



DAVID EVANS
& ASSOCIATES

July 5, 2016

Andrea Flower
City of Lake Forest Park
Planning & Building Dept.
17425 Ballinger Way NE
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

SUBJECT: LaBossiere Short Plat (2016-SP-003) - Review Comment Responses

Dear Ms. Flower,

We have reviewed the comments from PACE in the letter dated June 7th, 2016 and offer the following responses in italics below:

PACE Engineers, Inc.:

City Engineering Consultant: John Forba, P.E.

Phone: (425) 827-2014

E-mail: Johnf@paceengrs.com

We have completed the review of the plans for the above project and have determined that additional information is required. Attached are sets of marked-up plans and Technical Information Report (TIR). Below are the following comments for the developer:

TIR

1. In multiple locations throughout the report, references were made to the 2005 King County Stormwater Design Manual (KCSWDM). Per Lake Forest Park Municipal Code (LFPMC) 16.08.030, the City has adopted the 2009 KCSWDM. Please revise.
The report has been changed to reference the 2009 King County Stormwater Design Manual (KCSWDM).
2. In the offsite analysis, references are made to a "control structure" on NE 190th near 34th Ave. NE. This nomenclature is commonly accepted as a structure that restricts flow in some fashion be it a weir, riser with one or more orifices or the like. Please confirm that this structure does in fact control flow rates.
The structure previously referred to as a control structure is now referred to as a catch basin; the structure on NE 190th near 24th Ave NE does not appear to restrict flow.



DAY & BLANKS
ASSOC. INC.

3. In flow control and water quality design section, there is a reference to an infiltration rate of 2.0"/hr found in Appendix G in the Geotechnical Report. In Appendix G however, there is no infiltration rate given and the statement "In-situ testing can be performed to refine/confirm long-term infiltration rates". Please provide this information.
A Bioretention Evaluation report from Earth Solutions NW has been added in Appendix G. An infiltration rate of 4 inches per hour has been provided for preliminary design. A new WWHM report was generated and is included as Report #2 in Appendix F.
4. In Appendix G, Geotechnical Report, the subsurface excavations show that test pit 6 (TP-6) is in the approximate location of the proposed bioretention cell. In the test pit logs, it shows that for TP-6, groundwater was found at approximately 3.0 feet below the surface. Per the Puget Sound Low Impact Development Guidance Manual, a minimum of 3' of separation between the groundwater level and the bottom of the bioretention facility is required if more than 10,000 sf of impervious area is draining to it. Based on this information, the location of this bioretention facility is infeasible. Please revise.
A minimum 3' of separation between ground water level and the bottom of the bioretention facility will be maintained by constructing a berm from on-site cut material. The Bioretention Evaluation (Appendix G) performed by the Geotech confirms that bioretention is feasible in this location. Please see the revised plan set.

Plan Set

5. The minimum size for the stormwater system is 8" in diameter, please revise.
The plan set has been revised to show the 8" diameter stormwater system.
6. Please show both proposed sewer system in both the plan and profile view along with the proposed stormwater system in the profile view.
The plan set has been revised to show the proposed stormwater and sewer systems in plan and profile view.
7. Please provide an asphalt pathway along the west side of the private access tract for pedestrian use.
A bark mulch path is being proposed in lieu of an asphalt path. This path is proposed to be placed within the wetland buffer at the toe of the slope. Please see the revised plan set.
8. Please provide frontage improvements with curb and gutter and a 5' concrete sidewalk along NE 195th Street.
Frontage improvements are not being proposed due to the lack of potential for future development in this area. Therefore, these frontage improvements may cause more liability than benefit.



DAVID EVANS
ASSOCIATES

Sensitive Areas Study

9. The drawings within the study need to show the ditches and berms discussed within the report. Please revise.
10. The report discusses impacts and replanting however there was not mitigation/landscape plan. Please provide.
11. The report did not include a figure delineating the sensitive areas, wetlands ect. Please provide.
12. The figure should also label the observed woodpecker habitat as well. Please provide.
13. There are multiple locations in the field data sheets in Appendix **B** that did not contain the required information. Please provide.
14. Additional information is needed in the wetland rating worksheet in Appendix C. Please provide.

All redlines and comments above pertaining to the sensitive areas study were sent to Habitat Technologies for the necessary revisions. A revised Sensitive Areas Study and Restoration Program have been included with this submittal.

Sincerely,

DAVID EVANS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Jack N. Molver, P.E.
Vice President