

PROJECT MEMO



TO: Chris Beale; City of Puyallup
FROM: Helen Stanton; AHBL
Wayne Carlson; AHBL
Andy Hartung; McGranahan Architects
Mike Read; TENW
DATE: January 28, 2022
PROJECT NO.: 2190297.30
PROJECT NAME: Pierce College Puyallup Master Plan
SUBJECT: Responses to Review Comments

This memo contains response to the comments provided by City staff on the Master Plan. Responses are found in italicized font.

PLANNING - Chris Beale (253) 841-5418 cbeale@puyallupWA.gov

General Notes:

- 1) The plan may contain a 20-year build out master site plan but the analysis provided, particularly in regards to traffic impacts, do not at present provide the analysis needed to authorize an approval for a build horizon of 20 years. Staff recommends correcting figures and maps throughout to clarify the build out time frames and label the 10 year build site plan (shown as figure 3.1 short term development plan) as 10-year master site development plan, and clearly label the 20-year future conceptual site development plan as a separate figure.

Comment Response: *The Master Plan is intended to cover a period of ten years only. Maps included in the Master Plan have been corrected and depict either existing development or proposed development for the next ten years.*

- 2) Section 1 should include a narrative that clearly describes the present master plan as related to the 10-year build out only, and that the 20-year conceptual site development plan is to show possible future development in future years, making clear that the authorized master plan is not approving other new improvements on the 20 year conceptual site plan.

Comment Response: *The Master Plan will only contain site development for the 10-year build out time period. A sentence to clarify this has been added to section 1.2 Scope and Purpose.*

- 3) Does the College intend to sunset the 1986 concomitant agreement for this property? DPS staff recommends examining this issue – if the College intends to do so, now would be the appropriate time to propose that to Council along with the master plan update. The master plan provides a similar vehicle to establishing standards that meet the College needs over time; the concom plan now conflicts with code and restricts the master planning to conditions from 35 years ago.

Comment Response: *The College does not intent to sunset the 1986 Concomitant Agreement at this stage.*

- 4) Please review the audited Comprehensive Plan policies below. There are policies and goals from the South Hill neighborhood plan that need to be better integrated into the Master Planning efforts on the campus over time to align with the city's neighborhood plan.

Comment Response: *The listed Comprehensive Plan policies have been reviewed and where appropriate have been integrated into the Master Plan.*



Chapter 1 Comments:

- 1) Section 1.2 should describe the differences with the 10 year approval master site plan and the 20 year long term vision map.

Comment Response: *The Master Plan seeks approval for only the 10-year period of site development. Future development beyond the 10-year horizon is not included in the Master Plan.*

- 2) Section 1.4 should draw a stronger connection to integrating with the city's Comprehensive Plan, in particular the city's South Hill Neighborhood Plan specifically. Please refer to the integrating the master planning efforts with the larger South Hill Neighborhood Plan in the College's commitments in the proposal.

Comment Response: *Section has been updated to include narrative to integrate a stronger connection with the City's Comprehensive Plan and South Hill Neighborhood Plan.*

Chapter 2 Comments:

- 1) The section 2.4 regarding Comprehensive Plan consistency needs to integrate all applicable policies, goal, etc from the Comp Plan, particularly the city's South Hill Neighborhood Plan. See below notes regarding audited policies

Comment Response: *Section has been updated to integrate applicable policies and goals from the Comprehensive Plan.*

- 2) The existing condition chapter should integrate and centralize further maps regarding natural resources, utilities, critical areas. See further comments on chapter 8 for critical area layers that should be integrated.

Comment Response: *Comment noted. Maps will be provided in response to comment on Chapter 8.*

Chapter 3 Comments:

- 1) Parking assessment states a deficiency of 386 parking stalls; please qualify this assessment with the data used to determine the shortage. Please also provide a break down of parking stalls required by city code (see PMC 20.55.010 for categories) and currently provided VS future build, providing additional analysis of the commensurate proposed parking stalls associated with the building additions on site. Master plans provide an ability to provide some flexibility on off-street vehicular parking ratios and total supply, but the baseline needs to be established with some analysis.

Comment Response: *The Master Plan has been updated to include the current parking stall deficiency as documented in the Parking & Trip Generation Memo (Appendix 9.6) produced by TENW. Calculations of parking stalls required under PMC 20.55.010 is included in Appendix 9.6 Parking Analysis.*

- 2) Please provide a break down of the parking lot stall count at the new athletic fields and a break down of anticipated use of the athletic fields. The athletic fields parking area needs to be sized to accommodate regular use of the facility with parking on site to minimize off site parking.

Comment Response: *The stall count at the new athletic fields is provided in Chapter 5. The anticipated use has been added to Section 3.2.*



- 3) Will the athletic fields be illuminated by field lighting? Additional details will be needed, if so. Study of light spill, glare, illumination, overall pole and lighting height limit, buffering, orientation of the lighting banks in relation to surrounding residential, limits on hours, etc. will need to be discussed.

Comment Response: *The athletic fields will not be illuminated by field lighting.*

- 4) Given that the athletic fields are conceptual and long term, does it make sense to move them to the 20 year build out site plan?

Comment Response: *The athletics fields were included in the previously approved Master Plan and are included in the 10-year site development plan. The development of athletic fields and associated facilities is dependent on future undetermined funding sources.*

- 5) Staff *strongly* recommends the college develop a plan for EV parking areas in the master plan; given the 10-year timeframe and developing market for EVs anticipated through 2031-2032 a plan should be developed so the campus can adapt over the life of the master plan approval horizon.

Comment Response: *Comment noted. The College intends to explore opportunities to provide EV charging facilities through partnerships with private EV charging providers.*

- 6) Staff recommends calling out bicycle parking areas on the campus master site plan and setting targets for building covered bike parking and/or indoor bike storage spaces now on the master site plan.

Comment Response: The location of bicycle parking areas and a discussion of code requirements. This information is included in Appendix 9.6.

- 7) Reconfiguring the main entry drive and transit loop – please provide a figure or conceptual idea of the reconfiguration, its not clear what this means conceptually.

Comment Response: *There are no immediate/funded projects to change the main entrance and loop within the next 10-years. The Master Plan has been updated to illustrate and describe proposed modifications to shorten the transit loop. The present Pierce Transit bus service/stop is however adequate at this time. This concept is connected to the addition of a new parking lot proposed north of the main entrance to the campus.*

- Is the campus planning a major re-grade or re-configuration of the 39th Ave entry to allow visibility into the campus?

Comment Response: *No*

- Is this related to the new parking lot off the south of parking lot A and will these improvements occur along with parking lot A?

Comment Response: *The shortening of the transit loop is related to the new parking lot north of the main entrance to the campus.*

- Has Pierce Transit been consulted about the bus routing? The route 4 will be part of the transit agencies near term Bus Rapid Transit planning efforts. This may substantially impact the plans to relocate and provide transit loop and circulation on site.

Comment Response: *Pierce Transit has not been consulted at this stage but will be consulted if/when the reconfiguration of the transit loop is in pre-design.*



Chapter 4 Comments:

- 1) Design standards. Please consider providing photos of examples of the type of design elements the campus development should replicate or continue with new proposals. Consider a list of general principles and guidelines that should apply to new structures, in terms of articulation, massing, modulation, etc. Planning staff will have difficulty in administering this section of the master plan if clear standards are not provided that grant unique design allowances that are specific to our design review processes. One way to do this is to compare PMC 20.26.300 and confirm if our code standards are acceptable to apply, or if the college wants flexibility with differing principles/standards under particular areas, perhaps with a review table of sorts.

Comment Response: *Pierce College has purposefully elected to describe only very general standards related to; building volume and massing; building orientation; setbacks and space between buildings; exterior wall articulation and materials; roof shape, volume, material, and color; pedestrian circulation; and energy efficiency. The intent for each new building will be to support the educational objectives of the College and be compatible with other campus architecture. Each project is required to be reviewed and approved by an internal college committee for adherence with these objectives.*

- 2) Signage. If the College wants specific allowances, please itemize the code sections that apply and if the proposed master plan would contain its own unique standards for signage. See PMC 20.60.058 for comparison purposes. PMC 20.88.020 contemplates a greater level of detail, such as specific design standards and a site location map for any new signs.

Comment Response: *In addition to the four signage types currently used on campus, the College plans to construct a freestanding, pole, electronic message sign, or alternatively, integrate and electronic message into a monument sign at the College main entrance. Pierce College is requesting the following modifications from the standards in the Public Facilities zone.*

Façade Signs:

- Two sq. ft. for each lineal foot of the building wall from which the sign is attached with no limit on the size.

Monument Signs

- Two monument sign per street frontage
- Sign height shall not exceed greater than six ft. above immediately adjacent grade when located within a required setback area or 15 ft. when located outside of a required setback area
- 120 sq. ft. per sign

Freestanding Signs (Other Than Monument Signs)

- To construct an unlimited number of freestanding signs that are not viewable from public rights-of-way.

Chapter 5 Comments

- 1) The map figures in this chapter need to be revised to show the planned campus mobility and circulation for the 10 year plan horizon only; the 20 year site plan is shown. Given that the 20 year is conceptual and future vision (i.e. will not be an approved plan horizon for this master plan update), the chapter figures need to be amended to be clear.

Comment Response: *Map figures have been updated to show 10-year plan horizon.*



- 2) The transportation management chapter should include information regarding commute trip reduction for employees and students, management of vehicle trips through strategic efforts to reduce VMT.

Comment Response: *Pierce College has a Commute Trip Reduction program. Section 5.2 describes the plan as follows:*

Pierce College has a Commute Trip Reduction program manager, who reports to the College President. This position involves publishing the monthly Pierce Trips News, mounting posters and advertising in the student and staff lounges, offering information packets to all new employees and students, offering bus and vanpool subsidies to employees, facilitating matching to carpool groups, and submission of the Employer Annual Report to Pierce County.

Pierce Transit offers bus services to the college with Transit Route 4. Bike racks are also available on campus for both staff and students. However, with the past two years, the most used method for commute trip reduction has been telecommuting or remote working. With the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, most of the college instruction has occurred remotely with approximately 10% of the classes taught in-person. Telecommuting or remote working also includes the professional staff who do not teach but provide support to the College District.

Where applicable, telecommuting schedules allow for portions of the work week to occur away from the college campus, typically at the employee's home. Additionally, during the summer months (June to August) the college is closed on Fridays, and staff work alternative work schedules.

- 3) The campus plays an important role in the geography of the city's transportation network, pedestrian transportation network, safe routes to schools (PSD) and access to community park space. Some comments from Planning:
 - The College Way drive should include future plans for dedicated pedestrian facilities with lighting. This connects the neighborhoods to Bradley Lake Park and neighborhoods to the west to the public middle and elementary schools with safe walking and biking routes to school.

Comment Response: *The State does not currently provide a funding mechanism for the construction of pedestrian facilities. Estimates for the costs associated with the construction of curbs, gutter, sidewalks, and lighting along College Way are between \$12-\$15 million. The desire for these improvements appears to be for users unrelated to the campus.*

Students may vote to establish a fee for the construction of pedestrian facilities along Campus Way. Pierce College would support students establishing this fee or the City constructing these improvements.

- 4) The major unimproved trail that runs east to west on campus (running along the fenceline of the Benaroya technology campus, running further east to the intersection of Wildwood Park Drive & 31st) is a major pedestrian amenity that should be highlighted on Figure 5.1. A plan to improve and highlight this trail should be included in the overall master plan. This route is shown as a future shared use (paved, 12') pathway from 31st to Bradley Lake Park – see map 12.6 in the South Hill Neighborhood Plan.

Comment Response: *A concomitant agreement is recorded against the title of the campus that requires the presence of a wooded buffer along the edge of the Pierce College campus that abuts the Benaroya properties. There are a series of volunteer trails within wooded areas of the campus. One of the trails is an unimproved, volunteer trail that extends along the fence line of the Benaroya technology campus. While Pierce College does not intend to eliminate these trails, the State does not have the funding mechanisms at its disposal to improve these trails to ADA standards. Moreover, improvements to these trails may encourage visitors outside school hours who may compromise campus security efforts.*



- 5) Trail connections from the neighborhood to the north of the campus should be shown and highlighted as assets to retain and improve connectivity.

Comment Response: *The approximate location of the volunteer trails has been depicted in Figure 5.1 of the Master Plan. Although Pierce College does not intend to eliminate these trails, the State does not have the funding mechanisms at its disposal to improve these trails to the ADA standards that would be necessary as elements of connectivity to adjacent sites and rights-of-way. Moreover, improvements to these trails may encourage visitors outside school hours who may compromise campus security efforts.*

- 6) The College needs to plan to make on street frontage improvements consistent with Traffic feedback and code requirements.

Comment Response: *Frontage improvements along Wildwood Park Drive bear no nexus to the impacts associated with the Pierce College Master Plan proposal. There is no planned access to Wildwood Park Drive. According to the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by TENW, a third access is not warranted for traffic reasons. A third access is also not warranted for emergency vehicle response. The design of all new buildings will include sprinklers and other applicable fire suppression construction techniques required under the City of Puyallup's codes.*

Chapter 6 Comments:

- 1) The College needs to plan to make on street frontage improvements consistent with Traffic feedback and code requirements.

Comment Response: *The change has been made.*

- 2) Please provide a short narrative regarding impacts to power and natural gas utilities.

Comment Response: *The change has been made.*

- 3) Please provide info regarding solid waste and recycling services.

Comment Response: *The change has been made.*

Chapter 7 Comments:

- 1) The map figures in this chapter need to be revised to show the planned storm utilities for the 10 year plan horizon only; the 20 year site plan is shown. Given that the 20 year is conceptual and future vision (i.e. will not be an approved plan horizon for this master plan update), the chapter figures need to be amended to be clear.

Comment Response: *The change has been made.*

- 2) No further comments on this chapter, defer to Engineering review notes on storm water.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

Chapter 8 Comments:

- 1) Please make clear that the wetland reports will be required to be updated at the time of site development or permitting for any structure or site improvement within 300' of known or suspected wetlands.

Comment Response: *Sentence added to Section 8.1 to address this comment.*



- 2) Please add a section to this chapter that will document the forthcoming SEPA analysis for the master plan. Those findings and any conditions from SEPA will need to be included in this Environmental Analysis chapter.

Comment Response: A placeholder has been provided that discusses the forthcoming SEPA environmental analysis and includes a spot for the mitigation.

- 3) Please provide a single full sheet showing wetlands. The figure is too small to be useful on the last sheet.

Comment Response: *Updated wetland map included in Chapter 8.*

- 4) A figure showing known critical areas throughout the site should be provided with a discussion. Steep slopes, habitat areas, erosion hazards, soils mapped, proximity to wells and wellhead protection zones, flood areas, streams and riparian buffers. These can just be GIS data maps with short descriptions of the critical areas in narrative.

Comment Response: *A figure showing known critical areas throughout the site is included in Appendix 9.8. This figure is sourced from the City of Puyallup's GIS Critical Areas Map provided on the City's website. A discussion of the critical areas on the site is provided in Section 8.2.*

Appendix 9.2 Landscape – Comments

- 1) Parking lot landscaping must comply with the city's Type IV design standards (see included appendix to these notes); this should be referenced now in this chapter and integrated into future parking lot planning efforts. Requirements for large shade trees may impact 6.1 plant palette list. Spacing of islands and dimension requirements will impact parking count anticipated.

Comment Response: *A sentence has been added to Section 5.1 to note that the proposed parking lots will comply with the City's Type IV design standards.*

Appendix 9.3 Lighting – Comments:

- 1) Additional analysis will be needed regarding illumination plans for the athletic fields. Height of fixtures, plans for evening use time limits, type of fixtures, positioning toward residential land uses and photometric planning is needed.

Comment Response: *No lighting of athletic fields is proposed at this time.*

Appendix 9.5 TIA – Comments:

- 1) Was the campus open fully and at expected full classroom capacity in November 2020 when the traffic count data was collected? Staff has concerns the numbers are under representative of traffic conditions given the status of the pandemic restrictions that likely affected traffic volumes during the count collection date.

Comment Response: *This comment is not applicable as the City required updated counts to be performed in 2021.*

- 2) The analysis date for traffic impacts needs to match the 10 year time period horizon of the master plan approval.

Comment Response: *The TIA has been updated to reflect a 10-year horizon period.*

- 3) Defer other comments to Traffic Division review.

Comment Response: Comment noted.



Appendix 9.7 Wetlands – Comments:

- 1) The report is outdated but okay to use as an appendix to the wetlands shown on the master site plan documents for now. Wetland reports will be required to be updated at the time of site development or permitting for any structure or site improvement within 300' of known or suspected wetlands.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

20.88.020 Contents of Master Plan.

- (1) A master plan must contain:

- (a) A conceptual site plan depicting the approximate location and size of all known and potential future development.

Conceptual site plans are provided in the Master Plan showing the known and planned 10-year campus improvement plan, as well as potential future development on a longer 20-year time horizon.

Comment Response: *Potential development on a longer 20-year time horizon has been removed from the Master Plan.*

- (b) A proposed phasing plan for development, describing which of the proposed improvements will be included within each phase.

Project phasing is contained within chapter 3 and includes anticipated improvements for the 10-year campus buildout plan.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

- (c) Proposed development standards, including:

- (i) Maximum building heights for various uses;

Heights anticipated are contained in chapter 4; all development is anticipated to be consistent with underlying PF zoning allowances of 50' height-to-setback allowances.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

- (ii) Minimum building setbacks;

Building setbacks appear on the site plan for the 10-year campus build out site plan; all development will be interior to the site's 100' landscape buffer area. Setbacks and space between buildings are described in section 4.6.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

- (iii) Areas of landscaping buffers;

Landscape yards appear on the site plan for the 10-year campus build out site plan; all development will be interior to the site's 100' landscape buffer area.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*



(iv) Estimated building square footage;
Table 4.2, Chapter 5 shows the 10-year campus build out square footages

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

(v) Overall maximum lot coverage;
Chapter 4, tables 4.1 and 4.2 provide lot coverage percentages.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

(vi) Open/green spaces, location and proposed activities;
The chapters show open spaces/green space areas and generally demonstrates the outdoor open spaces on the site plans submitted and figures.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

(vii) Vehicular and pedestrian access points and throughways;
Figure 5.1 demonstrates the access points and circulation points and anticipated patterns.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

(viii) Parking – number of stalls, type (surface or garage), location;
Parking is shown in Chapter 3, but additional analysis is needed to determine adequacy of parking provided.

Comment Response: *Additional analyses of current parking deficiency and proposed new parking is provided in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 as well as Appendix 9.6 and 9.7.*

(ix) Lighting standards to limit impact to off-site areas;
Appendix 9.3 is included as a lighting plan. Additional analysis will be needed regarding illumination plans for the athletic fields.

Comment Response: *No illuminations are proposed for the athletic fields.*

(x) An overall signage plan and design standards to be applied within the master plan area. Signs shall be of a consistent design and sized and located to minimize potentially adverse aesthetic and lighting impacts on adjacent areas.
Signage standards are shown in chapter 4. See notes above.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

(d) A transportation management program in which a performance standard is designated and features to attain this standard are established. Program features may include special site design features; annual promotion events; contracted parking enforcement; shuttle services for employees, etc.
This is contained in Chapter 5; see notes above.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

(2) A master plan application must include necessary environmental analysis to allow for a determination of its potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures.
This is contained in Chapter 8; see notes above.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*



20.88.030 Approval criteria.

(1) The city council may approve or approve with modifications a master plan if:

- (a) The proposed plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan; and
- (b) The proposed development (including signage) is appropriate in design, character and appearance with the existing or intended character and quality of development in the immediate vicinity and with the physical characteristics of the subject property; and
- (c) The location, configuration, design and detailing of major structures and landscaping convey an image of its semi-public use and will serve as prominent landmarks in the city; and
- (d) The structures and site development, including landscaping, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, public plazas and sitting areas, functionally relate with the site and connect to adjacent areas; and
- (e) The primary vehicular and pedestrian entrances are located and designed to delineate the complex as a major institution; and
- (f) The plan provides for adequate parking and circulation as to not adversely impact adjacent areas.

(2) The city council may impose conditions on the master plan to ensure the standards and intent of this code and the comprehensive plan are met and to mitigate potential adverse impacts.

Comment Response: *Comment noted.*

COMP PLAN POLICIES:

The following Comp Plan policies are audited that would apply to PMC 20.88.030 (1)(A); please provide analysis of consistency in response. Of particular highlight are the sections of the South Hill Neighborhood Plan.

Staff identified additional efforts in the Master Plan around the following areas:

- *Planning commitments to identifying habitats on site and ways to set aside native vegetated areas with easements or protective covenants. This can be a policy or future planning action in the Master Plan for the College and city to work on jointly.*
- *Cooperative work with Pierce Transit on Bus Rapid Transit planning for the transit relocation on campus.*
- *Greater emphasis on green infrastructure and low impact development in the Master Plan.*
- *Discussion on circulation patterns to outer areas of campus consistent with SH 9.5 policy framework. Also see comments above regarding pedestrian circulation.*
- *Public art and distinctive place making efforts in landscaping and plaza spaces should receive a greater emphasis and acknowledgement in the Master Plan. (SH 9.7)*
- *Planning emphasis on a shared use path through the east-west Bradley connector shared use pathway and a plan for connectivity on the Williams Pipeline corridor with non-motorized pathways. See map figures 12.4 and 12.6 in SHNP and figure 14 in the Active Transportation Plan.*
- *Further planning and improvements on Wildwood Park Drive frontage improvements (see map figure 12.5 in SHNP)*

Comment Response: *Comprehensive Plan and South Hill Neighborhood Plan policies applicable to this proposal are included within the Master Plan resubmittal. The applicability of various City policies and the nexus of policies to the proposal are addressed in the Master Plan and in individual responses within the body of this memorandum.*



ENGINEERING – Mark Higginson (253) 841-5559 mhigginson@puyallupWA.gov

- 1) Master Plan (MP), Section 2.3-correct typo as indicated.

Comment Response: *The typo will be corrected.*

- 2) MP, Section 4.3-coordinate number of onsite wetlands between the Master Plan and the Storm Report. The Storm Report indicates ten wetlands, and the Master Plan is stating nine wetlands.

Comment Response: *Master Plan Figures 2.1, 3.1 and 5.1 will be revised to match the number of wetlands shown in the storm report.*

- 3) MP, Section 4.6- correct typo as indicated.

Comment Response: *The typo will be corrected.*

- 4) MP, Section 7-Revise the 6th paragraph to reflect the Master Plan's common plan-of-development and compliance with stormwater regulations.

Comment Response: *The paragraph will be revised to note the Master Plan's compliance with stormwater regulations rather than stating that stormwater mitigation is not required.*

- 5) Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan (PSSP), Section 1.0-clarify flow control for pollution generating hard surface areas.

Comment Response: *The change has been made. Paragraph 3 of Section 1.0 has been revised to state that flow control will be provided for all impervious surfaces and water quality will be provided for PGIS upstream of the flow control facilities.*

- 6) PSSP, Section 1.1.1-coordinate number of onsite wetlands between the Master Plan and the Storm Report.

Comment Response: *Master Plan Figures 2.1, 3.1 and 5.1 will be revised to match the number of wetlands shown in the storm report. The total number of wetlands is noted as 11 wetlands in both the Master Plan and the Preliminary Storm Report.*

- 7) PSSP, Section 1.2-clarify flow control for pollution generating hard surface areas.

Comment Response: *The change has been made. Paragraph 3 of Section 1.0 has been revised to state that flow control will be provided for all impervious surfaces and water quality will be provided for PGIS upstream of the flow control facilities.*

- 8) PSSP, Section 2.5-Revise BMP T5.10...downspout dispersion may be feasible per the criteria outlined for this BMP (Ecology Manual, Vol. III, Section 3.1.2).

Comment Response: *The section will be revised to note feasibility of downspout dispersion, specifically for projects at the southeast corner of the site.*

- 9) PSSP, Section 2.5, BMP T5.30-Please be aware that projects utilizing Full Dispersion must protect the dispersion area in perpetuity (easement or tract).

Comment Response: *Noted.*



- 10) PSSP, Section 2.5-BMP T5.11...concentrated flow dispersion may be feasible per the criteria outlined for this BMP (Ecology Manual, Vol. V, BMP T5.11).

Comment Response: *The section will be revised to note feasibility of concentrated flow dispersion, specifically for projects at the southeast corner of the site.*

- 11) PSSP, Section 2.5-Revise BMP T5.12...sheet flow dispersion may be feasible per the criteria outlined for this BMP (Ecology Manual, Vol. III, Section 3.1.2).

Comment Response: *The section will be revised to note feasibility of sheet flow dispersion, specifically for projects at the southeast corner of the site.*

- 12) PSSP, Section 2.8-please provide additional clarification regarding compliance with Minimum Requirement 8 (MR8). Any changes to a subbasin tributary to a wetland must be evaluated for compliance with MR8, which in turn, may affect sizing of proposed storm facilities.

Comment Response: *It is the intent of the Master Plan to maintain all sub-basin in the existing condition. The storm report will be revised to note this for additional clarification.*

- 13) PSSP, Section 4.3-revise the paragraph associated with the Storage Building as indicated.

Comment Response: *The paragraph titled Storage Building has been revised and no longer notes a new gym building.*

- 14) PSSP, Section 4.3-Please clarify the term “flow control trade” associated with Parking Lot 5. Is the intent to bypass surface water from one basin to another?

Comment Response: *Stormwater will be collected from areas that are outside of the project limits in exchange for areas within the project limits that cannot be collected to topography. Surface will not bypass from one basin to another as all areas are within the same basin.*

TRAFFIC – Bryan Roberts (253) 841-5542 broberts@puyallupWA.gov

15) Traffic Analysis

- a. The traffic analysis completed by TENW was analyzed with a 2025 horizon year.
- i. The analysis years need to be consistent Master Plan assumptions. 10 year (2032)? 20 year (2042) horizon year? Please clarify full buildout assumptions.

Comment Response: *The TIA has been updated to reflect a 10-year horizon period.*

- ii. Ensure the building sqft assumptions used for trip generation estimates are consistent with the Master Plan document. Current sqft assumptions are not consistent.

Comment Response: *The revised Master Plan buildout assumptions of floor area have been adjusted and are reflected in the TIA.*

- iii. Update study intersection list accordingly.

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested.*



- iv. Include Existing delay analysis results in the same table as your full build out assumptions (no-build & build). Existing delay for Intersection #9 (AM Peak) and Intersection #3 (PM Peak) improves in future analysis.

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested and 2021 traffic counts as requested by the City. All delay/LOS reported values have been adjusted accordingly.*

- b. Due to unknown COVID related impacts at the time, older traffic counts (1-4 years old) were utilized for this analysis. Growth and/or adjustment factors were then applied to estimate non-COVID conditions.
 - i. To eliminate the uncertainty with the previous adjustment methodology, the City will require all AM/PM traffic counts to be re-collected to represent existing conditions.
 1. Traffic volumes have largely returned to normal in this area.
 2. Additionally, there was an unusually long duration between the traffic analysis and the completed Master Plan submittal.
 3. Provide details on how traffic volumes at college access driveways are estimated to simulate non-pandemic conditions. It's the City's understanding Pierce College is currently operating at reduced capacity.
 4. Provide any network volume balancing assumptions used to account for Pierce College reduced capacity.
 - ii. To ensure unserved demand is captured in your delay analysis, existing queue lengths shall be captured as part of your updated data collection.
 - iii. How were existing signal timing assumed in your Synchro analysis? Were signal timings/phasing confirmed in the field?

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested and 2021 traffic counts as requested by the City. Adjustments to reflect reduced capacity at Pierce College have been modeled accordingly. Reported LOS or existing counts do not reflect any saturated conditions and signal timing/phasing plans were updated as available by WSDOT/City.*

- c. The analysis needs to include all signalized intersections along 39th Ave SE
 - i. 39th Ave SE & Wildwood Park Drive
 - ii. 39th Ave SE & 25th St SE (AM impacts overlap with highest volumes for school and college)

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested.*

- d. Based on comments from the public meeting, add 23rd Ave SE & Shaw Rd intersection to your analysis.

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested.*



16) Pedestrian Improvements

- a. The entire length of College Drive should be improved with ADA compliant walkway (including adequate lighting). This improvement will provide safe pedestrian access to campus via 7th St SE.

Comment Response: *The State does not currently provide a funding mechanism for the construction of pedestrian facilities. Estimates for the costs associated with the construction of curbs, gutter, sidewalks, and lighting along College Way are between \$12-\$15 million. The desire for these improvements appears to be for users unrelated to the campus. Students may vote to establish a fee for the construction of pedestrian facilities along Campus Way. Pierce College would support students establishing this fee or the City constructing these improvements.*

- b. Evaluate pedestrian improvements at the intersections of (1) Manorwood Dr & Wildwood Park Drive and (2) 31st Ave SE & Wildwood Park Drive.
 - i. Pedestrians use these intersections to cross Wildwood Park Drive to access college property. Currently, these pedestrian crossings and trails are unimproved.

Comment Response: *Pierce College is unaware of pedestrian crossing by its students, faculty, or staff of Wildwood Park Drive. If warranted, pedestrian improvements at the intersections of Manorwood Drive/Wildwood Park Drive and 31st Avenue SE/Wildwood Park Drive are due to school children taking a short cut and crossing campus to get to Ferrucci Junior High School and is unrelated to the students, faculty, and staff that attend and work at Pierce College.*

- c. Provide details on possible pedestrian connections north of the proposed ball fields.

Comment Response: *A concomitant agreement is recorded against the title of the campus that requires the presence of a 100-foot wide, wooded buffer along the edge of the Pierce College campus that abuts Wildwood Park Drive. There are a series of volunteer trails within wooded areas of the campus. While Pierce College does not intend to eliminate these trails, the State does not have the funding mechanisms at its disposal to improve these trails to ADA standards. Moreover, improvements to these trails may encourage visitors outside school hours who may compromise campus security efforts.*

- d. These pedestrian improvements are consistent with expected outcomes described within “Needs Analysis” section.

Comment Response: *The needs analysis section of the plan was discussing internal walkways between vehicle and bicycle parking areas and buildings on campus. The needs analysis does not identify any other pedestrian improvement needs.*

17) Frontage/site circulation/access

- a. City Code requires frontage improvements to be implemented along Wildwood Park Drive

Comment Response: *Frontage improvements along Wildwood Park Drive bear no nexus to the impacts associated with the Pierce College Master Plan proposal. There is no planned access to Wildwood Park Drive. According to the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by TENW, a third access is not warranted for traffic reasons. A third access is also not warranted for emergency vehicle response. The design of all new buildings will include sprinklers and other applicable fire suppression construction techniques required under the City of Puyallup’s codes.*

- b. Provide a detailed analysis of a future Wildwood Park Drive access location per concomitant agreement
 - i. Based on City geometric standards, provide an analysis of placement/alignment options to evaluate.



- ii. Per the concomitant agreement, “access to Wildwood Park Drive should be selected so it does not align with any existing neighborhood streets that would then promote cut-through traffic, but at such a location that entering sight distance meets current City design standards.”
- iii. Public comments received by the City detail concerns regarding current traffic conditions (congestion + speeding) on 7th St SE. An alternate Wildwood Park Drive access would likely reduce traffic impacts along the 7th St SE corridor. Address this public comment within the Master Plan document.

Comment Response: *Consideration of potential alignments for an access to Wildwood Park Drive is only appropriate if a third access is warranted. According to the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by TENW, a third access is not warranted for traffic reasons. A third access is also not warranted for emergency vehicle response. The design of all new buildings will include sprinklers and other applicable fire suppression construction techniques required under the City of Puyallup’s codes.*

- c. Provide design proposal for reconfiguration of main entrance drive and transit Loop as described on page 18.

Comment Response: *There is no proposed reconfiguration of the main entrance drive. Pierce College intends to work cooperatively with Pierce Transit to reconfigure the existing transit use as part of Pierce Transit’s bus rapid transit planning. Reconfiguration is intended to shorten the loop for Pierce Transit and would occur in conjunction with the construction of the new parking area north of the main entrance to campus from 39th Street SE. This will enable a shorter turn around for transit and may also make it easier for Pierce Transit to expand routes as the reconfiguration would be more accessible. See Figure 3.1 and 3.2 for the existing and proposed transit loop.*

- d. City strongly recommends internal driveway/intersection design consider sight distance requirements based on national recognized standards

Comment Response: *The detail described in this comment is not applicable at the Master Plan stage. Site development and landscape plans will be submitted for the construction of new parking and circulation facilities. Such facilities will be designed for student, faculty, staff, and visitor safety.*

- e. ESD sight lines at proposed driveways may interfere with parked vehicles. Should also consider roadway geometry and landscaping impacts to sight distance.

Comment Response: *Entering sight distance considerations are not being considered as a part of our parking lot design. The detail described in this comment is not applicable at the Master Plan stage. Site development and landscape plans will be submitted for the construction of new parking facilities. No changes to the driveways that connect to City rights-of-way (e.g., 39th Avenue SE and 5th/7th Connector) are proposed.*

- f. Recommend evaluation of SSD for proposed head-in parking located on the SE corner of the campus.

Comment Response: *Stopping sight distance is not of concern within the parking lots. The head-in parking proposed for the southeast corner of campus is similar to the head-in parking throughout all of the other parking lots throughout campus. The circulation from parking lot to parking lot is designed for low-speed parking maneuvers. The circulation is not designed to be a public or private road.*



WSDOT TIA Comments (Eli Baker, Ariel Heckler Olympic Region)

- 1) Can Figure 1 be enhanced to include more legible road names? It does not include 7th St SE which would be helpful to see as well.

Comment Response: *Given the scope of the TIA, limited options are available for legible beyond current graphic resolution.*

- 2) Why were the intersections along 39th Ave between College Way and Shaw Road not considered in this traffic study? Would there be any impact to these intersections?

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested.*

- 3) What were the values used to adjust for the lower traffic volumes due to COVID? Can you elaborate on how you made these adjustments

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested and 2021 traffic counts as requested by the City. Adjustments to reflect reduced capacity at Pierce College have been modeled accordingly. Reported LOS or existing counts do not reflect any saturated conditions and signal timing/phasing plans were updated as available by WSDOT/City.*

- 4) The number of new trips in Table 3 should be presented as whole numbers

Comment Response: *Values are reported per City standards/requirements.*

- 5) Figures 5 and 6 would be more helpful if they were moved to this section

Comment Response: *As part of the report updated, many figure locations have been reorganized to follow as introduced.*

- 6) In the last paragraph it mentions that LOS E is considered acceptable on S Meridian (SR 161) during PM peak periods according to the city's Comprehensive Plan. Is this also agreed to by WSDOT?

Comment Response: *Locally adopted LOS standards reflect WSDOT LOS ratings per GMA.*

- 7) Suggest adding a map to show transit service/stops discussed in this section. Also, what are the transit service headways?

Comment Response: *A general discussion has been added to the TIA.*

- 8) What about bike facilities? Are there any areas lacking sidewalks? Suggest adding more information on active transportation (especially with this being a college campus).

Comment Response: *A general discussion has been added to the TIA.*

- 9) Unable to find AM/PM peak traffic volumes for intersection #3 in Appendix A. I believe page 4 is missing in both packets.

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested and 2021 traffic counts as requested by the City. Adjustments to reflect reduced capacity at Pierce College have been modeled accordingly.*



10) The AM peak traffic volumes for intersections #9 and #11 don't appear to match what is featured in Appendix A (even when you account for the growth rate). This may impact your Synchro analysis as well.

Comment Response: *The revised TIA has been expanded to include the additional study intersections requested and 2021 traffic counts as requested by the City. Adjustments to reflect reduced capacity at Pierce College have been modeled accordingly.*

11) Can you provide your Synchro files used for this TIA?

Comment Response: *Updated synchro files can be delivered to City if requested.*

12) The TIA mentions a review of the City of Puyallup's TIP (for Planned Transportation Improvements). Was a review done for WSDOT projects in this area?

Comment Response: *Yes, but no WSDOT projects are expected to increase capacity at study intersections.*

13) MP25.50-25.76 is identified as CAL/CAC and MP25.48 is identified as IAL. Safety analysis is required.

Comment Response: *This comment is assumed to be related to SR 161. As this is a regional facility and the City has no authority to require mitigation that is disproportionate to project impacts, no analysis or project mitigation can be required.*

Q:\2019\2190297\30_PLN\Working_Files\Comments\20220128 Comment Responses.docx