Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business

22 November 2022

City of Puyallup
Attn: Chris Beale
Senior Planner
(253) 841-5418
CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov

Project Name: East Town Crossing
Permit #: P-2-0034
Permit: Preliminary Site Plan
Subject: DRT Letter (3) Dated 18 August Responses

Team,

Please find below and attached information / plans / exhibits / reports regarding some questions, comments and request for information to approve and release the SEPA, Grading and TESC part of the project during the dry months.

Also: In the last DRT Letter there was plenty of information about codes for civil construction plans and during construction, permits fees and other items associated with later activities. We thank you for providing this updated information. To save some time, we acknowledge the codes and items as part of construction drawings and construction, and fees and cost so they have been left out of this response.

The following are comments provided by the City of Puyallup from the DRT Letter dated 18 August 2022 with our responses in **blue**. To assist your review process, we have categorized your questions with our responses by department below.

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

- Please provide responses to all Traffic comments/responses:

  Please note, the draft Development Agreement (P-19-0010) describes frontage improvements will not be constructed east of the E Pioneer driveway (item #5 of the BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY section). Without an approved development agreement authorizing the deviation from PCC 11.08.135, City municipal code will require frontage improvements along the entire length of E Pioneer frontage.
  Frontage improvements have been added east of the E Pioneer driveway. Please see the revised site plan.

  City will require a reduced speed school zone to be installed for Shaw Rd Elementary. The City has determined a reduced speed school zone on Shaw Rd is feasible. Design required during civil submittal. Coordinate with Engineering staff regarding equipment specs.
  Per PSDs support for bus stop locations on Shaw Rd. Design will be implemented at the time of Civil submittal.

  Civil plan set shall provide a detailed channelization plan for all striping & pavement markings in within ROW. All proposed striping shall meet City and MUTCD requirements. Plan shall include signage located in ROW. All City standard details related to pavement markings, striping, sign placement must be provided.
  At the time of civil submittal, channelization and striping plans will be provided.

Provide AutoTurn analysis for this radius (NBR movement from at Shaw Rd/E Pioneer) to ensure design vehicles can safely maneuver without impacting WBL turn pocket.
AutoTurn analysis has been provided for this radius see the plans.

Street lighting plan will be reviewed during civil review. Please reference "conditions" section for street lighting design requirements. Preliminary streetlight design does not meet City standards.
Acknowledge. Street lighting design will meet City Standards per Conditions section of this Traffic Review.

The E Pioneer curb alignment does not match Pioneer crossing offset. I estimate the curb alignment needs to shift 2ft toward roadway centerline. This will place the curb at approximately 34ft from centerline. Please see "conditions" section for more details.

Per previous comment, ROW dedication on E Pioneer needs clarification. City estimates that only 52.5ft (from centerline) is needed along frontage. However, 56ft (from centerline) is shown.

On the east side of the E Pioneer driveway, the creek alignment needs to shift approximately 2ft south of current location (match offset/alignment on the west side of the driveway). This will avoid conflicts with future frontage improvements.

Per previous comments, sight distance analysis required at the E Pioneer driveway per City Standards. ESD of 415ft is required at this driveway. Assume 14.5ft setback from the E Pioneer curb alignment (west side only) and 3.5ft driver eye height. It appears there's a pedestrian barricade and a fence that will obstruct sight distance here.

Please reference/respond to Engineering comments regarding the radius design at the E Pioneer driveway.

Per previous comments, the channelization plan for E Pioneer needs to provide the following information:

1. Applicant will need to verify there's adequate ROW to accommodate paved offsite taper.
2. Applicant to verify paved transition will provide adequate utility pole clearance from the travel lane.

Bus Stop 2A & 2B are not feasible. These locations will cause significant sight distance hazard for vehicles entering E Pioneer from site driveway. Please clarify if on-site school bus access is necessary. Email from PSD (9/21/22) seemed to indicate they do not want internal bus access.
Per PSDs support for bus stop locations on Shaw Rd. Design will be implemented at the time of Civil submittal. See the email from PSD and the exhibit that they support. Onsite PSD bus access will be for ADA use only.

- **TIA Comments:**
  Please see the revised TIA report prepared by Heath Traffic dated 09.21.22.for responses specifically addressing these comments.
  Unserved demand was not included in the analysis. This is critical for intersections along Shaw Road, specially at cross streets of Pioneer and 23rd Ave SE
  - This is why their analysis shows the southbound approach at Shaw/23rd Ave SE operating at LOS B

  Need to confirm that initial queue was included in the LOS and Delay calculations as per HCM 6 guidelines.

  The appendix shows a total of 142 trips (84 entering and 58 exiting) during the PM peak hour, after accounting for internal capture. However, Table 1 shows slightly different numbers.

For Simtraffic Queuing analysis, provide the details of “intervals and volume adjustments” used. Were The results based on multiple runs? If yes, how many?

- Was simtraffic analysis performed on an isolated intersection by removing all other intersections or was the simulation performed for the entire study area network?
- Consider performing simtraffic simulation for Shaw/Pioneer and two access intersections to determine if the queuing from Shaw/Pioneer spills back into project access intersections
- How does the AM peak northbound queue at Shaw/Pioneer impact Shaw/Pioneer Crossing Access? Report worst movement delay for side street stop controlled intersections instead of worst approach

Crosswalks should also be provided on the east and west legs at Shaw/Pioneer Crossing Access intersection.

Should analyze right-turn warrants during AM peak as well. The requirement for northbound right at Shaw/Pioneer Crossing Access should be checked against AM peak volumes and LOS, as northbound is predominant movement during AM peak. The northbound queue from Shaw/Pioneer will most likely spill back into Shaw/Pioneer Crossing Access.

Provide the “Lanes, Volumes, Timings” sheets in Synchro results appendix.

PREVIOUS DIRECTION FROM CITY:

Please see the revised TIA report prepared by Heath Traffic dated 09.21.22.for responses specifically addressing these comments.

Per previous comment the City did not receive an updated TIA to reflect the current site plan. The first/second TIA submittals (attached) assumed different land use assumptions and layouts compared to what is currently proposed. Here’s list of necessary updates:

First, the City needs to meet with your traffic consultant to discuss the updated TIA scope. An updated traffic scoping worksheet will be required prior to any work (Internal capture must be recalculated and approved by the City)

- All trip generation rates must be updated to the 11th edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual The 2023 horizon year is no longer accurate and must be updated
- 2015-2019 turning movement counts are too old to be used for a 2022 baseline analysis
- Post-COVID Traffic volumes have largely returned to normal in this area
- All study intersections must be re-counted to represent current conditions.
- To ensure unserved demand is captured in your delay analysis, existing queue lengths shall be captured as part of your updated data collection

Background projects must be reassessed Signalized intersection outbound channelization must be analyzed. Growth rate assumptions must be reassessed

Traffic analysis must evaluate impacts related to the following requirements described in our previous comment letter:

Based on comments received from the school district, this site will not receive bus service for students attending Shaw Rd Elementary. These students will be expected to walk. Based on the increase volume of elementary age students walking to Shaw Rd Elementary. The City will require the following modifications:

a. At the new traffic signal, an electronic blank-out sign shall be mounted on the eastbound signal pole that restricts eastbound “right turn on red” vehicle movement when pedestrians are using the crossing
b. Internal pedestrian paths will need to accommodate safe routing to the traffic signal.
c. Reduced Speed School Zone along Shaw Rd has been requested by the School District. If the City determines a reduced speed school zone is feasible/warranted for Shaw Rd Elementary, this mitigation will be required (to be installed by the East Town Crossing development).

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

- CRITICAL AREAS – STREAM BUFFER MITIGATION PLAN: Currently under review by city's critical areas consultant (Confluence). See 08/03/22 review letter in Portal.
  Please see the revised report prepared by Habitat Technologies. Note, per conversations with Chris Beale, the City understands that this report may be provided a week from the initial submittal

- CRITICAL AREAS – GEOTECHNICAL REVIEW: Soil liquefaction report being reviewed by Building Division.

- SEPA: The city's Safe Routes to Schools Plan indicates a need to slow and calm traffic on this high speed 5 lane arterial corridor; this project is within the walk distance of Shaw Road elementary - school children are expected to walk to and from the site to attend. The project is anticipated to be required through SEPA to mitigate existing unsafe conditions to allow safe walking for children residing in the area as a result of the project impacts. This may include speed zone signage off site, or some other form of improvements, in coordination with the School District, Public Works and the city Traffic Engineer. Please be aware this is anticipated to be a SEPA mitigation measure. 10' building setback from buffer. 10-foot building setback from all buffers required by PMC 21.06.840. [arch site plan sheet 1].
  In coordination with PSD, PSD supports bus stop locations to be located on Shaw Rd. Please see the included email and corresponding exhibit for the proposed locations and PSDs support. This plan includes using a proposed crosswalk on the south side of the Shaw Rd intersection. Speed zone signage per Traffic to be addressed at the time of Civil review.

- 10' building setback from buffer. 10-foot building setback from all buffers required by PMC 21.06.840. [arch site plan sheet 1.
  10' building setback has been added. Please see the site plan.

- Swale cannot conflict with site plan design principles and landscape code. Remaining questions about plantings to meet landscaping code.
  Swale is designed to handle offsite road stormwater runoff. The design intent of this swale is to mimic the stream restoration area plan as the stream does not extend all the way to the street corner and instead connects the City storm system via a culvert.

- RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN: Please remove the onsite school bus stop improvements, per the direction from PSD staff and city Traffic Engineer, provided on June 27. Provide frontage stop improvements per the same guidance provided.
  In coordination with PSD, PSD supports the onsite school bus stops for ADA use only. Regular bus stop locations will be located on Shaw Rd. Please see the included email and corresponding exhibit for the proposed locations and PSDs support.

- RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN: PMC 21.06.840 requires a 10' building setback from all critical area buffers
  10' building setback has been added. Please see the site plan.

- RM PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS – DENSITY BONUSES - UPDATED ANALYSIS AUGUST, 2022: The overall land area is now described as 8.67a, which allows a total of 139 total units (8.67 X 16 units/acre). However, land area on the open space calculation sheets still indicates 8.29a. Please provide correct calculations from a land surveyor.
  Lot calculations per our professional land surveyor are for the existing and proposed lots based on the submitted Short Plat Maps and recorded documents:
  Existing 7 Lots:
  - 0420264021: 90,934 SF | 2.088 acres
  - 0420264053: 202,699 SF | 4.653 acres
  - 0420264054: 43,339 SF | 0.995 acres

• 0420351030:		23,408 SF	|	0.537 acres
• 0420351029:		23,408 SF	|	0.537 acres
• 0420351026:		23,405 SF	|	0.537 acres
• 0420351066:		58,799 SF	|	1.350 acres
• TOTAL:		465,991 SF	|	10.697 acres

ROW Dedication Areas: (See Proposed Survey Base-Short Plat Lot Configuration Plan)

Multi-Family	Pioneer:	11,761 SF	|	0.269 acres
Commercial	Intersection:	8,032 SF	|	0.184 acres
Multi-Family	Shaw:	4,982 SF	|	0.114 acres
	TOTAL:	*24,775 SF*	|	*0.57 acres*

Proposed Lot 1 (Commercial):	*28,824 SF*	|	*0.66 acres*
Proposed Lot 2 (Commercial):	*50,896 SF*	|	*1.17 acres*
Proposed Lot 3 (Multi-Family):	*361,495 SF*	|	*8.30 acres*

Proposed Lot 1 + Lot 2 + ROW Ded. = 28,824 + 50,896 + 8,032 = 87,752 SF = 2.014 acres

Proposed Lot 3 + ROW Ded. = 361,495 + 11,761 + 4,982 = 378,238 SF = 8.683 acres

Nix Property Easement: 47,448 SF | *1.08 acres*
(AFN:202108080454)

Williams ROE Agreement Area: *11,377 SF* | *0.26 acres*
(AFN: 202202100364)

The overall land area for the multi-family site is 8.77 acres.
After the ROW dedication the multi-family area is 8.30 acres

8.3 acres * 16.00 units/acre = 133 units

Please see the provided Density Calculations Table and the Architectural breakdown sheets for the full breakdown.

CRITICAL AREA BUFFER DENSITY TRANSFER – UPDATED ANALYSIS AUGUST, 2022: To transfer the density from the off-site stream buffer, a permanent protective easement shall be established pursuant to PMC 21.06. – a copy must be provided with the preliminary site plan application for TPN 0420351000. The land area involved and shown in the June 29, 2022 indicates: 1.35 acres off-site RS-10 land area (4 units per acre) and .96 acres on site RM-20 land area in critical area and buffer.

- 1.35a X 4 units/a = 5 units X .25 bonus density transfer = 1.25 transfer density units
- .96a X 16 units/a = 15 units X .25 bonus density transfer = 4 transfer density units
- 5 units eligible for transfer from critical areas

A protective easement for this will be following final WDFW final approval for the HPA permit of the Stream Restoration Area the protective easement will be finalized for the area and then recorded with Pierce County for the area associated with TPN 0420351000. The wetland determination is still pending which may change buffers for this easement. It is preferable to wait until this has a final area prior to providing the protective easement.

Other notes:

- Please ensure the calculation does not include areas of buffer on CG zoned lands (the buffer calc. exhibit shows small area (roughly 1,100 square feet) on CG which cannot be used to transfer residential density). Is the area of the Williams pipeline on the far SE corner of the site plan a buffer area eligible for transfer?
  This area 3,658 SF is counted as part of critical area buffer.

OPEN SPACE BONUS – UPDATED ANALYSIS AUGUST, 2022: This bonus is related to centralized active open space above and beyond the required active amenity area required by 20.25.040(2)(A).T). The analysis shows the site qualifies for this bonus from a land area calculation. Please notes that active open space amenities will be checked at the final permit (civil) stage.

- 8.67a X 16 units = 139 units (base allowed by RM-20).
- 139 units X .15 bonus = 21 density units eligible for open space

Please see the provided Density Calculations Table and the Architectural breakdown sheets for the full breakdown.

PUBLIC TRANSIT: Bus stops for School District only will not count toward this requirement per the code text requirements for bonuses. An off-site public transit stop improvement will be required at the time of civils. City staff will facilitate the site location identification, as we have with other developments. The density bonus calculation is:

- 139 units X .05 = 7 units eligible for transit stop improvements.

Please see the provided Density Calculations Table and the Architectural breakdown sheets for the full breakdown.

ADA UNITS: Code requires: "Provision of handicapped accessible dwelling units and at least one parking stall per unit designated for handicapped use adjacent to the dwelling units such that 100% of said bonus units are in addition to the number required through the building code and Americans with Disabilities Act".

This is in addition to building code-required units – this needs to be verified with your architect. This also requires additional ADA parking stalls. The bonus is provided based on above and beyond the base building code requirements for ADA units. Your architect still needs to provide a memo documenting base IRC code requirements (X number of units), plus the 14 required based on the bonus (Y number of units) and show how the site meets the total (X + Y), as well as show that all ADA parking stalls are provided on the site plan. All bonus units must be Type A accessible.

Per the city's building code official's calculation, 9.3 units are required for the site. The calculation is based on the overall total units that would be permitted maximum, with the bonus applied. The density bonus calculation is 139 units X .10 = 13.9 units. The density bonus calculation is always based on the base quantity of units allowed by zoning, without any bonuses applied. The total number of type A accessible ADA units would therefore be 23.2, or 23 total units. The site plan presently indicates only 10 are provided. The project architect will need to provide 23 accessible parking stalls, and the appropriate number of van accessible stalls based on the IBC ratios. Some accessible stalls will need to be provided under carport cover. Please provide this in the architect's memo.

Please see the provided Density Calculations Table and the Architectural breakdown sheets for the full breakdown.

Max density calculation potential = 5 units (critical areas) + 21 (open space) + 7 (transit) + 14 (ADA) [not yet eligible - needs to be verified] = 47 bonus units potentially allowed, but not verified.

47 bonus units + 139 base (based on 8.67a land area - land area needs to be verified by a surveyor) = 186 units possible, but not verified as eligible without further analysis. The proposed 193 units exceeds the maximum cap with density bonuses, assuming the ADA units and parking stalls are provided to meet the density bonuses.

Please see the provided Density Calculations Table and the Architectural breakdown sheets for the full breakdown.

- ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW– COMMERCIAL: Provide analysis for PMC 20.26.300 (1)-(5), PMC 20.46 (SPO Overlay) and 20.30.037 (site plan design principles) related to the two commercial structures.

See the architectural memo that provided the analysis on the commercial design and how it meets the design standards and code requirements.

- COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN: A required plaza space on the lot 1 commercial building shall be located on the Shaw Road and Pioneer side per PMC 20.30.037; additional landscape area (min. 8 feet) shall be located between the plaza and the Shaw Road shared use path, with a large perpendicular access walkway connecting to the shared use path. Additional comments will occur at the time of civil.
  Site plan has been modified. Please see the site plan for how the corner and plaza design has been changed to meet the design standards and code requirements.

- OPEN SPACE AND SITE LAND AREA: Open space calculation sheets provided (dated 05/17/22) indicate the site is 8.29a. The density calculation now states the site is 8.67a; four different calculations have been provided since the last resubmittal. Please provide a sheet from your land surveyor with a certified letter from your surveyor, indicating the correct and true land area of the RM zoned land area.
  The full existing site area before the multi-family development is 8.68 acres for before the ROW dedication. The architectural site plan for the multi-family site is 8.30 acres after the ROW dedication. The 0.38 acres of discrepancy is because of the ROW dedication.
  See the Short Plat survey map for the calculated areas.

- LANDSCAPE: Please anticipate full comments at the time of civil permit on the overall landscape planting plans. Staff does not conduct full review at a preliminary site plan stage. However, some issues are noted right now that need to be accounted for in the design:
  - The landscaping in the roadside stream are not reconciled with the stream re-vegetation plan and critical areas ordinance; these areas must be entirely designed as a stream buffer (native plantings only), in accordance with the project biologist recommendations.
  - The swale / water quality features on the street frontage on Pioneer must meet the type II landscaping requirements (variety of shrubs and trees) and cannot be grasses/rushes/sedges only.
  - Additional silva cells will be required under parking stalls adjacent to each reduced landscape island to mitigate for lost planting area.
  - Additional density of plants and street trees required. Large trees must be used 25 ft OC. PSD school bus stop required back of walk. Please address at the time of civil permit. [landscape sheets, L1.1]

We anticipate full comments at the time of civil permit on the overall landscape planting plans.

- Landscape yard must be 12 ft along this portion of Shaw Road frontage. Please address at the time of civil permit. [landscape sheets, L1.1]
- Row of large shade trees required in this area along main drive aisle. Adjust walkway to place the 6 ft landscape buffer along curb with trees, shift walkway along fence line and away from curb line. Please address at the time of civil permit. [landscape sheets, L1.1]
- Add four large shade trees into the courtyard between buildings B and F to meet architectural design review. Please address at the time of civil permit. [landscape sheets, L1.2]
- All landscape islands shall have 3 silva cells on each side (6 total for each island, under parking stalls only) to compensate for reduced parking lot island sizes. Please address at the time of civil permit. [landscape sheets, L1.2]
- Adjust walkway interior to landscape to buffer walkway from main driveway. Please address at the time of civil permit. [landscape sheets, L1.3]
- Stream buffer area shall be landscaped in accordance with buffer mitigation plan from wetland biologist (native plantings only) [landscape sheets, L1.3]
- Add three large shade trees into the landscape areas around Building A to meet architectural design review. Please address at the time of civil permit. [landscape sheets, L1.2]
- 6'-6" [Landscape Sheets, L1.1]

Acknowledged. Landscape comments will be addressed at the time of civil permit

Engineering Review - Mark Higginson; (253) 841-5559; MHigginson@PuyallupWA.gov

Please see revised stormwater report and stormwater design sheet provided by McInnis Engineering addressing. Direct coordination with Mark Higginson we have prepared a preliminary drainage report and system that addresses the City's concerns.

- The City's recommendation would be to connect the existing grass-lined ditch east of the project site with the proposed stream to avoid mixing "clean" ditch runoff and "clean" stream water with the polluted road runoff...see additional review comments on Pioneer Basin Map, Appendix D. [Storm Report; Pg 5]
- This design approach appears to be recirculating stormwater between the splitter and the biocell see additional comments Pioneer Basin Map, Appendix D. [Storm Report; Pg 6]
- Since flow control (MR7) is triggered, is the biocell large enough to treat (MR6) the entire frontage basin? This would eliminate the need for the "splitter" structure. Also, see additional review comments on Pioneer Basin Map, Appendix D. [Storm Report; Pg 6]
- Clarify...is the intent to strip the site to these lower elevations? Considering the results of the PIT testing, its obvious that any existing soil above the "restrictive layer" elevation is also non-infiltrative. [Storm Report; Pg 6]
- Hard surfaces must be permeable to the extent feasible per MR5 List Option...essentially no run-on allowed. If the design intent is to meet the LID Performance Standard, then any concentrated infiltration facility (roof runoff) must meet Ecology's separation criteria. [Storm Report; Pg 7]
- Due to the minimal depth to the restrictive layer on this site, any infiltration facility other than permeable pavement will require a mounding analysis in accordance with Ecology 3.3.4. [Storm Report; Pg 8]
- Please be aware that discharging roof runoff to the permeable pavement reservoir course is only acceptable if there is adequate separation to the restrictive layer and an individual subbasin meets the LID Performance Standard, otherwise List 2 BMPs would apply. If List 2 applies, then roof runoff must be evaluated per MR5 BMPs. BMP T5.10A is not applicable (high density multi-family) then bioretention must be considered. If bioretention infeasible, then roof infiltration would require a minimum separation of 5ft to the restrictive layer...which is not possible based on the geotech analysis. (A separation down to 3ft would be allowed if supported by a mounding analysis). [Storm Report; Pg 8]
- Pond conversion area? [Storm Report; Pg 9]
- Revise per comments in Section 1 and on the individual basin maps. [Storm Report; Pg 9]
- Per Fig. F5, the biocell will remain saturated and not provide treatment. Revise accordingly. [Storm Report; Pg 9]
- This may be due to the pond filling with sediment as a result of the sidewall failure and lack of maintenance over the decades. [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- Please note that the converted pond must provide the same volumes and stages for both WQ an FC (not appropriate to match the existing pond condition for water quality). [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- Also need to account for wetpool storage for WQ (23,454cf below live storage per CES Design Report) [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- and 1/2-2yr event (ref. CES Para 3.4) [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- This is ok for the control riser, but both FC and WQ facility volumes must be "equivalent" to those in the CES Design Report. [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- In order to meet WQ, the dead storage must match the CES design, not the blown-out pond condition. CES WQ Storage = 23,454cf. [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- If this is the footprint, then only 8,192cf of WQ volume is provided. Need to match the CES Design WQ Volume of 23,454cf. [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- Once WQ wetpool volume (23454cf) is accounted for, will the same flow frequency results be obtained? [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- These WQ values have no meaning (hypothetical pond). Need to match the original CES design WQ volume to provide the same level of treatment at the time of the original pond approval. [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- Gravel Bed Footprint = 20,480sf

- Revise per review comments. [Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- Please label as "Dead Storage" (wetpool for WQ) [Storm Report; Pond Conv; Fig 3]
- Per CES design report, total dead storage below El 66.55 (70.05) for WQ should be 23,454cf. [Storm Report; Pond Conv; Fig 3]
- Adjust elevations for 3.5ft conversion factor from NGVD29 to NAVD88. [Storm Report; Pond Conv; Fig 3]
- Shouldn't this be zero (bottom of live storage)? [Storm Report; Fig 5}
- Shouldn't this be zero (bottom of live storage)? [Storm Report; Pond Conv; Fig 5]
- These WQ values have no meaning. WQ volume should be based on CES's original wetpond design (23,454cf) [Storm Report, Pond Conv; Fig 6]
- This appears to be the pond volumes based on the as-surveyed condition. The conversion design must match the FC volumes (and release rates) as well as the original WQ volume of 23,454cf. [Storm Report; Pond Conv; Fig 6]
- Match original WQ volume of 23, 454cf and account for the backfill void space. [Storm Report; Pond Conv; Fig 6]
- The City does not agree with the applicant's assertion that "the fact that the entire roof areas [sic] has been modeled to be dispersed to permeable pavement (concrete or asphalt) is the defining determination of feasibility". The Ecology Manual clearly states that concentrated stormwater intended to be infiltrated shall have a minimum separation to any restrictive layer of 5-feet unless a mounding analysis would support a separation down to 3-feet. Based on the recent PIT testing, the restrictive layer is essentially the existing ground surface, and considering the applicant's intention to import 1 to 3 feet of engineered fill, the minimum separation of 5-feet cannot be met…deeming the proposed Onsite stormwater plan not viable. The use of bioretention would allow a minimum separation of 1 to 3 feet depending on tributary area, but bioretention is no longer proposed for the Onsite stormwater design. In addition, due to the minimal depth to the restrictive layer on this site, the City will require a mounding analysis for any infiltration facility other than permeable pavement in accordance with Ecology Volume III, Section 3.3.4. Per previous review comment, prior to PSP approval, provide acknowledgement from a licensed geotechnical engineer that the proposed stormwater design is feasible considering the Ecology Manual separation requirements and the potential for mounding at locations where roof runoff is discharged into the permeable pavement reservoir course.
- The preliminary storm report indicates the use of run-on from conventional pavement drive aisles onto permeable pavement parking areas. The applicant is correct that BMP T5.15 Permeable Pavement "…does not state anywhere in the limitation and or design sections that Permeable Pavement MUST be used for pavement areas where feasible". However, Ecology Manual, Vol. I, Minimum Requirement 5 (MR5) specifies "Where pavement is proposed, it must be permeable to the extent feasible unless full dispersion is employed". Since the applicant is proposing permeable pavement on imported engineered fill as feasible on the parking areas of the project site, then it is obvious that permeable pavement would also be feasible on the drive aisles and walking paths which are also intended to be constructed on imported fill. The applicant's misunderstanding of the context of BMP T5.15 warrants clarification. Run-on onto permeable pavement areas is allowed by the Ecology Manual…provided, the proposed project demonstrates compliance with the LID Performance Standard. Otherwise, MR5 List 2 governs and the project must provide permeable pavement where feasible. As of this writing, the preliminary storm reports submitted to date have not provided sufficient information that would support a conclusion of complying with the LID Performance Standard considering the minimum separation requirements necessary for infiltrating roof runoff. In accordance with prior review comments, and prior to PSP approval, revise the stormwater design to either comply with the LID Performance Standard, provide permeable pavement where feasible, or justify a finding of infeasibility.
- The proposed Pioneer Way bioswale detail (Storm Report, Figure F5) indicates the outlet to be approximately 1.2 feet above the bottom of the swale resulting in standing water within the bioswale. Per Ecology, the bioswale must drain within 48 hours to ensure water quality viability. Since this bioswale is also a flow control facility, please revise the bioswale design to ensure the proposed Pioneer Way stormwater design is viable.
- The preliminary storm report indicates the use of run-on onto permeable pavement areas. Please

be aware that permeable pavement must be used for any pavement areas "where feasible" if choosing the MR5 List Option rather than the LID Performance Standard. If the design intent is to meet the LID Performance Standard, then any concentrated infiltration facility (roof runoff) must meet Ecology's separation criteria. [Storm Report; Cover]

- 6.03ac per 2002 CES Design Report. [Storm Report; Pg3]
- Discuss existing floodplain and status of flood study. [Storm Report; Pg 3]
- Note: Any storm facility serving public infrastructure must be located in ROW or located in a tract dedicated to the City. [Storm Report; Pg 6]
- 60-in shown on Fig A4 [Storm Report; Pg6]
- Provide FEMA floodplain map for the project site. [Storm Report; Appendix A]
- WQ Volume required = 23, 454cf No Good.[Storm Report; Pond Conv]
- Due to depth of groundwater (El 70.63) and the history of failures associated with clay liners in saturated conditions, a synthetic liner shall be used. [Storm Report; Pond Conv; Fig 9]
- Min. wetpool storage for WQ is 23,454cf below live storage per CES design report) [Storm Report; Pond Conv, Fig 9]
- Liner must be impervious due to groundwater levels onsite. [Storm Report; Pond Conv.; Fig 9]
- At time of civil application, the lower arm of the control riser shall extend 2-ft below the Dead Storage elevation. [Storm Report; Pond Conv; Fig 9]
- 6.03ac per 2002 CES Design Report. [Storm Report; Fig. B2]
    - Will WDFW allow easterly grass-lined ditch to tie directly to stream (existing conditions) and avoid mixing "clean" ditch runoff and stream with the PGIS frontage? -If WDFW does not allow the ditch-to-stream connection, then construct the proposed conveyance pipe to align with the storm main along the frontage. [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
    - Not sure how this works...it appears that the stream culvert, frontage storm main, and biocell outlet pipe all enter the "splitter structure"? If so, then the biocell stormwater is simply being recirculated from/to the splitter. [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- Existing stub...best place to discharge biocell into downstream system if doable. (May be worthwhile to rerun a new pipe to the Biocell. [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- New structure required if connection to existing stub (if in sidewalk, address ADA at time of civil). [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- Easement requird for any public storm infrastructure not in ROW.[Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- Is it possible to inlet easterly frontage flows across stream culvert using DI and 1-ft cover to avoid mixing the PGIS w/ the stream; then gutter flow only to westerly CB and 2nd Biocell inlet? This would allow the stream and easterly ditch to bypass the frontage storm facility altogether [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map
- Based on pipe alignment shown and the flow splitter detail, it seems the polluted road water is mixing with the clean stream water prior to the road water being treated. If doable, the stream should be isolated from the PGIS until after treatment of the road runoff. [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- Since flow control is triggered, is the biocell large enough to treat all of the frontage basin? This would eliminate the need for a splitter structure. [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- At time of civil, locate storm main at proposed curb alignment per standards. Provide stub and cap for future connection. [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- Stub and cap if WDFW allows ditch connection to stream.[Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- Clarify...vault is connected to POC, but it appears that the vault is discharging back into the flow splitter per the Bioswale Detail Sheet. [Storm Report; Fig. D3]
- Please be aware that discharging roof runoff to the permeable pavement reservoir course is only acceptable if there is adequate separation to the restrictive layer and an individual subbasin meets the LID Performance Standard, otherwise List 2 BMPs would apply. If List 2 applies, then roof runoff must be evaluated per MR5 BMPs. BMP T5.10A is not applicable (high density multi-family) then bioretention must be considered. If bioretention infeasible, then roof infiltration would require a minimum separation of 5ft to the restrictive layer...which is not possible based on the geotech analysis. (A separation down to 3ft would be allowed if supported by a mounding analysis). [Storm Report; Onsite Basin Map]

- Due to the minimal depth to the restrictive layer on this site, any infiltration facility other than permeable pavement will require a mounding analysis in accordance with Ecology Vol. III, Section 3.3.4. [Storm Report; Onsite Basin Map]
- Drive aisles must be permeable if feasible per Ecology MR5 [Storm Report; Onsite Basin Map]
- It is unclear where/how the stream culvert enters along with the road frontage conveyance pipe and the bioswale outlet pipe (see Fig. D1). How does the combined volume of the stream and easterly ditch compare to the frontage volume? It would seem that the frontage runoff would be significantly diluted prior to being treated. [Storm Report; Fig. F4]
- This area differs from the biocell shown on the Basin Map. [Storm Report; Bioswale Details]
- Standing Water Elevation...won't drain down w/in 48hrs. Redesign accordingly. [Storm Report; Bioswale Details]
- Any storm facility serving public infrastructure must be in ROW or a tract dedicated to the City. [Storm Report; Bioswale Details]
- Culvert appears to conflict with the existing power pole. [Storm Report; Pioneer Basin Map]
- The stream realignment is subject to the review and approval of the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Prior to Preliminary Site Plan approval, the applicant shall acknowledge that the WDFW conditions of approval may revise the proposed stream realignment which in turn could necessitate revisions to the site plan currently being considered under this application. [Site Plan Part 1-Pioneer Frontage Storm Plan; Pg 79]
- The December 2021 resubmittal has proposed a realignment of the regulated stream that runs along the east property line which currently discharges to the existing Pioneer Way ditch. The applicant is aware that the stream realignment is subject to the review and approval of the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Prior to Preliminary Site Plan approval, the applicant shall acknowledge that the WDFW conditions of approval may revise the proposed stream realignment which in turn could necessitate revisions to the site plan currently being considered under this application.
- Per City Standards, the easterly Pioneer Way curb radius must align with future curb extension. If non- standard design is desired, then City Engineer approval must be obtained using the AMR process prior to Preliminary Site Plan approval.
- Depending on the outcome of the City Engineer's decision, if the non-standard curb radius AMR is not approved, then the existing power pole must be relocated to the future planter strip area. If the AMR is approved, there must be a minimum of 4-ft separation between the travel lane and face of pole while meeting City Standard taper requirements. If 4-ft cannot be provided, the power pole must be relocated.
- Per MTC report dated April 13, 2022, Falling Head tests were conducted. [MTC Letter 6/30/22; Pg 5]
- Also, adequate separation [MTC Letter 6/30/22; Pg 5]
- Krazan subsequently revised the groundwater depth to 3ft bgs based on monitoring well results. [MTC Letter 6/30/22; Pg 6]
- A revised stormwater report and preliminary storm design was not provided with this submittal. See prior stormwater review comments outlined in DRT letter dated May 6, 2022. [Prelim Civil Drawings Part 1; Cover Sheet]
- At time of civil application, emphasize the grading aspects of the project and minimize the other backgrounds (buildings, utilities, amenities, etc.) for legibility.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Grading Master Plan]
- At time of civil application, emphasize the grading aspects of the project and minimize the other backgrounds (buildings, utilities, amenities, etc.) for legibility.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Grading Plan West]
- At time of civil application, emphasize the grading aspects of the project and minimize the other backgrounds (buildings, utilities, amenities, etc.) for legibility.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Grading Plan East]
- At time of civil application, emphasize the storm design and minimize the other backgrounds (buildings, other utilities, amenities, etc.) for legibility.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Master Plan]
- Per prior comment, DRT letter dated May 6, 2022: The preliminary storm report indicates the use

of run-on onto permeable pavement areas. Please be aware that permeable pavement must be used for any pavement areas "where feasible" if choosing the MR5 List Option rather than the LID Performance Standard. If the design intent is to meet the LID Performance Standard, then any concentrated infiltration facility (roof runoff) must meet Ecology's separation criteria.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Master Plan]

- An updated storm design and report was not provided with this resubmittal. As discussed in the DRT letter dated May 6, 2022, as well as multiple meetings, the proposed storm design does not meet current regulations and must be revised prior to preliminary site plan approval. The Ecology Manual clearly states that concentrated stormwater (roof runoff) intended to be infiltrated shall have a minimum separation to any restrictive layer of 5-feet unless a mounding analysis would support a separation down to 3-feet. Based on submitted PIT test results, the restrictive layer is essentially the existing ground surface, and considering the applicant?s intention to import 1 to 3 feet of engineered fill, the minimum separation of 5-feet cannot be met…deeming the proposed Onsite stormwater plan not viable.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Master Plan]
- In addition to Ecology criteria, the storm outlet design is subject to WDFW conditions and approval. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Master Plan]
- If this is intended to be a combined water quality and flow control facility, the design must adhere to Ecology criteria outlined in Ecology Manual Vol V for combined facilities, i.e., 2 cell design for WQ, etc. Similarly, the design must meet the WQ treatment and detention volumes of the original, approved, CES design. See prior comments in the Storm Report dated December 15, 2021. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Master Plan]
- Gravel Bed porosity to be verified at time of civil application. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Master Plan]
- Per prior review comment, culvert appears to conflict with the existing power pole. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Master Plan]
- Per prior review comments, indicated the methodology of flow control for building structures considering the Ecology Manual minimum separation requirements for infiltrating concentrated storm runoff and/or retention facilities.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Master Plan]
- At time of civil application, emphasize the storm design and minimize the other backgrounds (buildings, other utilities, amenities, etc.) for legibility.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Plan West]
- At time of civil application, emphasize the storm design and minimize the other backgrounds (buildings, other utilities, amenities, etc.) for legibility.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Plan East]
- Outlet to stream subject to WDFW requirements. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Profiles]
- Per prior comment, DRT letter dated May 6, 2022: Liner must be impervious due to groundwater levels onsite. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Detention Plan]
- Per prior comment, DRT letter dated May 6, 2022: Min. wetpool storage for WQ is 23,454cf below live storage per CES design report. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Detention Plan]
- Wetpool storage volume for WQ must account for the porosity of the glass backfill. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Detention Plan]
- Per prior comment, DRT letter dated May 6, 2022: At time of civil application, the lower arm of the control riser shall extend 2-ft below the Dead Storage elevation (per Ecology requirements). [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Detention Plan]
- Per prior comment, DRT letter dated May 6, 2022: Due to depth of groundwater (El 70.63) and the history of failures associated with clay liners in saturated conditions, a synthetic liner shall be used. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Detention Plan]
- If this is intended to be a combined water quality and flow control facility, the design must adhere to Ecology criteria outlined in Ecology Manual Vol V for combined facilities, i.e., 2 cell design for WQ, etc. Similarly, the design must meet the WQ treatment and detention volumes of the original, approved, CES design. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Detention Plan]
- This is confusing. What is meant by Treatment Liner? There is no infiltration to subgrade, so no treatment capability through the liner, and the original design was based on WQ wetpool volume. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Storm Detention Plan]
- Per prior comment, DRT letter dated May 6, 2022: The preliminary storm report indicates the use

of run-on onto permeable pavement areas. Please be aware that permeable pavement must be used for any pavement areas "where feasible" if choosing the MR5 List Option rather than the LID Performance Standard. If the design intent is to meet the LID Performance Standard, then any concentrated infiltration facility (roof runoff) must meet Ecology's minimum separation criteria.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Aisle/Pervious/Roof Drain Exhibit]

- Per prior comment, DRT letter dated May 6, 2022: Please be aware that discharging roof runoff to the permeable pavement reservoir course is only acceptable if there is adequate separation to the restrictive layer and an individual subbasin meets the LID Performance Standard, otherwise List 2 BMPs would apply. If List 2 applies, then roof runoff must be evaluated per MR5 BMPs. BMP T5.10A is not applicable (high density multi-family) then bioretention must be considered. If bioretention infeasible, then roof infiltration would require a minimum separation of 5ft to the restrictive layer...which is not possible based on the geotech analysis. (A separation down to 3ft would be allowed if supported by a mounding analysis). [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Aisle/Pervious/Roof Drain Exhibit]
- Drive aisles must be permeable if feasible per Ecology MR5. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Aisle/Pervious/Roof Drain Exhibit]
- Refer to APWA GSPs for permeable pavement design criteria. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Aisle/Pervious/Roof Drain Exhibit]
- Refer to APWA GSPs for permeable pavement design criteria. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Aisle/Pervious/Roof Drain Exhibit]
- Refer to APWA GSPs for permeable pavement design criteria. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Shaw Storm Details]
- Per prior review comments, face of existing light standard must be 24in (min) from face of curb. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Shaw Storm Details]
- Sidewalk should be permeable if feasible. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Pioneer Storm Details]
- Min. 4-ft clear zone required between existing pole and travel lane. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Pioneer Storm Details]
- See prior review comments in the Preliminary Storm Report dated December 15, 2021 and DRT letter dated May 6, 2022 for requested frontage revision and alignment.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Pioneer Frontage Storm Plan]
- Per prior review comments outlined in the DRT letter dated May 6, 2022, the stream realignment is subject to the review and approval of the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Prior to Preliminary Site Plan approval, the applicant shall acknowledge that the WDFW conditions of approval may revise the proposed stream realignment which in turn could necessitated revisions to the site plan currently being considered under this application. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Pioneer Frontage Storm Plan]
- Per prior review comments outlined in the DRT letter dated May 6, 2022, it appears the existing power pole conflicts with the proposed stream culvert. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 1; Pioneer Frontage Storm Plan]
- See prior review comments in the Preliminary Storm Report dated December 15, 2021 and DRT letter dated May 6, 2022 for requested frontage revision and alignment.[Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 2; Pioneer Frontage Storm Plan]
- Per prior review comment, Standing Water Elevation...won't drain down w/in 48hrs. Redesign accordingly. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 2; Pioneer Frontage Storm Details]
- See prior review comments in the storm report dated December 15, 2021. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 2; Pioneer Frontage Storm Details]
- See prior review comments outlined in the Preliminary Storm Report dated December 15, 2021 and the DRT letter dated May 6, 2022. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 2; Pioneer Frontage Storm Details]
- See prior review comments on the Water Master Plan previous submittal and DRT letter dated May 6, 2022. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 2; Water Master Plan]
- This is a duplicate of Sheet 10 of 21, this packet. [Prelim Civil Drawings Part 2; Sanitary Sewer Master Plan Sheet 16]
- See prior review comments on the Shaw Frontage Plan previous submittal and DRT letter dated May 6, 2022. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 2; Shaw Frontage Plan]

- See prior review comments on the Pioneer Frontage Plan previous submittal and DRT letter dated May 6, 2022. [Prelim. Civil Drawings Part 2; Pioneer Frontage.
-

Please see revised stormwater report and stormwater design sheet provided by McInnis Engineering addressing. Direct coordination with Mark Higginson we have prepared a preliminary drainage report and system that addresses the City's concerns.

Building Review - Janelle Montgomery; (253) 770-3328; JMontgomery@PuyallupWA.gov

- A) Plans would need to be complete at the time of submittal with all building, plumbing, mechanical, truss specs stamped by the truss engineer and showing all current 2018 I-codes.
  B) Include 2018 Washington State Energy code items and supporting reports for new construction.
  C) This is not a complete plan review but informational only. No other Building items at this time. Contact me for any clarification of building requirements.

Acknowledged. Comments will be addressed at time of buildings permit.

- SHEET 4/74 ARCHITECTURAL_R2: Provide complete calculations per note "SEE FRONTAGE CALCULATIONS FOR AREA INCREASE ON SHEET #AG1.2". Sheets are not labeled and did not find any calculations to support proposed increases for each building. Identify areas claiming as yards as unable to confirm "modifications to the base allowable area" based on what is shown on page 4 of 74.

STANDARD COMMENTS

- Building plans will need to be complete with all building, mechanical, plumbing, energy code items and accessibility requirements that may apply on the plans for complete review during Building permit application. All building code related eliminates will be reviewed to codes during building plan review.
- The truss specs will also be required with the truss engineers' stamps and a layout that matches the submitted plans at the time of submittal.
- The R-2 apartments are required to have the infrastructure in place for charging stations per IBC section 429 Washington State amendments and will need to be shown on the plans.
- Apartments are required to have Type A & B units for accessibility, and this will need to be clearly depicted on the plans.
- Plans will need to be per the applicable codes 2018 adopted February 1, 2021, for all permits.
- All electrical is permitted by the Washington State Department of L & I.
- Accessible parking and access to the public way will be required. For all accessible requirements the City adopted the 2018 IBC / WAC 51-50 and the ICC A117.1-2009 standard.
- Please reach out to me if I can answer any other questions in relationship to Building code items for this project.
- Architectural plans must detail compliance for Electrical Vehicle charging:

Fire Review – Ray Cockerham; (253) 841-5585; RayC@PuyallupWA.gov

- 3. Frontage Fire Hydrants outside the fencing shall be separate from required internal Fire Hydrants.
  - Abbey Response: Clarification needed. Does this say that we must tap these hydrants in right of way hydrants off the main line in each street? This would be very costly and a traffic nightmare? Or is the comment we need additional Hydrants in the Right of Way and we cannot count the Right of way in the requirements to meet spacing and distance requirements.
  - City Note: The hydrants required by standard and code in the ROW need to be served from the public main. Please consult development engineering for details regarding codes and standards. This item will has been moved to a separate review line and remains outstanding.

CONDITIONS

Engineering Division – Mark Higginson; 2538415559; MHigginson@PuyallupWA.gov

- General: See engineering markups on the preliminary site plans that were submitted with ARG's cover letter dated December 22, 2021; and the preliminary civil plans submitted with ARG's cover letter dated June 29, 2022.

CONDITIONS (TRAFFIC): Bryan Roberts; (253) 841-5542; broberts@PuyallupWA.gov

Traffic Impact fees (TIF) will be assessed in accordance with fees adopted by ordinance, per PMC 21.10.
Impact Fees will be paid at the time of building permit application or whenever it is required.

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
Impact Fees will be paid at the time of building permit application or whenever it is required.

Park impact fees shall be charged per new dwelling unit based on its size. Fees are assessed in accordance with fees adopted by ordinance, per PMC 21.10.
Impact Fees will be paid at the time of building permit application or whenever it is required.

School impact fees shall be paid directly to the school district in accordance with adopted fee at the time of collection by the District.
Impact Fees will be paid at the time of building permit application or whenever it is required.

Per Puyallup Municipal Code Section 11.08.130, 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. Based on the materials submitted, the applicant would be expected to construct half-street improvements on the following streets:

a) E Pioneer is designated as a major arterial roadway, consisting of curb, gutter, 10' planter strips, 8' sidewalks, and City standard streetlights every 150ft.
b) The east leg of the Shaw/Pioneer intersection was designed to accommodate 5 lanes of traffic (56ft throat) to align with the existing channelization on west side of Shaw Rd. The curb line along the south side of E Pioneer frontage shall continue this alignment heading East (approximately 34ft from centerline). This will require roadway widening to accommodate this alignment.
c) Sidewalks and planter strips will not be required east the E Pioneer driveway. However, ROW dedication will be required to facilitate future improvements.
d) A TWLTL is required along the E Pioneer frontage (minimum 75ft on either side of driveway).
e) Paved transitions off-site will be required for safety reasons.
f) Shaw Rd is designated as a major arterial. Per our comprehensive plan, this section of Shaw Rd shall be constructed with a shared use path along the entire length of frontage. The dimensions and materials shall match the existing Shaw Rd shared use path constructed between 23rd Ave SE & Manorwood Dr.
g) As part of these improvements, additional right-of-way (ROW) may need to be dedicated to the City.

During civil review, City staff shall review street tree placement, monument signage, fences, etc. to ensure required sight distance requirements are met.
Acknowledged to be addressed during civil review.

Site access driveways shall meet our minimum commercial driveway requirements (35ft curb radius, 30ft width). This could change based on design vehicles used for the AutoTurn.

Site access restrictions:

a) No SBL movement at traffic signal
b) E Pioneer Driveway Driveway can remain full access as shown with the following conditions:
    1. Driveway spacing from Shaw Rd remains as shown on the current site plan
    2. TWLTL extending 75ft on either side of driveway (within E Pioneer)
    3. Entering sight distance standards are met to allow outbound left turns.
    4. At the City's full discretion, outbound left turns from the proposed E Pioneer driveway can be restricted in the future. The following statement will be placed on the face of the short plat:
        a. "At the discretion of the City, the City may restrict outbound left turns from the E Pioneer access in the future. At the request of the City, the Owners, Heirs, Successors and Assigns agree to renovate and/or improve the driveway access in accordance with the City of Puyallup Municipal Code and Engineering Standards."

At the time of civil permit review provide a separate street lighting plan and pavement striping plan (channelization) sheet for the City to review.

a) Street lighting plan:
    I. City standard streetlights are required every 150ft along E Pioneer frontage.
    II. E Pioneer (Arterial) will require GE EVOLVE ELR2 Fixtures ERL2-3-23-A3-40-D-Gray-A-V1 (City to provide latest part numbers)
    III. The existing service cabinet at the E Pioneer/Shaw Rd traffic signal has capacity to power the E Pioneer streetlights.
    IV. City would allow new streetlights to be installed on the north side of E Pioneer to avoid overhead utility conflicts.
    V. If the applicant choses to install streetlights on the south side of E Pioneer, it is the sole responsibility of the design engineer to ensure streetlight design/placement is outside of the 10ft minimum "safe zone" area. The City will not allow streetlights to be within 10ft of the PSE primary for safety reasons.
    VI. Streetlights shall have shorting caps installed with remote photocell located on the service cabinet.
    VII. The existing PSE utility pole mounted streetlight does not meet current City standards and will be removed with installation of City standard streetlights.
    VIII. Streetlight design shall provide the following:
        1. Provide details on how streetlights will be powered
        2. Location of conduit runs
        3. a. Conduit size and Wiring type for each Schedule raceway
           b. Conductors details
        4.a. STA & Pole offset for each schedule luminaire
        5. Show location of junction boxes
b) Channelization + signage plan:
    I. Shaw Rd/E Pioneer traffic signal may require striping and signage modifications based on the design of the E Pioneer frontage/driveway.
    II. The new Shaw Rd traffic signal will also require striping and signage modifications.
    III. Pavement markings approaching traffic signal shall be thermoplastic

Acknowledged, street lighting plan included and addressed during civil review.

Traffic Signal Modifications:

a) The Shaw Rd access intersection (signal) will require modifications to accommodate the proposed driveway. The applicant will coordinate with the City's Adaptive Signal Contractor to purchase/install/configure proprietary equipment.
b) Signal designer will implement modifications to the westbound and eastbound approach:
    I. Signal heads + phases
    II. Flashing yellow arrows
    III. Left turn phases
    IV. Striping/channelization modifications - Channelization shall match the assumptions outlined in the TIA
c) The applicant will install a new crosswalk at this signal to accommodate pedestrians

crossing Shaw Rd. At this location, only one crosswalk will be allowed to cross Shaw Rd.

d) Crosswalk will be installed on the south leg of the intersections (see additional requirements below).
e) The required signal/intersection modifications must be fully configured and operational no less than 2 weeks prior to receiving occupancy for any building on-site. Adaptive signal contractor (Rhythm Engineering) will be required to configure the adaptive system onsite.
f) At the SE corner of the new Shaw Rd access location, adequate ROW must be dedicated, or an easement granted for signal maintenance purposes.

TENW is currently preparing the traffic signal modifications plans and will be incorporated into the Civil Design for the Civil Construction Submittal.

Based on comments received from the school district, this site will not receive bus service for students attending Shaw Rd Elementary. These students will be expected to walk. Based on the increase volume of elementary age students walking to Shaw Rd Elementary. The City will require the following modifications:

a) At the new traffic signal, an electronic blank-out sign shall be mounted on the eastbound signal pole that restricts eastbound "right turn on red" vehicle movement when pedestrians are using the crossing
b) Internal pedestrian paths will need to accommodate safe routing to the traffic signal.
c) Reduced Speed School Zone along Shaw Rd has been requested by the School District. If the City determines a reduced speed school zone is feasible/warranted for Shaw Rd Elementary, this mitigation will be required (to be installed by the East Town Crossing development).

Per PSDs support for bus stop locations on Shaw Rd. Design will be implemented at the time of Civil submittal. See the email from PSD and the exhibit that they support.

Thank you for your time and dedication of your time on this project.
Please let us know if you need any other information or if you have comments or questions.

Have a happy thanksgiving,

Gil Hulsmann
CEO - Director of Land Development Services
Abbey Road Group Land Development Services Company, LLC
253-435-3699 Phone (ext 101)
253-446-3159 Fax
253-405-1246 Cell
Gil.Hulsmann@AbbeyRoadGroup.com
www.abbeyroadgroup.com