

From: Evan Maxim
Sent time: 05/05/2020 05:05:25 PM
To: Gleaton, Steve <steve.gleaton@soundtransit.org>
Cc: Hoffman, Jemae <jemae.hoffman@soundtransit.org>; Lu, Martin <martin.lu@soundtransit.org>; Baggott, David <david.baggott@soundtransit.org>; Anthony Wilen <aow@deainc.com>; Clint Morris; Patrick Yamashita; Don Cole; Jeromy Hicks; Paul West; Kirsten Taylor
Subject: RE: MI - Design Plan Review
Attachments: ST Comment Form 5-5-2020.docx

Good Afternoon,

Attached is a copy of the comments and questions we have compiled related to the technical review of the proposed design.

Regards,

Evan Maxim

Director

City of Mercer Island - Community Planning & Development

Office: 206.275.7732 | Cell: 206.640.6928

mercergov.org/CPD | **LET'S TALK**

If you would like a public record, please fill out a public records request at <https://mercerisland.nextrequest.com/>.

Notice: Emails and attachments may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (chapter 42.56 RCW).

*Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, Community Planning and Development has modified our operations. The City Hall and the Permit Center are closed to the public as of Friday, March 13. There is no "walk in" permit service; staff are working remotely. **Please note** that the Governor has issued a Stay at Home order. More information is available on the City's website: www.mercergov.org/cpd. Most services will be continuing via remote operations. We encourage customers to contact staff directly via email or their office number - phone lines are set up to forward calls to staff. Please contact us by phone or email for general customer support at 206-275-7605 or epermittech@mercergov.org.*

From: Gleaton, Steve <steve.gleaton@soundtransit.org>

Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 4:56 PM

To: Evan Maxim <evan.maxim@mercergov.org>

Cc: Hoffman, Jemae <jemae.hoffman@soundtransit.org>; Lu, Martin <martin.lu@soundtransit.org>; Baggott, David <david.baggott@soundtransit.org>; Anthony Wilen <aow@deainc.com>

Subject: MI - Design Plan Review

Hello Evan,

In preparation for Wednesday's review, I wanted to ask if you and your review team had questions or concerns regarding particular parts of the design. The consultant PM, Anthony Wilen, will be on the call and will be able to answer general questions. He will have his roadway design and 80th frontage lead, as well as the roundabout design lead on the call. We want to have the right resources available if there are other specific technical areas of concern. Please let me know as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Steve Gleaton PE

Corridor Design Manager

Design Engineering and Construction Management

Sound Transit

D 206-398-5335

M 425-533-8061



SUBMITTAL REVIEW COMMENTS

AE 0072-19 Mercer Island Transit Interchange

SOUNDTRANSIT

Submittal No./Ref./Title: 60% Submittal

Date Received: 4/22/2020

AHJ: City of Mercer Island

Date Due: 5/6/2020

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	Response Code ¹
Prior cmnt# 80 th - 7	80 th Plans	Various sheets	DC	This comment has been on all previous versions of previously submitted plans. The current plan still shows a passenger loading zone, which is not allowed on 80th. If allowed, details need to be provided that verify the passenger load zone and accessible route of travel meet accessibility requirements (currently show stairs, curb, etc.)	No transit use (bus, kiss ride/uber drop off, pickup, etc.) intended on 80 th . The drive opening is for Emergency/Service vehicles. Additional striping/signage to be included to design.	CD
Previous RAB NMW 3			JH	Provide AutoTurn information for Fire Apparatus Ladder Truck (Seattle and Bellevue) 100' Tiller Ladder and "typical" Ladder Truck (105' three axle non-articulated- Eastside Fire) on a separate page for Fire Review. (Attached in folder). Fire Apparatus Access must also be approved by CoMI Fire Marshal. IFC 503	AutoTURN information on Fire Appartus' received from JH. Design work/exhibits underway.	90
F1			JH	Provide information on "Emergency apparatus" zone. How is this space delineated from a passenger drop? Obtain FM approval for EV access requirements. Fire Department access may not be obstructed by parked busses in front of or adjacent to buildings, aerial access, fire hydrants, FDC or other Fire Department entry points.	This zone is only for emergency services. No other obstructions to be present, including transit bus stops, car stops, etc. Coordinating with new hydrant system installed.	90
F2			JH	Ensure that Opti-com devices are installed on intersections to allow Fire Apparatus to have "complete" control of the intersection when activated by responding units.	Opticom already installed at intersection. No physical improvements to signal (only timing). No action required.	N/A

¹ Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
F3			JH	Provide point loading information- confirm aerial apparatus outriggers will be supported by design of Emergency Vehicle Access points.	To be included.	90
F4			JH	Include Fire Hydrants, Fire Department Connections, Post Indicating Valves on drawings pertaining to Fire Access.	To be included.	90
CPD1	Plans	7 of 63	MPY	Provide pavement thickness on all applicable sheets on next version of the plans.	To be included.	90
CPD2	Plans	13 of 63	MPY	Note 9 refers to removing trees, landscaping, and vegetation within clearing and grubbing limits. Please show the actual trees (species and diameter). A tree permit and arborist report will be required. Refer to MICC 19.10.	Certified Arborist work to be completed, including tree permit.	90
CPD3	Plans	20 of 63	MPY	Are you showing a drop off/pick up area on 80 th ? This has not been discussed or approved. The responses to our 30% design comments indicate that there isn't such an area on 80 th .	No transit use (kiss ride/uber drop off, pickup, etc,) intended on 80 th . The drive opening is for Emergency/Service vehicles. See full response to first comment on the list.	CD
CPD4	Plans	22 of 63	MPY	The ADA plans for North Mercer Way shows the ramp landing on the north side directly on top of an electrical vault ("EV"). I can't tell based on the plans whether this is a large vault or a small handhole. Are you sure you can grade and pave the sidewalk if it's directly on top of the vault? Where's the hatch. Will it be impacted? You may need to relocate the EV for safe pedestrian passage.	This is a PSE vault that feeds power to the MI Station. Relocation of the vault would be difficult and would need to be coordinated with E750 project if MIS power outage is needed. Grading to provide ADA compliant slopes. Grades to be shown on 90% Plans.	90
CPD5	Plans	39 of 63	MPY	The curb alignment along the west side of 80 th Ave. SE differs from what is shown on other plans sheets. Please reconcile and make all sheets consistent.	To be addressed.	90
CPD6	Plans	41 of 63	MPY	Relocate the existing sign (R2-1) to an appropriate location on the signage plan.	To be included.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
CPD7	Plans	48 of 63	MPY	Luminaire schedule 6 says to relocate existing pedestrian luminaire. All luminaires shall be new and not relocated.	This is a new luminaire as part of the current East Link construction. Relocate new pole for additional clearance to roadway.	N/A
CPD8	Plans	All	MPY	Please bookmark the plan sheets by subject matter to make more useful (eg. grading, drainage, illumination, etc.)	To be incorporated.	90
CPD9	Plans	1 of 63	MPY	There are notes that indicate that the traffic control plans and construction sequencing plans will be provided in the 90% drawings. Please also make sure to provide all necessary pedestrian/bicycle, vehicle detour plans and a written description in a separate document discussing the different phases of traffic control/detours, the purpose, and approximate timeframes (hours and number of days) so we can understand the expected impacts and durations. This is necessary for review and approval of the ROW permit. Lane closures are usually allowed 9am-3:30pm while hours may be reduced on school bus routes. As part of the future ROW permit application, please provide a copy of WSDOT's approval of TCPs for work in their right of way.	To be prepared for 90% plans.	90
CPD10	Plans	Roundabout sheets	MPY	The north side of the roundabout/sidewalk and the flow control structure and access driveway are proposed to be on private property. This area will need to be dedicated to the City as right of way. Check with City planning staff to discuss what is required to dedicate only a portion of the parcels as right of way if that's what you're planning to do.	ST proposes to dedicate both properties on north side of roundabout to city as ROW; as code requirements make the remaining property undevelopable.	FW
CPD11	Storm Drainage Report Draft	Fig 2	Ruji Ding	Provide square footage for pollution generating hard surface.	To be included.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
CPD12	Storm Drainage Report Draft	Fig 2	Ruji Ding	Provide square footage for non-pollution generating hard surface.	To be included.	90
CPD13	Storm Drainage Report Draft	8	Ruji Ding	The last flow chart question is not answered, how was the decision "No additional requirement" made? It appears this flow chart is missing one step.	Flow chart to be updated to answer question.	90
CPD14	Storm Drainage Report Draft	15	Ruji Ding	Based on the flow chart Page 8, MR#6 is not exempted, you only need to treat the new hard surfaces. The 5,000sf PGHS exemption is for the total PGHS, not the new PGHS. The total PGHS for this project exceeds 5,000sf.	Based on the flow chart, the project is over the threshold for the 5,000 SF of hard surfaces. The flow chart only indicates "hard surface," and not the type of surface (i.e. pollution generating vs. non-pollution generating). Based on roundabout and bus areas, the net area is below the 5,000 SF threshold of pollution generating. Will add clarifying text to report.	90
CPD15	Storm Drainage Report Draft	15	Ruji Ding	For MR#7, please provide calculations with exhibits showing the square footage of the new hard surface that is required to flow into the new flow control system.	To be included.	90
CPD16	Storm Drainage Report Draft	22	Ruji Ding	Please expand table 2 and list the square footages of each hard surface area and be consistent with the exhibits.	To be included.	90
CPD17	Storm Drainage Report Draft	22	Ruji Ding	Please revise term "detention system" to "flow control system", so it is consistent with DOE manual.	To be revised.	90
CPD18	Storm Drainage Report Draft	22	Ruji Ding	Will the new flow control system be a concrete vault? If so, then structural calculations and design will be required.	To be included.	90
CPD19	Storm Drainage Report Draft	Fig 6	Ruji Ding	Please add square footages for each hard surface area.	To be included as a summary table for each type of surface.	90
CPD20	60% Plan set	1	Ruji Ding	Please provide the original survey drawings.	Basemapping shown in plans. Original survey shows as "lighter gray" color.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
CPD21	60% Plan set	31	Ruji Ding	The proposed contours north of the new sidewalk shows a 50% slope. Would a retaining wall be needed along the sidewalk?	Grading to be revised. Will verify need for retaining wall.	90
CPD22	60% Plan set	32	Ruji Ding	Is the existing drainage pipe from new CB1 to the existing CB on N. Mercer Way to be removed? It's unclear.	Will verify plans.	90
CPD23	60% Plan set	32	Ruji Ding	Provide a plan showing the tributary area flowing into the new flow control system including square footage consistent with the Drainage Report.	This will be shown in the Storm Drainage report	90
CPD24	60% Plan set	32	Ruji Ding	The existing side sewer for 2291-78 th Ave. SE is going through the 2297 78 th Ave. SE parcel. A new side sewer design for 2291-78 th Ave. SE will need to be provided.	Will review GIS mapping and connections for side sewer.	90
CPD25	60% Plan set	32	Ruji Ding	New curb/gutter lines are missing from the plan between Sta. 11+00 to Sta. 11+50	To be included.	90
CPD26	60% Plan set	32	Ruji Ding	The new flow control system is located on the property of 2297-78 th Ave. SE, there is no grading (new and existing) shown on the plan, a detail grading design is needed to determine if additional walls and private easement will be needed for the vault.	To be included.	90
CPD27	60% Plan set	32	Ruji Ding	How to access and maintain the new control structure at the design location?	Access drive off of 78 th Ave SE	90
CPD28	60% Plan set	33	Ruji Ding	The proposed contours along north of the new sidewalk shows a 50% slope. Would a retaining wall be needed along the sidewalk?	Grading to be revised. Will verify need for retaining wall.	90
CPD29	60% Plan set	33	Ruji Ding	It appears there are not sufficient catch basins to collect all runoff from the new roadway, please add a new CB (sta 11+50)	New CB to be added. Location to be adjusted based on existing utilities.	90
CPD30	60% Plan set	53	Ruji Ding	It is not clear if the temporary construction access will be a permanent access driveway as shown on the plan.	Permanent maintenance access shown on plans from 78th Avenue SE.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
CPD31	60% Plan set	53	Ruji Ding	The landscaping feature will impact the access and maintenance of the new flow control system.	Will revise the landscaping design as necessary so the access and maintenance area will not be impacted.	90
CPD32	60% Plan set	59	Ruji Ding	Would all new irrigation system be connecting to the existing park's irrigation meter? Would an upsize of the existing water meter required? Please clarify the responsibility of the irrigation system and ownership of the water meter.	Irrigation ownership being discussed.	FW
CPD33			EM	Please provide documentation establishing Sound Transit's authority to build and to own / operate infrastructure in the City's right of way. For franchise utilities, their authority comes through franchise agreements. What is the statutory basis for Sound Transit's authority?		P
CPD34			EM	It appears that a public facility (i.e. stormwater vault) is proposed on the a residentially zoned property to the north of the roundabout. MICC 19.02.010(C)(1) requires that public facilities obtain a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Please apply for a CUP prior to construction permit application for the stormwater vault.	The stormwater facility is collecting water from city street. Sound Transit plan is to dedicate the property to CMI as right of way.	CD
CPD35	60% Plan set	18/63, 41/63	EM	The settlement agreement (provision 4.2.a.) indicates that: "...all bus drop-off/pick-up and layover areas (other than those for local Mercer Island buses) will be located on the south side of North Mercer Way. (bold added)" Sheets CRP002, CMP002 reflects a new, approximately 140' pull out area on the north side of North Mercer Way. Please clarify the intended use of this pull out area.		S
CPD36	60% Plan set	19/63, 42/63	EM	The settlement agreement (provision 4.2.a.) indicates that: "There will be no drop-off/pick-up or layover area on 80 th Avenue SE." Sheet CRP003 reflects a new, approximately 90' pull out area on the west side of 80 th Avenue SE.	No transit use (kiss ride/uber drop off, pickup, etc.) intended on 80 th . The drive opening is for Emergency/Service vehicles.	CD

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed an clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
				Please clarify the intended use of this pull out area.	Additional striping/signage to be included to design.	
CPD37	SEPA		EM	The 2017 SEPA Addendum (77 th Ave configuration) indicated that westbound PM peak turning movement volumes will not exceed 45 buses and eastbound PM peak will not exceed 36 buses. The 2017 SEPA Addendum was prepared prior to the settlement agreement, which significantly modified the design and operations of the proposed interchange. Please provide written confirmation that the proposed design and operations are consistent with the previously issued SEPA determination.	Reference chart from Q&A KCM expects there will be about half as many bus trips to Mercer Island under the Settlement Agreement compared with the FEIS Addendum estimates. ST will provide documentation with permit application	P
CPD38	SEPA		EM	The 2017 SEPA Addendum (77 th Ave configuration) indicates that 320 buses will stopping daily on Mercer Island. Please confirm that the current design and operations are consistent with the previously issued SEPA determination in the 2017 SEPA Addendum.	Reference chart from Q&A KCM expects there will be about half as many bus trips to Mercer Island under the Settlement Agreement compared with the FEIS Addendum estimates.	P
CPD39	60% Plan set	18/63, 32/63, 37/63, 50/63, 51/63	EM	Please clarify the intended land use status of the properties located to the north of the proposed roundabout. a. Will these properties remain as real property (private or public) or be dedicated as public right of way? b. If the properties will remain as real property, please include structural setbacks on plan set and confirm that utilities, including the proposed wall north of the roundabout, and the vault are located outside of required setbacks.	Sound Transit plan is to dedicate the property to CMI as ROW.	CD

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
				<p>c. If the property will be dedicated as public right-of-way, please describe how dedication will occur.</p>		
CPD40	60% Plan set	32/63, 37/63, 53/63	EM	<p>Sheets CDP001, UCP001, LPP001 indicate that a stormwater vault will be located on the northeast side of the proposed roundabout. Please address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please confirm that the vault will be entirely underground; please note that MICC 19.02.020 limits impervious surface coverage and establishes setbacks. b. Please specify the surfacing of the proposed vehicle access to the vault. If asphalt / concrete is proposed, please consider an alternative design c. Please specify vehicle access controls to vault (e.g. bollards, gate, etc). 	<p>Vehicle access driveway to vault is called out at CSBC per Note 26 of Sheet 18.</p> <p>To be verified and included.</p>	90
PW1	60% plan set	19	CEM	STA 13+76 – concrete paving limit should be same across full width of road. No jog.	To be revised.	90
PW2	60% plan set	Concrete pavement	CEM	Provide details for concrete pavement: thicknesses, typical panel sizes and jointing, utility casting installations within panels, dowels bars, etc. I did not see these unless I missed them somehow.	To be included at 90%	90
PW3	60% plan set	Concrete pavement	CEM	All utility castings within new concrete pavement should be replaced. Manholes and catch basins should all have locking frames and grates.	To be included.	90
PW4	60% plan set	Concrete curbing	CEM	No precast curbing except on bridge deck.	To be revised.	90
PW5	60% Plan	8/63	ATH	77 th Ave SE Section does not show bike lane on the west side; however plan sheet for striping does. Please modify this section detail	Revised plans and sections to match previously approved WSDOT channelization plans.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
PW6		11/63	ATH	There is a FH approx. sta 11+52 north side that you do not show a site prep note such as remove FH. Please do not overlook	To be revised.	90
PW7		13/63	ATH	Property demo for the Woo property doesn't show sewer service disconnect. Our GIS shows this is a shared side sewer with the property to the north. Please make sure the Woo property is properly disconnected from the side sewer.	To be included.	90
PW8		13/63	ATH	Any of the utility disconnects from City mains should follow City standards.	To be included.	90
PW9		16/63	ATH	Are there any CB's near the SE 27 th I/S that will require inlet protection? Same is true for other CB's just outside the 'project limit' but potentially impacted by runoff	Will verify and include additional inlet protection as needed.	90
PW10		18/63	ATH	North side of NMW in the roundabout – there needs to be a way for cyclists on the trail to get onto the roadway at this intersection, and a way for cyclists NB on 77 th to get onto the trail if they want to at the roundabout. I appreciate your response from 30% review (RAB/NMW 15) however it's not okay to presume that every cyclist will use the crosswalk to cross NMW, or stay on the sidewalk in front of the rail station to then cross the street at Sunset. I am sure you are aware of the issues we currently have in front of the P&R with peds/bikes sharing the same space. To continue to allow this mixed use along the station frontage without accommodating separation or providing alternative modes for the varying degrees of ability will only continue the conflict.	We also have focused on bike access; per the Design Memo submitted to CMI with 60% design. The constraint is that we cannot enlarge the Roundabout diameter due to constraints of WSDOT and private property. We will follow up with ATH on possible solutions and collect feedback on possible solutions in the open house. Currently SB cyclists will follow the sharrows in the Roundabout if they want to head South on 77 th and not mix with 77 th Station users. NB cyclists on 77 th will have the option to safely cross NMW to the I-90 trail.	FW
PW11		18/63	ATH	Curb Ramp on north side NMW – Note 13 only points to the east side of the ramp. Does the west side of the ramp need pedestrian curb too?	Will verify.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
PW12		32/63	ATH	? Ultimately who will be the responsible party for the SD vault?	CMI as the water collected is city street water, and the vault property will be dedicated to the city as ROW.	CD
PW13		32/62	ATH	CB7 Notes – these notes point to the curb line, not to the CB. Please modify	To be updated.	90
PW14		37/63	ATH	Telecom and Fiber Optic notes (south side NMW) -I am confused by the notes and drawing. Is only the vault on the south side being relocated? Or is the fiber/telecom also being rerouted into the new electrical crossing of NMW. If so	Will revise. Additional details from WSDOT provided during comments.	90
PW15		38/63	ATH	FH approx. sta 11+52 north side – the note says to adjust, however the FH is in the way of the construction of the pull out and should be removed/relocated. At minimum note needs to reflect something different than adjust to grade.	To be revised.	90
PW16		38/63	ATH	There is an additional water note 1 on the north side that doesn't point to anything. Please correct.	To be revised.	90
PW17		40/63	ATH	Crosswalk markings need to be Mercer Island standards, which would be a ladder style crossing	Plans to be revised per discussions with ATH.	90
PW18		40/63	ATH	Lane line markings need to be Mercer Island standards, which are RPM;s for the lane lines, thermoplastic for the crosswalk, sharrows and bike lane symbols, and paint for the edge line. The dotted entry line in the roundabout, and the yield line symbol please install as thermoplastic for longevity. We would rather not be maintaining annually if we can help it. Please make sure the markings follow Mercer Island standards.	Drawings to be revised.	90
PW19		42/63	ATH	Emergency access area on 80 th – where are the signs that tell people this is not a passenger	Additional signs and striping to be included.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
				load unload area and it's not open for public use and it is for emergency vehicle access only.		
PW20		43/63	ATH	Note 3 – change City of Bellevue std to City of Mercer Island	COB Plans to be used per discussions with ATH.	90
PW21		44/63	ATH	Note 3 – change City of Bellevue std to City of Merce Island	COB Plans to be used per discussions with ATH.	90
PW22		48/63	ATH	General Note 3 – somewhere make sure that the City of Mercer Island has been consulted/approves the finish and color.	Originally FM. Discussed with CMI. Revised response to 90. Cut sheets obtained for other illumination on 77 th so systems will match. Plans to be revised to include additional details such as color, type, style, etc.	90
PW23		52/63	ATH	Why is the most easterly shelter set back so far from the road edge? That could be a potential cause of conflict as peds are walking in front of the shelter while users might be trying to get to their bus. Also, with this placement will that encourage people to walk into the landscaping to get to the bus?	This is for additional weather protection while maintaining an active pedestrian access route along the south side of N Mercer. Passengers would still need to walk to their bus pick-up location (which isn't in front of the existing landscaping areas).	90
PW24		37/63	ATH	Composite Utility Plan – water. Noted that the water valves will be addressed post-60% plans – thank you. Please note that if a water main shutdown is required for any work on the water system only City staff will be allowed to shut down the main, an engineer on your team must evaluate which valves to turn and prove that the shut down can happen as planned, with no fire flow or potential water quality issues, and this information must be given to the City Utility team 90 days in advance so they can test the valves etc.	Noted. Additional work to be shown at 90%	90

Key: “90”: will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed an clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
PK1	60% Contract Plans	GZK001 and others	PW	Scope of 80th– At 30% design, CMI commented that the southern extent of the 80 th Ave Improvements should be coordinated with the proposed Gateway Transit Plaza that was under consideration for ST3 System Access Funding. That project was not funded. The extent of this project should extend to SE 27 th to provide transit users safe access to Town Center. Walkway, lighting and landscape elements shown should be continued southward past the Primavera sculpture.	This consideration is impacted by O&M responsibilities. ST is evaluating the cost (design, construction, operations cost) of extending the pathway, lighting and landscaping south the northern edge of the Primavera Sculpture pathway. In exchange, PW proposed CMI maintain any extension , The Gateway plaza for CMI is outside the scope of our final design contract to design. We will continue to coordinate with CMI design for the plaza.	D - 90
PK2	60% Contract Plans	CRY003 and others	PW	Emergency Pullout on 80th – This feature is poorly defined in the plan set. It needs additional detail including features that are going to clearly delineate it from public access areas. Recommend that A&E consider orienting stairs north-south to reduce the visual cueing that this provides access to/from the headhouse. As depicted it presents as an invitation to the public.	To be revised. Additional signing and striping to be included.	90
PK3	60% Contract Plans	CSP001	PW	Trees in planting strip on north side of NMW (Site Prep Note 5 callout): Tree survey is out of date. These trees are new plantings less than 6" diameter. According to General Note 3, they would be destroyed. CMI would like the trees protected or dug up and delivered to parks nursery at Luther Burbank Park.	New survey to be conducted with Arborist. Tree salvage to be noted in plans.	90
PK4	60% Contract Plans	CSP sheets	PW	Need tree inventory and tree protection detail to evaluate tree removal/replacement.	To be included.	90
PK5	60% Contract Plans	CSP004	PW	Need tree inventory shown on ROW acquisition property to evaluate tree retention/replacement. Confirm the plan is showing wholesale clearing of these lots.	To be included.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
PK6	60% Contract Plans	CSP/CRP sheets	PW	When I-90 was built, root barriers were installed along the edges of many sections of pavement that border trees. CMI has found this root barrier while patching pavement. ST should provide notes and details to indicate that the contractor is to replace root barrier (CRP sheets) wherever it is found (CSP sheets)	To be included.	90
PK7	60% Contract Plans	CRP/LLP sheets	PW	<p>At 30% review, CMI made the following comment: Trees species should be selected to thrive at mature size in the designed soil volume of the landscape. Larger trees can be accommodated with the installation of suspended pavement (e.g. Silva Cells) to increase soil volume.</p> <p>Other Sound Transit projects have used soil cells (e.g. Bellevue stations) to meet the soil volumes recommended for landscape trees such as show on the plans. CMI recommends suspended pavement sections under the Mountains to Sound trail on the north side of N. Mercer Way and under the headhouse path along 80th Ave SE.</p>	Will verify tree species. Those on lids have been previously approved by ST/WSDOT/CMI for East Link.	CD
PK8	60% Contract Plans	UCP001	PW	<p>Irrigation – Water meter and irrigation valves at SE 24th/78th Ave SE are shown as relocated. CMI made the following comment at 30%: This irrigation control system covers an extensive area of landscaping on the overpasses and street frontages. Those landscape are planted in sand-based soils that have little moisture holding capacity. Cutting off this irrigation for even 2-3 days could result in damage or death of extensive plantings. A plan for the transition to the new irrigation control system needs to be developed.</p> <p>ST's approach at other sites has been to allow the construction contractor to improvise the</p>	<p>Irrigation ownership being discussed.</p> <p>Irrigation connections to be coordinated for seamless transition.</p>	FW

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed an clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
				irrigation service transition. The contractor typically cuts off the irrigation and does not water for the length of construction. This has caused significant death of landscape plantings. It not only results in the expense of replacement, but also incurs significant staff involvement to troubleshoot and resolve the problems and handle the resulting public comment. CMI may require ST or its contractor to post a landscape bond since damage from drought stress can show up 1-5 years post-construction.		
PK9	60% Contract Plans	CLP003	PW	SE 80 th Lighting - Lighting plan should be carried south to SE 27 th St.	See response on PK1.	90
PK10	60% Contract Plans	LPP001	PW	Is the access road at SE 24 th /78 th Ave SE to remain?	Access to remain for O&M access	90
PK11	60% Contract Plans	LPP001	PW	When 77 th frontage was constructed by ST, the irrigation to the southwest corner of 77 th Ave SE/N Mercer Way was cut off. Four trees have died as a result. The curbing on this corner is being reconfigured. Address the loss of trees from the previous ST project with a minimum of 4 new trees in this location. Show removal of dead trees in CSP001.	New trees to be shown in plans.	90
PK12	60% Contract Plans	LPP001	PW	CMI suggests tree selection in the planting strip on north side of roundabout to be <i>Parrotia persica</i> 'Persian Spire' to match new planting to the west. Or keep <i>Carpinus</i> sp. and incorporate a larger suspended pavement system to support this size tree.	Will review/revise.	90
PK13	60% Contract Plans	LPP001	PW	Which agency will maintain the plantings on the new ROW properties?	ST proposed to dedicate ROW to CMI as code requirements make the remaining property undevelopable.	CD
PK14	60% Contract Plans	LPP002	PW	Find a substitute for <i>Amelanchier alnifolia</i> . This plant is an alternate host of a rust that affects	Will review/revise.	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
				incense cedar. <i>Philadelphus lewisii</i> is a good native substitute.		
PK15	60% Contract Plans	LPP003	PW	Populus tremula is prone to suckering. Suggested substitute: <i>Parrotia persica</i> 'Persian Spire'	Will review/revise.	90
PK16	60% Contract Plans	LPP003	PW	The proposed landscape will require more maintenance than the current landscape. If CMI is to take over maintenance of this landscape, a cost adjustment will be needed in the maintenance agreement between CMI and WSDOT. Or will ST retain an airspace lease on landscaping and maintain it as they do with the Park and Ride frontage?	Discussing maintenance responsibility with WSDOT as part of OMP for I-90.	FW
PK17	60% Contract Plans	LRP003 and LRD sheets	PW	Irrigation on 80th: Will the landscaping on 80 th require new water service with irrigation clocks or run off existing irrigation clocks? It is unclear from the plans. Details are provided for a separate system that connects to an existing meter. This is hard to reconcile with the field situation. Existing landscape on the west side of 80 th is run off two clocks. North side runs off Park and Ride clock (included in this project), and the south side runs off of the Tully's clock. That clock is located in bushes along Sunset Hwy north of Primavera sculpture. Cutoff is in the vicinity of the Headhouse. Is there a capacity issue with the current clocks? In past practice, ST has left irrigation and landscape restoration for "field design" by the contractor. This causes significant technical issues and public comment during construction. CMI strongly urge ST to design the systems before construction. With the Shorewood overpass, ST put in a deduct meter for new landscaping. Will there be deduct meters so that ST is charged for	Additional irrigation details at 90%. Coordination w/ CMI to occur. Ownership/billing to be coordinated. Can CMIO provide information about existing clock capacity?	FW

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review

Item No.	Document	Page	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments	Designer Response	
				landscaping around the headhouse, or will this become WSDOT's landscaping? How does the billing work?		
PK18	60% Contract Plans	LPD001	PW	Street Tree Planting detail 1: add note that mulch should be squared-off, curb-to-curb in planting strips, such as NMW. Dimension indicator for overall diameter of planting hole is graphically misplaced. Locking tree tie damages bark; suggest ArborTie webbing or equal. Tree stake position note does not reflect the graphic representation.	To be revised.	90
PK19	60% Contract Plans	LPD002	PW	Soil Preparation profiles: These profiles create an interface of soil texture between the scarified existing soil and the placed planting soil. Soil texture interfaces create drainage issues. CMI recommends adding a step for a partial layer of planting soil and incorporate it into the existing soil to reduce interface issues.	Will be incorporated at 90%	90

Key: "90": will be included in 90% design; CD – discussed and clarified in Designer Response notes; FW – Follow Up Discussion; P - part of Permit Application; S – legal settlement agreement or operations issue not part of physical design review