



LEROY SURVEYORS & ENGINEERS, INC.

Surveying • Engineering • Geology • Septic Design • GPS • GIS Mapping

December 19, 2022

Chris Beale, AICP

Senior Planner

(253) 841-5418

cbeale@puyallupWA.gov

RE: Plans & Report Redlines – Dos Lagos Lot C

City of Puyallup Permit # P-21-0099

LSE Job No.: 12896

We have completed our responses to the items addressed per plan and report markups from you dated December 28, 2021, regarding the above-mentioned project. Our item-by-item responses to your comments, as well as the original comment, are presented below to assist with your re-review of the construction documents.

Preliminary Storm, Sewer, & Water Plans Redlines Sheet C2.0

Add 4' black top asphalt path up to 39th on frontage of lot A

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Add lighting and benches to match Affinity and Memory care frontage on 5th

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Show existing streetlight locations along 5th Street SE. Provide station & offset

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

match stationing with Affinity street tree cutouts

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Coordinate with Chris Beale to ensure street tree species on 5th St SE will not obstruct entering sight distance at driveway.

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

12' landscape required

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Compact stalls need to be 15' min.

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Add curb ramp

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Remove parking stalls, too close to commercial driveway.

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Setback issue - see DRT notes

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Update driveway design to accommodate 30ft wide & 35ft radii City standard

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Show physical right-in/right-out access restriction treatments

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Setback issue – see review notes

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Remove trees here. Will interfere with SB visibility of signal heads & impact EB right turn on red sight distance.

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Move street trees to back of walk

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

City standards require 35ft radius, existing radius is only 30ft.

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

12ft wide frontage around corner

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

ROW dedication required on 43rd Ave SE or 5th St SE?

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Re-align curb

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Show estimated streetlight locations on planter box spacing 43rd Ave SW

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

43rd Ave SE planter box spacing must match existing 5th St SE show estimated streetlight locations on planter box spacing

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

right-on-red sight line, site plan must not have any sight obstructions from this movement

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Sight line for SB signals

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Sheet C2.1

Provide ALTA Survey as supporting documentation for the Preliminary Site Plan Application

RESPONSE: All items are included in resubmittal package.

Sheet C2.2

The grade is being raised substantially in this area which may allow the use of permeable pavement (MR5) with the import of permeable fill and reservoir course material...unless deemed infeasible per the criteria outlined in the Ecology Manual

RESPONSE: Permeable pavement is proposed with this resubmittal.

-Due to the pump being located downstream of the control riser, provide preliminary calculations showing the proposed pump system curves comply with the Duration Standard (MR7).

-Also, refer to City Standard 204.7 for criteria associated with pump systems

-Considering the depth of the proposed vault, infiltration into the Everett-Neilton soils may be a possible alternative to the proposed pump system...provided wet season testing into the infiltrative stratum confirms feasibility

RESPONSE: Permeable pavement is proposed vs. a vault or pump system.

-Clarify if the design intent is to retain or remove the existing fill on this site. If removed, is import to support the use of permeable pavement (MR5) infeasible per the criteria in the Ecology Manual?

-If fill is to remain, what Ecology infeasibility criteria negates it's use for compliance with MR5?

RESPONSE: Onsite fill materials will be more accurately assessed at the time of construction however it is anticipated that the majority of the existing onsite fill materials will need to be removed.

Provide maintenance access to pipe outfall

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

40-ft easement req'd for public utility

RESPONSE: Preliminary 40 foot easement shown on revised plans.

FYI...Dimns do not agree in Storm Report

RESPONSE: Vault has been removed.

Possible Alternative Alignments (either all onsite or partially onsite and in road section)

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Structures shall be located in ROW

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

-Gutter flow must be captured and conveyed to an appropriate discharge location

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Road Frontage Improvements must be treated

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

There is no storm crossing here

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

City storm crossing to North

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

YMCA storm crossing to North

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

No storm crossing at this CB (CB discharges to South)

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Verify-City believes the YMCA crossing is approx. 6-10 ft east of City crossing.

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

ROW Dedication Req'd

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Upgrade non-standard frontage to current standards; or, with prior approval of the City Engineer, the City may allow the improvements to remain with the processing of an AMR

RESPONSE: Plans updated as requested.

Preliminary Drainage Report Redlines

There are a number of storm conveyance pipes which convey public road runoff onto Parcels 0419106028, 0419102118, and 0419106030. An easement, if one does not currently exist, shall be granted to the City for the portion of the storm conveyance system on private property. Minimum easement width is 40-ft per current City Standards. (1)

RESPONSE: Please refer to the revised plans. A 40' Public Storm Easement is proposed.

Clarify...what site development permit?? (4)

RESPONSE: Acknowledged, this has been revised within the report.

A conservative assumption for PSP application, but wet season infiltration testing must be evaluated per Standards (4)

RESPONSE: Please review the revised Geotechnical Report within the appendix. Infiltration testing has now been completed for this project.

-If pumping stormwater, the applicant will have to show how the pump system meets both the

predeveloped release rates as well as the flow duration standard during pump operation (pumps are the point-of-compliance; must consider cycling of pumps when evaluating the Ecology duration standard).

-Reference City Standard 204.7 for stormwater pumping requirements. (4)

RESPONSE: Due to the listed concerns about a pump system meeting city and DOE standards, a pump system is no longer proposed for this project. Please review the revised drainage report for an updated plan to address stormwater runoff.

Conservative for PSP, but wet season infiltration testing req'd (7)

RESPONSE: Please review the revised Geotechnical Report within the appendix. Infiltration testing has now been completed for this project.

2.5.1? (8)

RESPONSE: The narrative within the MR#5 section has been revised to refer to Table I-2.5.1.

Very difficult, if not impossible, to do w/ a pump system (8)

RESPONSE: Due to the listed concerns about a pump system meeting city and DOE standards, a pump system is no longer proposed for this project. Please review the revised drainage report for an updated plan to address stormwater runoff.

only a qualitative analysis provided...see comments in Appendix E (8)

RESPONSE: MR8 analysis has been added within the revised drainage report.

does not agree w/ calculations provided (9)

RESPONSE: The landuse tables and calculations have been revised within the report.

Drainage from the YMCA property is tributary to the project site. (11)

RESPONSE: Please refer to the revised drainage report and plans.

C2.0? (13)

RESPONSE: This has been revised within the report.

Does not agree w/ commentary (1.25ac) (17)

RESPONSE: The landuse tables and calculations have been revised within the report.

ok for filled area (17)

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

Does not agree w/ preliminary civil plan (18)

RESPONSE: This comment is no longer applicable as a vault is no longer being proposed. Please refer to the revised drainage report.

Provide output that confirms compliance with the Flow Duration Standard (MR7) (21)

RESPONSE: Please see the revised MR7 narrative within the revised drainage report.

-See comment next page- (31)

This statement requires additional clarification for Site E (Parcel C). Groundwater is called out to be 6-7ft BGS at the lowest point of the site (west side) and the onsite fill material, as well as the native Everett and Neilton soils which are known to be permeable, have not been tested for infiltrative capacity per the Ecology Manual requirements. It is unclear whether the fill material will remain or be removed en masse, but if it is to be removed, it is possible to provide imported fill material with infiltration capability which could support the use of permeable pavement. If the fill is to remain, hydraulic conductivity testing should be conducted to determine Minimum Requirement 5 feasibility.

Similarly, based on the preliminary site layout, the west end of Site E will be raised substantially and it is unclear why imported fill material with infiltration capability is not feasible for this area. Again, based on the submitted documentation, it does not appear that wet-season hydraulic conductivity and groundwater testing has been conducted for this site justifying a finding of infeasibility. (32)

RESPONSE: Please review the revised Geotechnical Report within the appendix.

Provide a quantitative analysis in accordance with the Ecology Manual, Minimum Requirement 8.

The analysis shall incorporate the downstream pump curves in the hydrologic modeling.

The hydrologic modeling used for the MR8 quantitative analysis shall be stamped by a licensed professional engineer. (49)

RESPONSE: It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup. This is not a Wetland Report for the project parcels and was merely included in order to provide further information about how neighboring parcels are addressing concerns about the wetland in order to further inform how the wetlands are being addressed by the subject parcels. As such, requested revisions to the existing report can not be made.

Not included w/ report (49)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached

Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

not attached (50)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

not included (51)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

not included (52)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

not included (52)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

Provide the MR8 supporting documentation including the not included input screens, compliance graphs, and modeling results. Include exhibits for the pre and post-developed land cover conditions. (52)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

not included (52)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

Confirm commentary/analysis using continuous hydrologic modeling and Appendix I-D of the Ecology Manual. (53)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

Clarify professional credentials of letter writer. (54)

RESPONSE: Please see above previous response. It should be noted that the attached Enco Wetland report was previously completed for a neighboring property and approved by Puyallup.

We trust that all items have been satisfactorily addressed. Please contact us if anything is missing or incomplete.

Sincerely,

Steve Nelson, P.E.

Professional Engineer

253-848-6608 ext. 107