

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

2707 Colby Avenue, Suite 900, Everett, WA 98201 | P 425.252.7700

To: Sherrie Ringstad, Associate Planner, City of Mill Creek

From: Brian Caferro, PE, Perteet

Date: October 09, 2019

Re: Crestview II – Preliminary Approval

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide formal notification that I have reviewed the Crestview II preliminary application documents as they relate to drainage design, grading design and Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control design and I have determined that these documents comply with City Codes and the regulations of the Washington State Department of Ecology.

END MEMO

PK ENTERPRISES

October 4, 2019

Ms. Sherrie Ringstad, Associate Planner
City of Mill Creek
15728 Main Street
Mill Creek, WA 98012

RE: **A Response to Staff's TRC Comments (September 11, 2019) Concerning Crestview II Preliminary Plat.**

City File Number PL2019-001

Dear Ms. Ringstad:

On behalf of the owners, Crestview II, LLC, PK Enterprises is re-submitting items to address staff's comments concerning Crestview II Preliminary Plat. The following are the specific items outlined in the letter followed by a response (in italic):

Engineering Review (Perteeet)

1. Plans

a. Sheet C3.0 (Existing Conditions)

- Add labels to existing contours.

Response: See revised Sheet C3.0 with contour labels.

b. Sheet C3.1 (TESC Plan)

- Add check dams to interceptor swales.
- Add high visibility fence to uphill sides of the project area.
- Add construction sequence to final design drawings.

Response: Check dams have been added. Check dams are typically added wherever a vertical drop of 2-ft occurs, but given the relatively gentle grade on this parcel, check dams have been added at 100-ft intervals. High visibility fence has been added as requested as well as a construction sequence. (Please see revised Sheet C3.1.)

c. Sheet C4.0 (Grading and Utility Plan)

- Add labels to both existing and proposed contours.
- The maximum water surface elevation in the detention vault is very close to the low point catch basin rims. Make sure you conduct a backwater analysis using elevation 488.00 as your tailwater. Catch basins cannot overtop during the 100-year event.

Response: Contour labels have been added as requested. A preliminary conveyance calculation has been added to the report demonstrating that none of the structures overtop. See revised Sheet C4.0

2. Drainage Report

- Page 6 – Use acronym SWMMWW instead of DOE Manual. Ecology prefers this term so as to not get confused with the Department of Energy. Typical throughout the rest of the report.

Response: The report has been revised on this page and throughout document replacing “DOE Manual” with “SWMMWW”.

- Page 17 – Ecology still wants to see proof that infiltration rates are less than 0.30 in/hr via a PIT test, even till soils. High groundwater table that will not provide separation can also be used as an infeasibility criteria. High groundwater elevation should be determined by performing groundwater monitoring during the wet season.

Response: The evaluation of bioretention facilities has been revised to discuss the depth to groundwater as an infeasibility criteria.

- Page 19 – Please give a reason why Basic treatment is required and not enhanced. Does this site not discharge directly to fresh waters or conveyance systems tributary to fresh waters designated for aquatic life use or that have an existing aquatic life use? (SWMMWW Vol. 5 Ch. 2, page 779)

Response: The report has been revised to follow the step-by-step selection process outlined in Volume V, Section 2.1 of the SWMMWW. The project does ultimately discharge to a fresh water body with existing aquatic life uses. This would typically require enhanced treatment, per Step 5 of the selection process, but there is a specific exemption provided for projects qualifying for basic treatment under Step 6. One of the qualifications provided under Step 6 is “residential projects not otherwise needing phosphorus control”. The project is a residential development which doesn’t require phosphorus control, and therefore is subject to basic treatment.

- Downstream map – Put a border around the project site and highlight the flow path along its length all the way to the ¼ mile mark.

Response: The project site and downstream flow path have been identified as requested.

- Minimum Requirements (MR)
 - MR #1: This requirement has been met.

Response: Comment noted.

- MR #2: The applicant needs to prepare a SWPPP using Ecology’s SWPPP template, which can be found on their website. The applicant has stated that they will prepare this document for a later submittal.

Response: A SWPPP is being provided with this submittal.

- MR #3: This requirement is not applicable for this type of a project.

Response: Comment noted.

- MR #4: This requirement has been met.

Response: Comment noted.

- MR #5: The applicant needs to investigate further in order to demonstrate infeasibility.

Response: Additional information is being provided concerning infeasibility.

- MR #6: This requirement appears to have been met but still need a better explanation as to why Basic treatment is required and not enhanced.

Response: A more detailed explanation is being provided in this matter.

- MR #7: This requirement has been met.

Response: Comment noted.

- MR #8: This requirement has been met.

Response: Comment noted.

- MR #9: This requirement has been met, assuming the applicant provides the O & M materials with the next drainage report submittal.

Response: O & M materials have been added to the drainage report.

3. Geotechnical Report.

- No comments.

Environmental Review (ESA)

1. As stated in our June 27, 2019 technical memorandum, based on conditions during the two site visits and documentation provided by the applicant, we agree that the ditch does not meet wetland or stream criteria and therefore would not be regulated as a critical area by MCMC 18.06.

Response: SVC acknowledges ESA's concurrence that the ditch does not meet wetland or stream criteria. The revised October 2019 Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment and Buffer Enhancement Plan report maintains the description of the ditch as an artificially excavated ditch.

2. According to Section 4.7 of the Report, the location of the NGPA has been included on the Existing Conditions figure in Appendix D. However, it does not appear that the NGPA has been added to either Sheet 1 of 3 – *Crestview II Existing Conditions* or Sheet 2 of 3 – *Crestview II Existing Conditions with Aerial Photo*. We recommend that the NGPA be added to all figures in the Report, including Sheet 3 of 3 – *Crestview II Proposed Project and Buffer Averaging Plan* to determine the location of the NGPA in relation to the proposed buffer averaging. According to the Snohomish County Critical Area Site Plan (CASP) included in the Appendix I of the Report, the NGPA is to be "left undisturbed in a substantially natural state. No clearing, grading, filling, building construction or placement, or road construction of any kind shall occur in this area." If it is determined that the buffer averaging plan would result in impacts to the NGPA, the location of the proposed buffer averaging should be reconfigured to avoid the NGPA.

Response: The location of the NGPA has been added to the site plans included in Appendix D of the revised October 2019 Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment and Buffer Enhancement Plan report. No impacts are proposed within the NGPA. The Applicant propose buffer enhancement in response to comment 3 below. The buffer enhancement will include removing non-native, invasive species and planting native species within the NGPA.

3. According to MCMC 18.06.610, "compensatory mitigation shall be provided for all unavoidable alterations of a critical area or buffer in accordance with an approved critical area report and mitigation plan." To the best of our knowledge, a mitigation plan was not submitted with the Project proposal. According to the Report and as documented during the site visits, the buffer of Wetland A is degraded due to the presence of non-native species including Himalayan blackberry and reed canary grass. Buffer enhancement in the form of invasive species removal and the subsequent planting of native vegetation is recommended to ensure that post-construction, the buffer will be adequate to protect the functions and values of the adjacent critical areas, as required per MCMC 18.06.930. We recommend that a buffer enhancement plan be developed for the buffer addition area that meets the requirements provided in MCMC 18.06.620 – General Mitigation Plan Requirements.

Response: The July 2019 Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment and Buffer Averaging Plan described a buffer averaging plan to offset the minor impacts to the Wetland A buffer due to the construction of necessary stormwater infrastructure. The additional buffer area created by the buffer averaging will be planted with native species. The Applicant will also provide buffer enhancement to provide a net gain in ecological functions in the buffer. The revised report includes a buffer averaging and enhancement plan.

Snohomish County Fire District No. 7

The Fire Marshall submitted comments via letter dated September 12, 2019, which is attached. Since adding a secondary access road does not seem feasible, we are assuming you will opt to provide residential fire sprinklers, which can be a Condition of Approval added to the plat. No plan changes would be required.

Response: Agreed.

Everett School District

The City received comments via an email on September 11, 2019 (attached). The Everett School District is requesting impact mitigation fees in the amount of \$103,592.00.

Response: Noted.

Silver Lake Water and Sewer District

Silver Lake Water and Sewer District Development Engineer Scott Smith submitted comments dated September 11, 2019 (see attached). A Developer Extension (DE) Agreement with the District will be necessary. Please contact the District Engineer at 425-337-3647 for more information on the DE application process. In addition, the District stated that the existing water and sewer mains on site need to be removed and the easement relinquished. A new water main should be looped to the existing stub in Wexford Court behind lot 14. In addition, a new sewer main should connect to the existing manhole in the entrance drive instead of a new saddle manhole.

Response: Agreed.

TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS REVIEW (Perteet)

1. The traffic volumes and related LOS calculations could not be verified since turning movement counts were not submitted. Please submit turning movement counts for verification of traffic volumes, peak hour factor, truck percentage, etc.

Response: The traffic volume data sheets are now included in Appendix A of the Updated Traffic Assessment dated October 1, 2019, prepared by TENW.

2. We concur with the trip distribution as shown. Please add the percentage to the figures. This was mentioned to be in place in the text but was missed on the figures.

Response: The trip distribution percentages are now shown on Figure 4 and Figure 5 in the Updated Traffic Assessment.

3. The analysis needs to be stamped and signed by an engineer licensed in Washington State.

Response: The Updated Traffic Assessment has been stamped and signed by TENW Senior Transportation Engineer Curtis Chin, P.E.

4. Please confirm that the signal timings for the intersections at 21st Drive SE and 25th Avenue SE with 132nd Street SE are per the existing signal timing plans. In particular, it appears that the protected only phasing at the 21st Drive SE signal may be operating more efficiently in reality compared to the analysis. This would be due to the left turn phase being able to terminate earlier for the eastbound left turn movement.

Response: The signal timing used in the LOS analysis was provided by Greg Wagner at WSDOT on July 9, 2019.

5. From the analysis, we concur that no impact fee is required for the Snohomish County ILA.

Response: Noted.

6. There is no discussion of safety of the intersection. It appears that the existing intersection has been operating for some time. Please provide a collision history for this intersection to determine if there is a safety concern. Further, please confirm that the sight distance at the intersection meets City requirements.

Response: A discussion of collision history is included in the Updated Traffic Assessment. A discussion of sight distance is also included in the Updated Traffic Assessment with a detailed sight distance exhibit (prepared by PACE) included in Attachment E.

7. The proposed development shows trips through the intersection of 35th Avenue SE and 132nd Street SE. Further, vehicles are shown traveling through the intersection to Snohomish County maintained and operated roadways. Please provide additional justification that no mitigation is required for County maintained roadways and/or intersections.

Response: An updated discussion regarding Snohomish County mitigation is included in the Updated Traffic Assessment dated October 1, 2019, prepared by TENW.

Snohomish County Public Works - Traffic

Snohomish County Public Works submitted comments via email dated August 21, 2019, which are attached. Mike Hendrix with Perteet spoke with County staff regarding their comments and Mike suggested that the County's comments can be addressed by providing additional justification that no mitigation is required for County maintained roadways and/or intersections. The County also sent a copy of their Requirements for Traffic Studies, which is attached for your reference.

(Elbert Esparza – Snohomish County Memo Dated 8.21.19):

"TENW is mistaken in their analysis, it not just impacts on County Road Improvement projects, but any trips impacting onto County roads (if using a TIA to support it). Since 35th Ave. is in the Middle of a Capital Improvement Project, and this development is just down the street, I find it a bit unreasonable to say there will not be any impacts on 35th Avenue. Please have them prepare a traffic that meets county standards as this is really difficult to understand and does not have the required information needed for County TIAs."

Response: TENW sent an email to Elbert Esparza on September 23, 2019 with additional clarification regarding the proposed project having no impact to Snohomish County roads. An email response from Elbert Esparza received on September 23, 2019 (also attached) states the following:

"I reviewed the offer and distribution that you sent for this project. Snohomish County Public Works concurs with the distribution and your conclusion that this development will not impact any county capital improvement projects or county road with three or more directional peak hour trips. Therefore, no mitigation and no offer is required of this development to the county under the county/city interlocal agreement. Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal."

October 4, 2019

Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter. Included with this submission is the revised information and documents per staff comments. If there are questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (206) 227-7445.

Sincerely,

PK ENTERPRISES

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Phillip Kitzes", with a stylized, flowing script.

PHILLIP KITZES

Enclosures (submitted online)

CC Mr. Kevin O'Brien, Crestview II, LLC
Mr. Robert Fitzmaurice, TDI
Mr. Ken McIntyre, P.E., PACE

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

2707 Colby Avenue, Suite 900, Everett, WA 98201 | P 425.252.7700

To: Sherrie Ringstad, Associate Planner, City of Mill Creek

From: Brian Caferro, PE, Perteet

Date: August 22, 2019

Re: Review Comments for Crestview II

This memorandum provides review comments for the preliminary Crestview II development project in the City of Mill Creek. Submittal materials were reviewed based on the project's compliance with the City of Mill Creek Municipal Code and the minimum requirements of the 2012 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (SWMMWW), as amended in December 2014. Review comments are specific to drainage, grading and TESC elements only. It is acknowledged that the submittal materials are preliminary. A more detailed review will be conducted when the detailed design plans are submitted.

Plans**Sheet C3.0 (Existing Conditions)**

- Add labels to existing contours.

Sheet C3.1 (TESC Plan)

- Add check dams to interceptor swales.
- Add high visibility fence to uphill sides of the project area.
- Add construction sequence to the final design drawings.

Sheet C4.0 (Grading and Utility Plan)

- Add labels to both existing and proposed contours.
- The maximum water surface elevation in the detention vault is very close to the low point catch basin rims. Make sure you conduct a backwater analysis using elevation 488.00 as your tailwater. Catch basins cannot overtop during the 100 year event.

Drainage Report

- Page 6 – Use the acronym SWMMWW instead of DOE Manual. Ecology prefers this term so as to not get confused with the Department of Energy. Typical throughout the rest of the report.
- Page 17 – Ecology still wants to see proof that infiltration rates are less than 0.30 in/hr via a PIT test, even in till soils. High groundwater table that will not provide required

MEMORANDUM

separation can also be used as an infeasibility criteria. High groundwater elevation should be determined by performing groundwater monitoring during the wet season.

- Page 19 – Please give a reason why Basic treatment is required and not enhanced. Does this site not discharge directly to fresh waters or conveyance systems tributary to fresh waters designated for aquatic life use or that have an existing aquatic life use? (SWMMWW Vol. 5 Ch. 2, page 779)
- Downstream map – Put a border around the project site and highlight the flowpath along its length all the way to the ¼ mile mark.
- Minimum Requirements (MR)
 - MR #1: This requirement has been met.
 - MR #2: The applicant needs to prepare a SWPPP using Ecology's SWPPP template, which can be found on their website. The applicant has stated that they will prepare this document for a later submittal.
 - MR #3: This requirement is not applicable for this type of a project.
 - MR #4: This requirement has been met.
 - MR #5: The applicant needs to investigate further in order to demonstrate infeasibility.
 - MR #6: This requirement appears to have been met but still need a better explanation as to why Basic treatment is required and not enhanced.
 - MR #7: This requirement has been met.
 - MR #8: This requirement has been met.
 - MR #9: This requirement has been met, assuming the applicant provides the O & M materials with the next drainage report submittal.

Geotechnical Report

- No comments.

End Memo