

Olympia High School Addition / File: 18-4309 PROJECT ADDRESS: 1302 North Street Review Comments – 12/26/2018			
Note: Please type your responses into the column titled <i>Applicant Response</i> , and include as much information needed to clearly respond to each comment. Please do not say “comment noted or acknowledged” without providing an explanation; doing so may delay resubmittal. Additionally, please avoid referring to the plans without a sheet number, or explanation of how the plans were revised.			
ITEM	COMMENT OR REQUESTED REVISION	DETAILS	APPLICANT RESPONSE
PLANNING			
1) Project Scope	Revision / Additional info.	<p>a) Plans indicate there are four additional classrooms for a “future addition”. In order to obtain land use approval for these future classrooms, they need to be addressed in all parts of this projects scope. Plans will need to reference this larger total number of classrooms, and all plans/reports will need to match. The parking calculations include 25 new classrooms (21 now and 4 later), the TIA addresses 20 new classrooms, etc.</p> <p>b) Project phasing needs to be addressed. If the future classrooms are to be included in this review, the anticipated timeline of their construction will need to be provided. Consider setting a timeline that is longer than anticipated. The Hearing Examiner will need to grant special exception to allow for more than one year approval for construction. The Hearing Examiner will establish a specific timeline as one of his findings, therefore a requested timeline is appropriate.</p>	<p>a) Consistent reference to the four Future classrooms have been added to all project scope and reports throughout the submittal as requested.</p> <p>b) The future 4 classroom addition will begin construction approximately 2025, and is contingent on demographics/growth and needs.</p>
2) Variance	Revision / Additional info.	<p>a) Please specify the exact amount of impervious surface and hard surface coverage proposed. The variance application mixes both together and does not specify the exact amount being requested above code requirements. As there are standards for both impervious and hard surfaces individually, the application materials need to be explicitly clear as which requirement is being exceeded. If both are to be exceeded, then the application must make it clear that both coverage limitations are being exceeded and by the exact amount for each.</p> <p>b) The SEPA Checklist states that the impervious surface limit will increase from 53% to 57%. Does this mean there is no permeable pavement proposed? Seems easier to argue that hard surfaces are increasing, but impervious surfaces will not, however this does not appear to be the request.</p> <p>c) Question 6 – minimum necessary: Add an explanation. For example, does the project include use of pervious pavement, rather than standard pavement in areas where pavement is proposed? If so, identify where. If not, clarify why not. Given the opportunity to use permeable pavements in various parking areas it will be difficult for the City to support the variance if permeable solutions are not proposed. If they are unworkable, a detailed analysis as to why will need to be submitted. Other measures proposed to reduce impervious surfaces will need to be addressed. For example, the two story design and other measures could be used to more clearly articulate how the proposal is the minimum necessary.</p> <p>d) Please provide a summary of how the proposed design will meet the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual related to stormwater impacts. This will help make it clear that the variance request will not negatively impact stormwater. Hard surface limits were created as an element of the Low Impact Development approach for stormwater. An argument that the goals of LID, and intent of the code provision will be achieved even if the specific numerical standard for hard surface coverage will need to be clearly articulated in the variance application.</p>	<p>a) The proposed site will consist of 21.6 acres (48.2%) of pervious surface, 1.7 acres (3.7%) of hard surface, and 21.6 acres (48.2%) of impervious surface. The memo included with the variance application has been revised accordingly. Both coverage limitations for hard and impervious surfaces will be exceeded.</p> <p>b) The paving improvements have been revised. Pervious concrete is now proposed for several walking surfaces throughout the site.</p> <p>c) Pervious concrete is now proposed for several walking surfaces throughout the site. Pervious paving is not proposed for vehicular areas because there are concerns with longevity. Additionally, the site drains to Freshman Pond, which is a wetland. Stormwater input volumes to wetlands must be matched to the existing condition to meet Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual requirements. Utilizing too much pervious pavement on the site would promote infiltration, which would reduce flows to the wetland and potentially compromise its health.</p> <p>d) A Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan was included with the CUP application. It describes how all stormwater requirements will be met. Please specifically note Appendix A-1, which summarizes how the applicable Core Requirements were determined. This project will not have a negative impact on stormwater management because it will infiltrate all stormwater in Freshman Pond (meeting the LID Performance Standard outlined in the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual).</p>
3) Site Details – Site Plan	Revision	<p>a) Provide site information / calculations on the site plan. Info should include development standard compliance (setbacks, impervious surface coverage, hard surface coverage, parking requirements/calculations, bike parking calculations, etc.)</p>	<p>a) The proposed site will consist of 21.6 acres (48.2%) of pervious surface, 1.7 acres (3.7%) of hard surface, and 21.6 acres (48.1%) of impervious surface. Bike and vehicle parking calculations added to sheet A1.0 as requested.</p>
4) Landscaping	Revision/additional info	<p>a) Submit an alternative landscaping plan summary. The analysis must address how existing landscaping adequately meets code: The project is either required to replace all landscaping onsite (including in existing parking areas) or show that keeping the existing landscaping will adequately address code requirements. Minor upgrades to existing landscape areas would likely meet this requirement, but this requires specific alternative landscaping approval. At a minimum all existing landscape islands require a tree, and ground cover within each that achieve 80% coverage at maturity. Existing islands that lack</p>	<p>a) Please see attached document, “OHS Addition / Modification Landscape Code Compliance Assessment”</p> <p>b) Revised plans have been replaced showing grass around parking lot perimeter with ground cover.</p>

		<p>these elements will need to be identified and proposed to be upgraded. The analysis needs to discuss areas where plantings are to be enhanced throughout the site.</p> <p>b) Lawn is prohibited in parking and perimeter landscaping areas. Area 8 includes some grass mix along the perimeter of the site and or parking lot. Replace “lawn” other drought tolerant plans in landscape islands.</p> <p>c) Soil Type: Plans are required to identify the existing soil type, if found suitable additional soil amendment is not required. Please provide additional information about soil quality in the various areas. This can be addressed with engineering permit rather than land use if preferred.</p> <p>d) Provide a planting list of proposed plans and show how this list achieves the requirement than 60% of new plantings are drought tolerant or native vegetation. This can be addressed with engineering permit rather than land use if preferred.</p>	<p>c) Design team included geotechnical soils information on Soil Placement Plan. Include quantities per area on plan.</p> <p>d) New plans include a column on Plant Schedule to identify proposed trees as drought tolerant or not. Indicate total percentage of proposed trees that are either native or drought tolerant.</p>																					
5) Bike Parking Calculation	Revision	<p>a) The initial construction of the school was unlikely to require bike parking, but several remodel permits since that time have required it for the subsequent additions. These previously required spaces as well as those required for the addition will need to be provided. The hearing examiner decision from 1998 school modernization required the installation of 29 long-term and 29 short-term bicycle parking spaces. These spaces must be retained onsite, and if being relocated must be brought into conformance to current code in terms of design (cannot be ribbon racks). Note: the way in which bike parking is calculated has changed since 1998, therefore the applicant could use the new ratio to calculate the entire school capacity. The applicant will need to demonstrate how bike parking has been adequately provided onsite. Consider either of the following calculation models:</p> <table><tr><td colspan="3">Option 1 -</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Long Term</td><td>Short Term</td></tr><tr><td>1998 Requirement for Existing Classrooms</td><td>29</td><td>29</td></tr><tr><td>Current Addition Requirement</td><td>20</td><td>47</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>49 Total Spaces</td><td>76 Total Spaces</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Option 2 -</td></tr><tr><td>Whole School Calculated at New Rate</td><td>70 Total Spaces</td><td>70 Total Spaces</td></tr></table> <p>b) Plans indicate some existing bicycle parking will be removed/relocated. All new spaces are required to meet current standards.</p> <p>c) Plans must clearly indicate locations of both types of bike parking. Relocation to meet these requirements is encouraged. If proposed locations are more than 50’ from the door, directional signage will be required to be shown on plans.</p>	Option 1 -				Long Term	Short Term	1998 Requirement for Existing Classrooms	29	29	Current Addition Requirement	20	47	Total	49 Total Spaces	76 Total Spaces	Option 2 -			Whole School Calculated at New Rate	70 Total Spaces	70 Total Spaces	<p>a) The existing site has 57 existing short term bicycle spaces that will remain and we will add 20 additional spaces to achieve the required 76 total short term spaces.</p> <p>b) 29 existing long term bicycle spaces will be relocated and be recalculated using the current standards that will result in 70 new long term bicycle bike spaces.</p> <p>c) See attached updated plans showing both types and locations of bike parking. Directional signage required for new long term bike parking at the South West entry, refer to sheet A1.0 for more information.</p>
Option 1 -																								
	Long Term	Short Term																						
1998 Requirement for Existing Classrooms	29	29																						
Current Addition Requirement	20	47																						
Total	49 Total Spaces	76 Total Spaces																						
Option 2 -																								
Whole School Calculated at New Rate	70 Total Spaces	70 Total Spaces																						
6) School Criteria	Revision	Please address the criteria in 18.04.060(cc) related to building size: Does the school contain at least 80sf of gfa per student?	The proposal will contain approximately 130 square feet per student when fully complete.																					
7) Wetlands	Revision	<p>a) Please clarify why this wetland is not exempt from the requirements of the CAO. Pursuant to OMC 18.32.515 wetlands less than 1,000sf shall be exempt from mitigation sequencing, buffers, and replacement ratios provided the wetland is an isolated category III or IV, is not part of a wetland mosaic, does not exhibit high habitat function etc. The statement provided did not evaluate this section of code, rather it assumes the wetland is regulated, rather than exempt. The evaluation needs to clarify how that determination was made.</p> <p>b) If the wetland is not regulated, rather than being exempt, please provide a more clear analysis as to how the additional stormwater outfalls are consistent with OMC 18.37.070, which addresses nonconforming structures within critical areas and their buffers. The analysis will need to identify how the proposal meets all three of the criteria listed. While the letter provided discussed increased water quality, it did not address increased flow, nor how the outfalls would impact existing habitats or change the exiting drainage pattern within the kettle.</p>	<p>a) Pursuant to OMC 18.32.515 the wetland is greater than a 1,000 ft2 and is not exempt from mitigation sequencing, buffers, and replacement ratios. It is an isolated kettle wetland and is approximately 13,939 ft2. Hence it is a regulated wetland, based on Kettle wetlands are rare on the landscape. It has high functions and values and would be considered a Category II wetland. It has snags, LWD, and has a tremendous teaching and learning opportunities. The Category II wetland was rated using the 2014 DOE wetland rating form.</p> <p>b) The existing outfalls that discharge stormwater into the wetland will be unchanged as part of this proposal. As a result, there will be no impact on the existing habitat or the existing drainage patterns. All the structures and playing fields that surround the Category II (kettle wetland) were existing prior to OMC 18.37.070, and are nonconforming structures. These structures and the playfields currently make up the entire buffer of the wetland, except for the small wetland buffer that exists inside the fenced area. The entire existing buffer falls into nonconforming according to OMC 18.37.070. They were preexisting prior to the new change in the CAO rules and regulations. When the school</p>																					

			<p>was first built, it was constructed around the existing Category II kettle wetland. The OHS has used this wetland as an onsite wetland classroom, which is an asset to the school and the students. They have worked very hard to keep it free of non-native vegetation, applying for grants that added Large Woody Debris (LWD) to the wetland for increased habitat for various wetland species. The fence around the wetland will be maintained.</p> <p>The quantity of stormwater discharging to the wetland will increase only marginally as a result of the proposal. This will increase the habitat value of the wetland and the species that use the wetland. During certain dry years, the kettle wetland may go dry. With the marginal increase in quantity of stormwater, may help maintain a more constant water level in the kettle wetland. Also, all the water going into the wetland will be treated, so stormwater discharging to the wetland following the proposed improvements will be cleaner than the existing condition.</p> <p>All stormwater that discharges into the wetland infiltrates into the underlying soils or evaporates. There are no overflow pipes or weirs, nor is there a known history of stormwater over-topping the wetland. Stormwater will continue to follow this drainage pattern in the proposed condition in order to preserve the natural drainage system and outfall, as required by the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual. Given that the increase in quantity of stormwater is only marginal, it is expected that the wetland and drainage patterns will be unaffected.</p>
8) public comments		<p>Please provide a written summary/ response to the public comments received. At a minimum the response should address the following topics:</p> <p>a) Please provide a more detailed analysis related to the intended use of the practice field as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What user groups are intended to be able to use the practice field?• What hours will the field be used?• What is the anticipated impact from proposed lighting?• Does the School District intend to limit users / hours to the same (no additional) allowed at Ingersoll Stadium as outlined in OSD District Policy 4260PC.• If increased user groups are proposed, please provide analysis as to why and how that has been addressed with the traffic impacts, and potential noise impacts.• What are the anticipated traffic impacts related to the new practice field? Consider pul <p>b) Please provide feedback regarding stormwater modeling and how the sampling can be accurate when performed in dry months.</p> <p>c) Does the TIA address increased user groups related to the practice field? Please provide a brief statement about how this has been addressed. Consider adding to the TIA to address the practice field and anticipated hours / user groups etc.</p>	<p>a) OSD is proposing to install a new full size (76,000sf) synthetic turf practice field, to replace the existing grass practice field on the Olympia High School campus, between the 700 (Allied Arts) Building, and Ingersoll Stadium. The Practice Field will not be scheduled for non-district use when Ingersoll is scheduled for event use. The Practice Field can be used for warm ups for the Ingersoll event, or where there is a short overlap (less than one half hour) as a district use or non-district use is ending its use and the Ingersoll event is beginning.) With this practice field being central located on this campus, it helps mitigate light from spilling onto neighboring properties. The light fixtures being proposed for the project are designed to direct light onto the field area, and minimize glare to adjacent properties to the greatest extent possible. Fully shielded LED luminaires focus light only on the field to provide an average of 30 foot candles of coverage. This is the minimum level of lighting needed for recreational use. There are no bleachers, or public address systems with this proposal. We do not expect large crowds, and anticipate minimal traffic impact as a result of this field being used by the school, or public. Noise makers (Air horns, cowbells, sirens and similar noisemakers) will be prohibited.</p>

			<p>Hours of operation for the use of field lights will comply with Olympia School District's Ingersoll Stadium Policy No. 4260P(C) as shown below. Lighting would occur during sporting practices, games, and events as needed.</p> <p>Hours of Operation:</p> <p>District Use: Monday – Friday 8:00 am – 10:00 pm Saturday 9:00 am – 10:00 pm Sunday N/A</p> <p>Non-District Use: Monday – Friday 5:00 pm – 9:00 pm Saturday 9:00 am – 9:00 pm Sunday 12:00 pm – 6:00 pm</p> <p>b) The stormwater treatment systems will be designed and modeled using the Western Washington Hydrologic Model, as required by the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual. The site drains to an existing wetland (Freshman Pond) and stormwater code requires that input volumes in the developed condition match the existing condition to preserve the health of the wetland. The DDECM allows a variation of 20% of the existing input volumes on a daily occurrence, and 15% on a monthly basis. Based on revised hydrologic modeling, wetland input volumes can be maintained within the limits specified in the DDECM without requiring a flow control facility. Because of this requirement, the time of year that the geotechnical investigations occurred is not relevant to the stormwater design - that information is provided for reference only when considering the stormwater design.</p> <p>c) Based on discussions with the district, the practice field is not expected to change under the new design with traffic impacts not expected to change. The school has responded in detail as to the intended use of the practice area.</p>
ENGINEERING			
9) Transportation / Frontage Improvements EDDS 2.040	Revision	<p>Revise TIA to incorporate the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A level of service (LOS) that represents a two-hour average per traffic impact analysis (TIA) guidelines and Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies.2. At un-signalized intersections, report both LOS total intersection and critical intersection approach delay.3. Provided acceptable LOS (D or better) intersection and approach delay are currently show with the one-hour LOS, indicate that a two-hour LOS would have similar or better results. These intersections would not necessarily need a modified analysis.4. With the two-hour LOS analysis, mitigate conditions where either intersection or approach delays are LOS E or F. This may change mitigation recommendations at Henderson Boulevard and Carlyon Avenue.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Two-hour average LOS were performed for the intersections of Henderson Ave & Carlyon Ave and Henderson Ave & North St. Tables 4 & 7 reflect two-hour average calculated delays. Additional LOS sheets have been included in the appendix.2. LOS total intersection was reported using City of Olympia's weighted average methodology for the intersection of Henderson Ave & Carlyon Ave in addition to the critical approach delay (see Tables 4 & 7). Calculation sheets have been included in the appendix.

		<p>5. Determine the need for intersection left-turn lanes per Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) Chapter 4I.140 Figure 6: Left Turn Warrant nomograph. For operational and safety type warrants (left-turn lane and signals) use one-hour peak volumes. Two-hour average volumes are used for LOS analysis.</p> <p>6. For school driveway intersection mitigation, prior to modifying City Street intersection configurations consider different on-site circulation patterns to redistribute traffic or alternative school start times.</p> <p>7. For reference, see attached traffic signal warrant worksheet at the intersection of Henderson Boulevard and Carlyon Avenue. With current volume, no warrants are met.</p> <p>8. The new access at Central Street and North Street will remain closed and will only be used for emergency access.</p> <p>9. Analysis a traffic signal at the driveway approach for the front looped entrance with a parking lot are to the west connected; no net new driveway connections to North Street can be allowed.</p>	<p>3. Statements acknowledging that two-hour average LOS delays would have similar or better results for the school accesses as little school traffic would emanate to/from the site during off-peak times.</p> <p>4. Henderson Blvd & Carlyon Ave was shown to operate at LOS F (52.8 sec) using the two-hour average delay with no mitigation or LOS C (20.3 sec) with the use of a TWLTL on Henderson Blvd.</p> <p>5. Left turn warrants were revised using Figure 6: Left Turn Warrant from the Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) Chapter 4. A left turn lane was found to be warranted at the West Parking 2 on Carlyon Ave and not the North Street entrances. The major influence of school related traffic creates a reduced speed lessening safety concerns. In addition, the reopening of the gate will create rebalancing of traffic between North Street and Carlyon Avenue which should redistribute some of the traffic off of Carlyon. Major widening along Carlyon to accommodate this short term, AM timeframe congestion is not proposed.</p> <p>6. This has been discussed with the district. The previously closed gate on the west side of the camp which didn't allow cross circulation is now proposed to remain open which will create a balancing in traffic to the site.</p> <p>7. With the provided volumes, a traffic signal is not warranted at the intersection of Henderson Blvd & Carlyon Ave.</p> <p>8. The site has been revised to remove the street access in question.</p> <p>9. A signal warrant analysis, based on MUTCD Warrant 3, shows a signal is not warranted at the School Loop entrance on North Street. Applicable warrant sheet is included in the appendix.</p>
10) Sewer	Comment (no revision required for land use)	Ensure 10' separation between all water and sewer lines.	This requirement is acknowledged and met. A note has been added to sheet C1.0 indicating the requirement.
11) Water	Revision	<p>Please revise plans as follows:</p> <p>a) Locate and describe all water service connections and meter sizes serving the site (reference attached utility map, correct as necessary).</p> <p>b) Denote all water services connections to be abandoned.</p>	Sheet C1.0 has been revised and now includes the requested information.
12) Solid Waste EDDS Chapter 8	Revision	<p>a) Only one site for solid waste is shown on the plan, which is not accessible with front load collection trucks. The enclosure location will need to align with a drive lane. The primary solid waste collection occurs off of Carlyon; show this site in detail on the plan to ensure access and space is not impacted.</p> <p>b) Provide turning templates on the site plan to demonstrate accessibility. The new enclosure located off of North street shall be 22' wide at the opening and 10' deep.</p>	<p>a) The proposed solid waste enclosure is intended to replace an existing enclosure near the southeast corner of the existing tennis courts that will be displaced by other project improvements. This enclosure has been shifted south so it aligns with an existing parking lot drive aisle. This enclosure primarily services the football stadium area. The high school building solid waste area is near the northwest corner of the existing building and will not be affected by this project.</p> <p>b) Turning templates have been added to sheet C1.0. The new enclosure has been adjusted in size, as requested.</p>
13) Stormwater	Revision	<p>This project is subject to the requirements of the 2016 City of Olympia Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual (DDECM) and must address Core Requirements 1 through 9 for all new and replaced hard surfaces.</p> <p>a) The hydrologic modeling (using WWHM) is not done correctly and will likely change the proposed detention sizing and possibly add another detention facility.</p>	a) The flow control system was sized in a conservative manner due to the preliminary nature of a CUP. Based on revised hydrologic modeling, wetland input volumes can be maintained within the limits specified in the DDECM without

		<p>b) The proposed project must try to match the current flow rates to the wetland (Freshman Pond) in order to meet flow control and wetland protection requirements. Freshman Pond has 5 storm pipes entering the wetland, and this proposal impacts 4 of the 5 pipes.</p> <p>c) The hydraulic modeling shown in this preliminary design took the sum of all impacted areas, 0.42 acres, and rolled them into one basin. The combination of all flows were used to size the flow control detention chambers. This approach will not work for matching flows to the wetland, because it will overestimate the volume of water going to the detention facility and underestimates the bypass flows.</p> <p>I. To model this correctly each one of those 4 pipes must be modeled as its own sub-basin, and all sub-basins combine to one point of compliance, the wetland.</p> <p>II. The four sub-basins include the following (use your own naming convention):</p> <p>Sub-Basin 1 (North) includes the new Two Story Addition, Single Story Addition, and Single Story Science Addition, and possibly the new play field.</p> <p>Sub-Basin 2 (SW Corner) includes the 28 new parking stalls and parking lot modifications, and relocated bicycle storage.</p> <p>Sub-Basin 3 includes the Emergency Vehicle Turnaround.</p> <p>Sub-Basin 4 (SE Corner) includes the new Driveway, Emergency Vehicle Access Drive, 40 parking stalls, trash enclosure and new tennis courts.</p> <p>d) Please provide a spreadsheet that shows a breakdown of the areas before and after for each sub-basin, including impervious surface, lawn or landscaping; and these areas should match the areas used for the WWHM model. That will make the design easier for us to check.</p> <p>e) Sub-basins that are bypassed straight to the wetland (do not include detention or water quality treatment) can be simplified to only the areas of impact, but sub-basins that will have detention or water quality treatment must include the entire sub-basin area draining to the stormwater facilities in order to size them correctly.</p>	<p>requiring a flow control facility. These calculations have been revised to match the requirements for Wetland Protection in the DDECM</p> <p>b) The proposal does not impact any of the existing Freshman Pond outfalls. However, the upstream tributary areas will be modified. The stormwater system has been revised such that the developed condition input volumes to the wetland match the existing condition input volumes.</p> <p>c) The previously provided flow control calculations were conservative because flows from the net increase in impervious surface (0.42 acres) were matched to a forested condition, not a grass condition. Based on revised hydrologic modeling, wetland input volumes can be maintained within the limits specified in the DDECM without requiring a flow control facility. The calculations have been adjusted as requested.</p> <p>d) The requested information has been provided in the form of existing and proposed basing maps. Please refer to Appendices B-1 and B-2 in the Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan.</p> <p>e) This is understood. The stormwater calculations have been adjusted accordingly.</p>
Addressing			
14) Address	No Comments		
Building			
15) Building Code	Revision	<p>a) Revise the new parking stalls added at SW portion of the property to provide 2 accessible parking stalls at the closet distance to the accessible building entrance.</p> <p>b) Revise the north parking area to include accessible parking stalls at the shortest distance from the accessible building entrance. Clarify that the 3 new accessible parking stalls comply with building requirements.</p> <p>c) Provide one additional accessible parking stall and clarify the number of VAN accessible parking stalls provided at each parking area.</p> <p>d) No piping shall be located below the proposed addition at the NW corner of the building addition except piping serving the building. Piping shall be protected against strains or stresses and structural settlement. Revise plans accordingly.</p> <p>e) Note: The new stormwater vaults design shall be submitted under separate building permit application. Stormwater vault shall be designed for fire truck & emergency vehicles loading per IBC 1607.7.2.</p> <p>f) Note: Construction documents shall provide information for the location of utilities piping & proximity from buildings foundations.</p>	<p>a) See revised Site Plan A1.0 showing additional ADA stalls as requested.</p> <p>b) Proposed ADA Parking stalls are the closest to the ADA accessible entrance. Refer to newly indicated accessible entry location on Site Plan A1.0.</p> <p>c) Van accessible parking stalls locations added to Site plan A1.0.</p> <p>d) There are no utilities proposed beneath any new buildings. The utility layout on sheet C1.0 remains unchanged. All utilities will be designed to withstand the applied forces.</p> <p>e) Based on revised hydrologic modeling, wetland input volumes can be maintained within the limits specified by the DDECM without requiring a flow control facility. The stormwater chambers have been removed from the plans.</p> <p>f) This information will be provided with subsequent permit / construction document submittals. Design teams goal is to submit on February 15th, 2019.</p>
URBAN FORESTRY			

16) Tree Protection and Replacement OMC 16.60	Revision	<div><div><div>a) Additional information regarding trees that are to be removed and/or protected is required. Please add the trees (both to remain and to be removed) to the site plan and site grading sheet.</div><div>b) Show trees to be removed with a larger symbol on Demolition /Clearing/Grading sheets of Civil Plan set. Current symbol is difficult to read.</div><div>c) Revise the landscaping plan by revising the proposed trees to be planted in planting strips, islands, and tree wells. The deciduous trees proposed are acceptable in unrestricted growing areas, but due to the aggressive rooting nature of these trees they are not appropriate in constrained areas. .(see attached City of Olympia Recommended Street Tree List)</div><div>d) Fraxinus are prohibited within the City of Olympia due to the Emerald Ash Borer epidemic, please replace with an approved alternative species.</div></div><div>The future engineering construction permit should include the following– <u>no change is requested for land use approval</u>:</div><div><div>a) Applicant shall provide the Project Forester with and approved Site Plan and grading Plan following Land Use Approval.</div><div>b) Provide an updated Soil and Vegetation Report so that the project forester can determine specific tree protection measures, and fencing locations. These specific tree protection measures, such as fencing details, locations and timelines shall be shown on the Civil Plan Set.</div><div>c) Show location of each tree species on the Landscape Plan at time of Engineering Plan submittal.</div></div></div> <div><div>a) Existing trees to be removed and to be protected will be clearly depicted on the forthcoming site development and building permit drawings. The forthcoming civil drawings will have more detail regarding clearing and grading, and will be more appropriate for showing existing trees to be removed and to be protected.</div><div>b) Existing trees to be removed are shown with a large ‘X’ for more clarity on the landscape and Architectural Site plans.</div><div>c) Replace proposed trees with trees included in the City of Olympia Recommended Street Tree List. To be found on sheets L6.0-L6.2.</div><div>d) Replace proposed Fraxinus with other species. To be found on sheets L6.0-L6.2.</div></div>
--	----------	--