking spaces will cause blocking events that will have undesirable effects on traffic. [Site Plan]

- Face of curb shall be 23ft from ROW centerline per Fife Standards (22ft shown)  
[Site Plan]
- 2.5ft between ROW and back of sidewalk (3.5ft shown)  
[Site Plan]
- Show proposed channelization/stripping. For civil submittal provide detailed taper calculations for 35mph design speed  
[Site Plan]
- Identify area where sight lines cross private property. These locations will require easements or property acquisition to ensure clear sight lines will be maintained.  
[Site Plan]
- Provide sight distance analysis at this EV driveway  
[Site Plan]
- Align driveways on either side 22nd Ave NW. Negative offset driveways are not acceptable  
[Site Plan]
- Remove all marked crosswalks within ROW  
[Site Plan]
- Eastern section of 22nd Ave NW does not meet City standard. As previously stated, CoP requires a minimum 60ft ROW.  
[Site Plan]
- Roadway does not meet City standards. 36ft wide road, 12ft of frontage improvements (sidewalk + planter + streetlights) on both sides  
[Site Plan]
- No AutoTurn provided for total site circulation or 22nd Ave NW driveways  
[Site Plan]
- EV access will require electronic gate with opticom (CHECK WITH FIRE)  
[Site Plan]
- Per previous comments, provide details on physical access restriction along Freeman Rd  
[Site Plan]
- Per previous comments, provide details on physical access restriction along Freeman Rd. Signage alone is not sufficient. The northern curb radius must be constructed per City standards to accommodate future NB truck movements. Using a substandard curb radius will not restrict right turns. Outbound trucks can defeat small radius by encroaching into SB Freeman Rd (safety hazard).  
[Site Plan]
- Per previous comments, off-site paved transitions are required along Freeman Rd (north driveway)  
[Site Plan]
- Per previous comments, off-site paved transitions are required along Freeman Rd (south driveway)  
[Site Plan]
- Provide details on how this parcel will access City ROW  
[Site Plan]
- If acceptable to Fire, there will need to be an agreement that gates will NOT be allowed at any public access unless specifically designated as an emergency access. [Site Plan]
- Why does entering sight distance analysis only include one direction?

- [CIVIL C33]  
ESD requirement: 1.47\*35\*11.5
- [CIVIL C33]  
Combination truck 11.5 second time gap.
- [CIVIL C33]  
Due to anticipated trucks on-site, 18ft setback should be used. AASHTO recommends 18ft setback for all vehicle types.
- [CIVIL C33]  
Per previous comments, site circulation and fire apparatus AutoTurn required
- [CIVIL C33]  
Identify area where sight lines cross private property. These locations will require easements or property acquisition to ensure clear sight lines will be maintained.
- [CIVIL C33]  
Why would entering sight lines be aligned with outward-bound vehicle lanes?
- [CIVIL C33]  
Assume 35mph design. 85th percentile speeds will increase when road is improved/widened
- [CIVIL C33]  
Per previous comments, photo documentation is required with sight distance analysis
- [CIVIL C33]  
SSD requirement 250ft @ 35mph
- [CIVIL C33]  
Why no AutoTurn for WBR? Future improvements to Freeman will require this intersection to accommodate large trucks.
- [CIVIL C33]  
Per previous comments, sight distance analysis required per City standards at Levee/Freeman.
- [CIVIL C33]  
Per previous comments, site circulation and fire apparatus AutoTurn required
- [CIVIL C34]  
Why would entering sight lines be aligned with outward-bound vehicle lanes?
- [CIVIL C34]  
Per previous comments, photo documentation is required with sight distance analysis
- [CIVIL C34]  
ESD requirement: 1.47\*35\*11.5

- [CIVIL C34]  
SSD requirement 250ft @ 35mph
- [CIVIL C34]  
Due to anticipated trucks on-site, 18ft setback should be used. AASHTO recommends 18ft setback for all vehicle types.
- [CIVIL C34]  
Combination truck 11.5 second time gap.
- [CIVIL C34]  
Why does entering sight distance analysis only include one direction?
- [CIVIL C34]  
Assume 35mph design. 85th percentile speeds will increase when road is improved/widened
- [CIVIL C34]  
Why no AutoTurn for WBR? Future improvements to Freeman will require this intersection to accommodate large trucks.
- [CIVIL C34]  
Why is design vehicle using the center TWLTL for right turns??
- [CIVIL C34]  
Provide photometric analysis for required streetlights. [CIVIL page 36]
- General Comments:
  - Preliminary Civil design does not have streetlight design or photometric analysis
  - Per previous comments streetlights are required along Freeman Rd between Levee Rd and proposed project. Show locations on preliminary civil design
  - Preliminary Civil design does not provide channelization/striping design.
  - During civil review guardrail analysis required on steep roadside sections of Freeman Rd and Levee Rd
  - 48th St E will be improved if warranted based on possible utility work or increased traffic volumes, which is yet to be determined. If necessary 48th St E pavement/subgrade design shall be consistent with pavement analysis.
  - 22nd Ave NW does not meet City of Puyallup engineering standards
  - Per previous comments physical deterrents are required to prevent heavy vehicle movements:
    - o Physical deterrents will be required to channelize outbound heavy vehicles to utilize the southern section of Freeman Rd. Provide details on how proposed physical deterrents will safely restrict access. Use of tenant lease agreements will not suffice or be accepted.
    - o Physical deterrents will be considered at Freeman Rd and Valley Ave to preclude semi-trucks from traveling south on Freeman Rd from Valley Ave to the development site.
    - o Physical deterrents will be considered at Freeman Rd and 48th St to preclude semi-trucks from traveling to or from the development site on 48th St.
    - Additional ROW acquisition required at Freeman/Levee intersection to accommodate

future ADA improvements and signalization.

- Per previous comments, the Levee/Freeman intersection AutoTurn analysis needs to include streetlight design to ensure placements are protected from trailer off-tracking conflicts

#### Traffic

#### Scoping

- An updated traffic scoping document was not performed or received the City. The City of Fife & Puyallup have not approved a Traffic Scoping Worksheet for this project. The previously submitted traffic scoping documents by Kimley-Horn have been reviewed by both jurisdictions with comments provided to the applicant. The City of Fife & Puyallup have not received a revised scoping document. The applicant has instead submitted a completed traffic analysis without traffic scoping approval. The TIA that was submitted with the current PSP submittal is not consistent with previous scoping document submitted by Kimley-Horn. The submitted TIA will not be reviewed by City staff.
- Once Scoping worksheet has been approved, the City of Fife & Puyallup will meet with the applicant's traffic engineer to discuss scope of TIA.

#### Pavement

#### analysis

- 48th Street East was identified as "Poor" condition by the applicant's geotechnical consultant (Terra). It does not appear the recommended mitigation on 48th Street East have been included in submittal.
- During civil submittal, must show full roadway (including subgrade) improvements must be compatible with geotechnical recommended structural improvements for 48th Street E and Freeman Rd.
- Per previous comment, pavement analysis needs to collect photo documentation of the existing pavement conditions. This was not provided.
- Which AASHTO methodology/guidelines were used for design?
- Analysis needs to show detailed calculation for design ESAL loading. What data was used? What future volumes and truck percentage were assumed over the design life? What growth rate was assumed? This information needs to be provided in this document.
- Provide calculations using defined parameters for flexible pavement structural design.
- What was the assumed design life? 20 years?
- Given the future industrial/commercial land use in the area, this arterial roadway should assume higher reliability.

**Planning Review** - Chris Beale; (253) 841-5418; CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov

- SEPA review: Please refer to the February 8, 2023 from the co-lead agencies for further detail. Site plan/Design review comments: See mark ups on October, 2022 preliminary civil plan set. Issues remain with design review (foundation line landscape buffering), perimeter landscape buffering, design of the Freeman Road frontage landscape buffer, truck trailer parking landscaping, potential for site plan design to be impacted by critical areas and critical area buffers, height to setback rules. Critical areas review: WSDOT does not yet have an approved wetland delineation or rating for off site wetlands, we corresponded with staff from the State. Please review the itemized list in the February 8, 2023 letter for an outline of remaining issues. Confluence has not conducted peer review of the reports as they would be reviewing the project under the preparation of the EIS.
- Buffer not yet determined [planning, sheet c7]
- Add 15 foot buffer along building frontage [planning, sheet c7]
- Pipe may impact trust property - no ROW line shown. [planning, sheet c7]
- Apply retaining wall buffer standard to site frontage - current in VMS design manual (Nov. 2022) [planning, sheet c7]
- Building may not exceed 42.5' in height with a 40' setback [planning, sheet c7]
- 8 foot walk, 6 foot planter required [planning, sheet c8]
- Move line out of planter [planning, sheet c8]
- Are these emergency generators? Relocate away from residential land uses [planning, sheet c8]
- Buffer not yet determined [planning, sheet c8]
- Off site wetland on WSDOT property may extend buffer into this area of the site [planning, sheet c8]
- Truck parking must be broken apart with landscape islands every 8 stalls [planning, sheet c8]
- 30 feet of dense evergreen landscape with fence required. Proposed location of lines will reduce available planting area due to spacing requirements [planning, sheet c8]
- 12 feet of landscape required [planning, sheet c8]
- 30 feet of landscape required - ADA stalls and walkway must be set back [planning, sheet c8]
- 12 feet of landscape required [planning, sheet c9]
- 30 foot buffer required [planning, sheet c9]
- 12 foot buffer required [planning, sheet c9]
- 15 foot buffer along foundation required [planning, sheet c9]
- Building may not exceed 38' in height with a 37' setback [planning, sheet c9]
- 35 foot buffer required south perimeter. Applicant would need a hearing examiner variance to deviate/reduce width [planning, sheet C10]
- 15 feet required design review landscape buffer, foundation line. This area tapers to less than 15 feet. [planning, sheet C10]
- Location of water and sewer extensions may require removal of substantial vegetation within wetland buffer areas. Applicant must demonstrate compliance with mitigation sequencing prior to alignment shown being approved. See PMC 21.06.920 (1) (a - f). [Planning sheet C13]
- Off-site wetland on this site. Fife has prelim report from past development proposal. Applicant must study if buffer or wetland will be impacted by road way improvements or storm water [planning sheet c20]

- Fife indicates tight line pipe design not acceptable [planning sheet c20]
- Extent of ROW improvements not yet defined. Must be resolved with TIA. [planning sheet c20]
- Improvements within shoreline jurisdiction will require shoreline permitting, potentially with both Fife and Puyallup [planning sheet c20]
- Does the applicant have construction easements for pipe if not located in ROW? [planning sheet C25]
- Is the pipe located in a wetland and/or stream buffer? [planning sheet C25]
- Applicant would need to seek relief from Hearing Examiner for 35 foot buffer requirement. The overlay and the design standards do not supercede base zoning requirements. [planning, response to comment, page 1]
- Planning reached out to WSDOT and the off site critical area reports are not yet final [planning, response to comment, page 2]
- Zone specific standards apply. Also see site civil plan mark ups [planning, response to comment, page 3]
- Perhaps the site is being overdeveloped if the project is trading compliance with parking for compliance with design review. [planning, response to comment, page 3]
- The VMS design manual for truck trailer parking/storage is specific on this issue. See VMS, section 14.4, Nov. 2022 [planning, response to comment, page 4]
- It appears the additional technical report has not been provided (hydraulic analysis) [planning, response to comment, page 7]
- Global comment on all outstanding wetland issues: Confluence would study these issues and determine impacts in scope of work for EIS [planning, response to comment, page 8]
- Conclusion of report does not analyze the potential for a user that might store hazardous materials. Conclusions of the report are not supported by a proposed use or user [planning, response to comment, page 8]
- The most current VMS design manual (Nov. 2022) requires the bermed standard with interior facing retaining wall. (Type Id, see page 38 of 11/22 VMS [planning, response to comment, page 11]

**External Agency Review** - Chris Beale; (253) 841-5418; CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov

## CONDITIONS

**Development & Permitting Services** - Jamie Carter; 2534353616; JCarter@puyallupwa.gov

- Submit With Civil Permit Application:

**Engineering Division** - Jamie Carter; 2534353616; JCarter@puyallupwa.gov

- Standard Conditions: 60 days prior to discharging any runoff from the site a Construction Stormwater General Permit must be applied for with the Washington State Department of Ecology.

**Traffic Division** - Bryan Roberts; 2538415542; broberts@PuyallupWA.gov

- Standard Conditions: • Traffic Impact fees (TIF) will be assessed in accordance with fees adopted by ordinance, per PMC 21.10. Impact fees are subject to change and are adopted by ordinance. The applicant shall pay the proportionate impact fees adopted at the time of building permit application
  - Park impact fee was established by Ordinance 3142 dated July 3, 2017 and shall be charged \$0.87 per sqft of building space.
  - Per Puyallup Municipal Code Section 11.08.135, the applicant/owner would be

expected to construct half-street improvements including curb, gutter, planter strip, sidewalk, roadway base, pavement, and street lighting. Any existing improvements which are damaged now or during construction, or which do not meet current City Standards, shall be replaced.

- As part of these improvements, additional right-of-way (ROW) may need to be dedicated to the City.
- Coordination with Union Pacific regarding potential at-grade rail crossing improvements. Such improvements may include:
  - Roadway widening, grade-separation, advanced pre-emption, queue detection, pre-signal, increased queue storage, health circuit, supervision circuit, etc
  - Any required improvements must meet Union Pacific design requirements.

Sincerely,  
Chris Beale  
Senior Planner  
(253) 841-5418  
CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov