



November 7, 2022

Nate Morgan
Public Works Director

Subject: Response to City review comments of Sky Valley Transportation Co-Op

General

1. Previous Comment: Per checklist plan sheet requirements, include the following:

a. Existing easement dimensions for access easement.

Added easement dimensions from the survey.

b. Please show and callout City cemetery maintenance equipment on plans. Area is not apparent.

Area is indicated.

C2.0 (SWPPP)

2. Previous Comment: Please have geotechnical engineer revise the submitted email for typo to indicate disturbance in setback is allowed.

See updated email as part of submittal.

C4.0 (Storm Drainage)

3. Previous Comment: Per 5-07 of EDDS, all catch basins and manholes must be per WSDOT standards, please indicate on the plans.

Added a note about catchbasins and manholes.

4. Previous Comment: Interceptor trench appears to act as an infiltration trench. Please size the infiltration trench accordingly using WWHM or guidelines set forth in BMP T5.10A and Figure V-4.2.

Added discussion in upstream narrative and sizing calculations in the Appendix of the drainage report.

5. Please revise the bioretention cell detail to be in compliance with the EDDS and DOE manuals. Please include width.

Added 3" coarse compost.

6. Per 5-12 of EDDS, bioretention facilities shall not be located within 200 feet of the top of an erosion hazard area or a landslide hazard area unless a geotechnical analysis shows that no slope instability will result. Please provide a geotechnical analysis supporting the bioretention facility location.

See response letter from GeoTest Services, Inc.

C4.1 (Storm Drainage)

7. Previous Comment: Per 5-14D of EDDS, minimum aggregate for infiltration trench is 1.5" diameter and maximum if 3", Gravel Backfill for Drains per WSDOT as called out on plans does not meet this requirement.

See response letter from GeoTest Services, Inc. The WSDOT callout is used on all of our infiltration trenches, even those on Snohomish County projects. It has been successful for years.

P:\Work\Projects\2020\20-381 Johansson\SUB\2022-11-07 Resubmittal\Comment Response Letter.docx

EVERETT
2822 Colby Ave, Suite 300
Everett, WA 98201
425-252-1884

MONROE
PO Box 516
Monroe, WA 98272
360-794-7811

MOUNT VERNON
603 South First Street
Mount Vernon, WA 98273
360-336-9199

OAK HARBOR
840 SE 8TH Avenue, Ste. 102
Oak Harbor, WA 98277
360-675-5973

8. Previous Comment: Per 5-14D of EDDS, geosynthetic shall surround all of the aggregate fill material except for the top one-foot, which is placed over the geosynthetic. Please revise infiltration trenches. *See response letter from GeoTest Services, Inc. Having geotextile on the bottom of the facility is generally not preferred for ex-filtrating systems as it could lead to plugging. We use geotextile on the sides and top to prevent migration of fines into the rock. The top layer is at the top of rock to provide that separation between the soil and rock. If the rock layer went fully to the surface, we would place geotextile 1 foot below to protect the geotextile since there is no soil to keep separate. Again, this is common for underground trenches and is performed on Snohomish County projects without comment.*

C5.0 (Grading & Paving)

9. Previous Comment: Section view of 329th Ave paving references section #2, dimensions are incorrect on section #2. Please revise reference.

Updated to remove that reference as there was already a paving depth reference.

Stormwater Report

10. Previous Comment: Frontage improvements do not appear to infiltrate through infiltration galleries and do not appear to be included in WWHM modeling to be shown as flow control exempt. Please provide exemption for frontage improvements.

The frontage improvements along Cascade View Drive are in a super section with all roadway flow draining to the north. The new landscape and sidewalk that are being added drain onto the site and thus are included in the site sizing calculations. This was not shown correctly on the frontage section and is not updated to reflect the grading. Discussion has been added to the MR 7 text.

11. The dimensions of the bioretention facility and the first gravel trench bed 1 do not match the dimensions shown on the plans. Please revise the plans for consistency or the WWHM calculations. *WWHM does not allow for complex shapes in sizing. The WWHM calculation gives a minimum bottom area, in this case 335 sf. The Plans then meet or exceed that same bottom area. For the gravel trench, it is much the same, the area is key. The WWHM has 80x10 which is 800 sf. The Plans have 70x12 for 840 sf. There is actually additional storage and infiltrative area in the plans.*

This concludes the response to comments. Let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

David W Harmsen

David Harmsen, PE
Project Engineer