



CITY HALL
33325 8th Avenue South
Federal Way, WA 98003-6325
(253) 835-7000
www.cityoffederalway.com
Jim Ferrell, Mayor

January 26, 2018

Mr. Eric LaBrie
ESM Consulting Engineers, LLC
33400 8th Avenue South, Suite 205
Federal Way, WA 98003
eric.labrie@esmcivil.com

**Re: File #16-102947-UP & File #16-102948-SE; 4th ROUND TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMENTS
Greenline Warehouse "A"; 337XX Weyerhaeuser Way South, Federal Way**

Dear Mr. LaBrie:

City departments/divisions have the following comments in response to your August 25, 2017, and October 5, 2017, resubmittals. The project has been revised in several areas and as a result, there are further technical review comments. Other items have remained a part of the review from prior technical comment letters, as they have either not been addressed or not been addressed adequately. Some comments provided herein are required and some are informative, while others may be applicable during future steps of the project. Comments in this letter need to be addressed prior to issuance of a SEPA threshold determination and land use application decision, or as otherwise noted. Questions regarding technical review comments should be addressed to the referenced staff representative.

Stacey Welsh – Planning Division, (253) 835-2634, stacey.welsh@cityoffederalway.com

Use Process III

1. *TIR Downstream Analysis* – Please see comments below from Public Works. The downstream analysis needs to be adequately addressed in order to determine any potential impacts. Is the pipe sized adequately, and which off-site properties are affected and how? Off-site improvements may be required to be evaluated for SEPA compliance and potential impacts to downstream critical areas.
2. *TIR* – Under the “Project Overview,” it indicates that the existing trail system is to be relocated to the Managed Forest Buffer (MFB) along Weyerhaeuser Way South. Section XII(H)(8) of the CP-1 zone allows trails that will not have a significant adverse effect on the sensitive area. The MFB contains portions of critical areas and their buffers, which would make it difficult to accommodate a trail within the MFB. It is also unclear what “relocation of the gravel roads to other portions of the overall Weyerhaeuser site” means. Relocation of such items elsewhere on the campus is not being reviewed as part of this project.
3. *Geotechnical Reports*– The two geotechnical reports indicate that the entire project area is Vashon till (Qvt). The “Project Overview” section of the TIR lists Vashon till also; however, Figure 1.4 sourced from the NRCS says it is Alderwood gravelly sandy loam (AgB), please clarify.

4. *Impervious Area* – The exhibit (Sheet EN-12) needs to be revised to remove the property south of Highway 18, since it is zoned OP-1, and then adjust the calculations shown as needed.
5. *Wetlands*– Please address the following comments:
 - a. Wetland and stream buffers have been added to drawings as requested. Buffers are shown for wetlands that will be filled and ones that are being treated as if they will be filled. The averaged buffers for wetlands and the stream are not shown. An existing conditions map is a more appropriate location for showing all wetlands and the stream and their standard buffers. The site as it is to be developed should be reflected in the site plan, including averaged critical area buffers, and only buffers for critical areas that will remain after development.
 - b. Section 7.2.2 of the critical areas report discusses temporary impacts to wetland buffers that will result from site grading. The 1994 *Federal Way City Code* (FWCC) code and CZA do not address “temporary construction impacts” to wetland and stream buffers. An impact is such regardless of the duration of time. As previously communicated, stream setback intrusions and improvements/land surface modifications in wetland setbacks require Use Process IV application review and approval per FWCC Sections 22-1312(c) & 22-1359(d). The “temporary construction impacts” need to be removed from the project and the project revised to meet required buffers, or the averaging plan updated to average additional areas, or a Process IV must be submitted for wetland and stream buffer impacts.
 - c. Why is Section 7.2.3 of the critical areas report, “Land Surface Modifications within the Setback (buffer) Areas” included and what areas are being referred to in this section? As communicated in the June 27, 2017, technical comment letter, per FWCC Section 22-1359(d), a Use Process IV review and approval is required for such activity. Land surface modifications within the wetland setbacks of non-exempt wetlands cannot be permitted under a Process III, including proposed critical area buffer enhancement activities.
 - d. Section 8.2 of the critical areas report, “Proposed Buffer Management Plan,” lists enhancement and restoration “per the Concomitant Agreement” with no specific citation noted. Please clarify the statements listed in the report and provide CZA and FWCC citations for buffer enhancement and restoration activities, and explain how they can be permitted under the Use Process III application, or remove these items from the proposal.
 - e. Sheet W1.1 in the critical areas report depicts a 20-acre portion plan regarding CZA Exhibit C, Section XII(H)(3). This drawing needs to allocate all of Parcels A and B into 20-acre sections. There is only one 20-acre section shown. Everything outside of it must be allocated to one or more other 20-acre sections. Was it your intention to place all of the critical areas into one 20-acre section as is represented in the submittal?
6. *Managed Forest Buffer* –
 - a. Please address the following comments pertaining to the “Managed Forest Buffer Management Plan” document:
 - i. Exhibit #1, Attachment #1, Sheet W1.0, Sheet W1.2:
 1. Do not match the same drawings contained in the updated Talasaea report.
 - ii. Exhibits #1, #2, & Attachment #1:
 1. These show an extended forested buffer line not reflected in other project documents, including the site plan. As requested previously, update the documents as necessary.

- iii. Exhibit #3:
 - 1. The site plan has been updated with this resubmittal and that version is not provided here.
 - b. The previous technical comment letter asked that on the site plan the distance from Highway 18 to the proposed storm pond be shown to demonstrate compliance with the Managed Forest Buffer requirement from the state highway pursuant to Exhibit C, Section III(B)(1). This has still not been done.
7. *Significant Trees* – Please address the following comments:
- a. Sheet TR-01:
 - i. Under the “Tree Preservation” section it states that, “native vegetation not within the 50’ width forested buffer...” However, the MFB is required to be 100 feet along Highway 18. Update the statement and labelling shown for the symbol to the right of the section to not include width amounts, since it varies on the site.
 - ii. Some of the information for the “adjoining pond site” in the Significant Tree Retention Calculations table differs from what is provided in the same table on Sheet TR-01 for the Warehouse “B” project. Please reconcile the information provided.
8. *Plan Set*– Please address the following comments:
- a. The August 25, 2017, resubmittal letter indicates that the proposed building height is 42 feet. The proposed height still varies according to submitted documentation, with the highest building height number shown on the site plan drawing and in the TIR at 44 feet, please clarify and correct documents as necessary.
 - b. On Sheet EX-01, correct the wetlands data shown in the lower left corner of the page to accurately reflect which wetlands would be filled in.
 - c. It is difficult to determine compliance with FWCC Section 22-1564(u) (screening of blank walls) with the scale used on the elevations drawings. It appears there are blank wall areas greater than 240 square feet in area, please clarify.
 - d. Landscaping was added to the end of the rows of parking adjacent to the loading area, in response to a previous technical comment. Since the last review was completed, additional parking stalls have been added to the site plan and they are missing the required landscaping at the end of the rows, see Sheet LA-01 (FWCC Section 22-1567[c][1] & [2]).
 - e. On Sheet ST-01, clarify what pedestrian connectivity is provided for site users to the bus stops along Weyerhaeuser Way.

SEPA Checklist

- 9. *Environmental Documents* – Please provide a copy of the Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA) (checklist item #8).
- 10. *Approvals/Permits* – A building permit and engineering permit (EN) will be required for the project (checklist item #10).
- 11. *Historic Preservation* – The August 25, 2017, comment response letter indicated that a full survey of the Weyerhaeuser Campus was underway and would be provided to the city upon completion. What is the status of the report?

12. *Transportation* – Review the Public Works comments below, and revise the SEPA checklist and site plan as necessary to ensure accurate information is included.

Ann Dower – PW Development Services Division, (253) 835-2732, ann.dower@cityoffederalway.com

Technical Information Report

Since the TIRs for Warehouse A and Warehouse B are essentially the same for land use purposes, they have been reviewed together. The parcel that is developed first will be responsible for building the detention pond and water quality treatment facility for both sites.

Downstream Analysis (*King County Surface Water Design Manual [KCSWDM] Section 1.2.2.1.1*)

13. The downstream analysis must provide information about offsite properties, including at a minimum, the WSDOT right-of-way and parcel #2121049014 to the south of the freeway.
14. The TIR includes conflicting information on the distance between the project and Hylebos Creek. The Level 1 field inspection implies that Hylebos Creek is over ½ mile from the site, while “Task 4. Drainage Description” states that it is approximately ¼ mile downstream. The TIR must accurately state how far the project is from the East Branch Hylebos Creek.
15. Map the area draining to the 24 inch pipe under the freeway and estimate the flow through it. Will the pipe still be adequate with additional post-development flow? Provide this information to WSDOT and obtain their approval.
16. Indicate how this project will affect the property south of the freeway. Will it impact the wetland or create any flooding problems? Since the 100-year peak discharge is over 0.5 cfs, in order to discharge to the offsite wetland it must be established that the wetland is an “acceptable discharge point” (see KCSWDM, section 1.2.1 footnote 12).
17. This comment must be addressed with the Warehouse B application, but is provided as a courtesy since the pond is a combined facility for warehouses A and B: four acres of the Warehouse B site currently drains to the southwest. Allowing that runoff to be routed to the southeast along with the rest of the site runoff could impact downstream properties and the existing downstream wetland. The TIR suggests a flow splitter, which will need to be used unless an adjustment is applied for and approved. Impacts to the offsite wetland must be reviewed as part of an application for an adjustment. Provide a downstream analysis for the four acres that drain to the southwest.

Section 4 Flow Control and Water Quality Facility Analysis and Design

18. Table 1 does not provide existing conditions information as stated.
19. Please explain why the totals in Table 4.1 (25.54 acres) do not account for the entire site (15.16 acres Warehouse A + 16.95 acres Warehouse B = 32.11 acres). The 6.57 acres are not included in the table.
20. Explain how much new and replaced pollution-generating impervious area, non-pollution generating impervious area, and new pervious area will be created within public right-of-way. Flow control and water quality will be required as outlined in the 2016 KCSWDM.

21. The basin boundary line does not show up on the Developed Basin Map. The map also says to see Table 4.1 for basin areas, but that information is not provided in Table 4.1.
22. Although details are not required at this time, the pond outfall elevation does not appear to be feasible considering the depth of the pond and the existing shown elevations at the outfall.
23. An agreement and necessary easements shall be recorded for the two parcels indicating access and maintenance responsibilities.
24. Because several wetlands will be displaced, address Section 3.3.7 of the KCSWDM for additional design requirements. Additional storage volume may be required.
25. Discuss the cumulative impact of development of Warehouses A and B upon Stream EA.

Plans

26. Provide building dimensions on the site plan.
27. Sheet SD-01:
 - a. Show the existing 24 inch pipe under the freeway and provide invert elevations.
 - b. Oil control (KCSWDM Special Requirement #5) must be shown conceptually.

Additional Information

28. As information, the city has received comments regarding storm water. To great extent, comments will be addressed through the permitting process. Project-specific needs for oil control, conveyance sizing, water quality treatment, erosion control, a maintenance plan, and bonding have been acknowledged by the applicant and will be required prior to permit approval.

Some comments requested further analysis of how development of the IRG property *as a whole* will affect erosion, water quality, water temperature, ph levels, flooding, and other factors that could cause degradation of the East Hylebos Creek Basin. By way of background, the entire IRG property lies within the East Branch of the Hylebos Creek Basin. According to the *Executive Proposed Hylebos Creek and Lower Puget Sound Basin Plan* (Basin Plan), written by King County Surface Water Management in 1991, flooding, erosion, and habitat degradation in the middle reaches of the East Branch were concerns at the time of the study. Several actions to repair or prevent further degradation were proposed. BW-3 flow control was recommended, which corresponds most closely to Level 3 Flow Control in the KCSWDM. Concerns were expressed that projects aimed at improving the Hylebos Basin will be negatively impacted by development of the IRG properties. You are encouraged to provide a written analysis of how the Warehouse "A" development will affect the projects and concerns outlined in the Basin Plan.

29. Under the 2016 KCSWDM, Large Project Drainage Review will be required for larger projects within the IRG properties. Although not required for Warehouse A and B due to their size, any Large Project Drainage Review for the IRG properties will need to include storm water impacts from the Warehouse A and B sites as part of the upstream and downstream analysis.

Rob Van Orsow– PW Solid Waste Division, (253) 835-2770, Rob.VanOrsow@cityoffederalway.com

30. Sheet A1.0 (“Code Specific Requirements”) - Comment #5 indicates the current design features a total of 725 square feet of enclosure space. The comment includes a formula that calculates 693 square feet of required enclosure space. The following calculation arrives at a similar figure:

Value	Description
3	sq. ft. /1000
0.001	conversion
225950	total size
677.85	result
678	(rounded up)

31. “Required Screening” per *Federal Way Revised Code* (FWRC) 19.125.040(4) indicates a requirement for 100 percent site obscuring fence; so please consider appropriate alternatives to chain link fence with slats for the enclosure gates.
32. “Required Gate Width” appears to be met by gates as proposed for enclosures.
33. ESM’s comment indicates a desire to “scale back” enclosure size, so please provide more details or alternatives in future comments.
34. The version of FWRC 19.125.150(7)(b) that applies for this site requires a minimum storage/enclosure area of 678 square feet for *recycling* receptacles alone. Note that in addition to recycling, the FWRC also requires storage areas to be incorporated into building design for garbage receptacles, as follows:

FWRC 19.125.150, “Garbage and recycling receptacles – Placement and screening”

“(1) *Storage area.* Storage areas for garbage and recycling receptacles for material generated on site shall be required to be incorporated into the designs for multifamily, commercial and institutional buildings. . .”

This establishes a requirement to also provide for storage and collection of bulky wastes and garbage generated at this site. Inadequate enclosure space will result in dumpsters, trash compactors, and/or bulky wastes placed in the “open” without required screening. This could result in a potential code enforcement issue requiring corrective action to install proper screening post-construction.

35. ESM indicates tenants may elect to use solid waste compaction equipment. Please note the current enclosure design is not compatible with trash compaction equipment (for example, a 35 cubic yard compactor is approximately 20 feet in length, which would not fit into the proposed enclosure design).
36. ESM indicates that waste compactors are often placed in a loading dock area. With many loading docks shown in the design, please consider designating one or more for waste compactors if this would be more appropriate for the intended use (instead of the row of enclosures as shown on the current design).
37. Note that loading dock area, if designated for trash compactor(s), should comply with screening and landscaping requirements per FWRC 19.125.040(4) and (5).

Sarady Long – Public Works Traffic Division (253) 835-2743, sarady.long@cityoffederalway.com

The Public Works Traffic Division has finished its review of the submitted materials. The following technical review items must be address prior to Public Works approval. Please note, these comments do not include comments from WSDOT. Traffic related comments/concerns by WSDOT must be addressed and approved by WSDOT.

Plans Comments

38. The civil plans must depict the correct frontage improvement and right-of-way dedication along Weyerhaeuser Way. Road improvements should be consistent with the depicted street section (Arterial / Collector Section G) and the right-of-way modification by the Public Works Director.
39. Explain how the required improvements on Weyerhaeuser Way South would be completed. Please specify/identify responsibilities between Warehouse A and Warehouse B for the improvements. Please note, Warehouse A was required to construct the improvements from the private Loop Road to SR 18 ramps. A street modification by the Public Works Director was issued for the original Preferred Freezer, which is now Warehouse A. Warehouse B should be responsible for a portion of the frontage improvements, but in accordance with completed street modification Warehouse A remains responsible.
40. It appears that trucks could utilize the loop road (private road) for access to both Warehouse A and Warehouse B. Please demonstrate how the development will prohibit truck traffic from traveling through the roundabout and using the private loop road for access to the site.
41. Submit a Vehicle/Truck Turning Diagram to the Public Works Traffic Division if any trucks utilize the roundabout. This diagram will show how the appropriate design vehicle can enter, maneuver, and leave the site without encroaching onto opposing traffic lanes or mounting a curb. The roundabout may need to be modified to accommodate the truck traffic, if applicable.
42. The proposed island on Weyerhaeuser Way will modify access for the property on the east side of the street (Parcel 3's driveway) from no left-turn out between 4 and 6 to no left-turn out at all time. Please inform and coordinate with the property owner of Parcel 3 of the proposed changes.
43. Show street lighting along Weyerhaeuser Way on the plans. Detailed design is not required at this time.
44. Provide rights-of-way dimensions on the plan.
45. Sidewalk ramps along Weyerhaeuser Way must meet ADA/PROWAG requirements.
46. Coordinate and confirm with transit agencies on the bus stop and bus shelter location.
47. Accessible pedestrian path/connection should be provided from the building (site) to the proposed bus stop on Weyerhaeuser Way South. Demonstrate how pedestrians will travel from the building to the proposed bus stop.
48. The southerly shared driveway designated as truck access is located within the Warehouse A parcel. Explain how this driveway will be constructed if Warehouse B were to proceed ahead of Warehouse A.

49. The channelization plans should be submitted to WSDOT for comments as soon as possible.
50. The proposed driveways shall be limited to 30 feet in width per the concomitant agreement. Please note, a written change to the agreement or a formal amendment must be approved by both parties to increase the driveway width.
51. The pavement analysis performed by GeoEngineers was reviewed by the Public Works Street Division. Based on their review, the existing pavement condition on Weyerhaeuser Way will not be adequate to handle the expected truck traffic load. The development must provide pavement design for city review and approval. Once the pavement design is approved by the city, the development must perform full depth reconstruction of the roadway.

TIA Review Comments

52. Based on the project description, the Institute of Transportation Engineer (ITE) Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition LUC 150 (Warehouse) with 20 percent truck trips is appropriate for the project.
53. The trip assignment for Warehouse A did not have any non-truck trips using the south driveway. Due to shorter travel distance, it is not reasonable to assume that non-truck trips (vehicle trips) would not utilize the south driveway for access. The additional non-truck traffic to the driveway may not impact the driveway LOS or queuing.
54. The proposal to apply a four percent annual traffic growth rate to the existing counts to estimate horizon year volume is acceptable. Please note, typically the city uses a two percent growth rate; however, four percent may be appropriate given the potential for vacant properties to become re-occupied without triggering review of transportation impacts.
55. The existing count for Weyerhaeuser Way South and Weyerhaeuser Road depicted in Figure 3 appears not to match the existing printout in Attachment B. Please clarify if seasonal factor was used.
56. Include Weyerhaeuser Way South and SR-18 eastbound ramps count data in Attachment B.
57. Figure 6: The southbound U-turn volume for AM and PM at Weyerhaeuser Way South and 33rd Place South is not correct. For AM the SBU should be 9 and 27 for PM. Please verify.
58. The LOS and queuing analysis at Weyerhaeuser Way South and Weyerhaeuser Way Road (private Loop road) intersection should include trips from the HQ building (assuming full occupancy). The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation - 10th Edition, land use code 714 (General Office building) may be used to estimate the trip generation for the vacant office building.
59. The TIA identified that all inbound and outbound truck traffic will use the main truck site access on Weyerhaeuser Way South. Please demonstrate how the development would prohibit/limit truck traffic from using Weyerhaeuser Way South north of the site.
60. The SR 18 ramp intersections are expected to operate at LOS D, with a maximum of 325-foot 95th percentile queue length. The SR 18 ramp intersections are state facilities and must be approved by WSDOT.

61. Based on the queuing analysis, the northbound left turn lane into the site is expected to have a maximum queue length of 75 feet for Warehouse A (about one truck). The analysis performed by staff using the queue length probability based on poisson distribution is two to three vehicles. The recommended 215 foot left turn storage for Warehouse A is reasonable.
62. The cycle length used in the LOS analysis for SR 18 ramps should be reflective of field condition. Please coordinate with WSDOT on ramp intersections cycle length.
63. The proposal to relocate the bus stops to the new crosswalk location is reasonable. Due to the proposed relocation, reasonable pedestrian access from Parcel 3 shall also be provided. However, this proposal must be reviewed and approved by the applicable transit agencies. Please note, transit amenities improvements such as bus pad, bus shelter, etc. will be required as identified by the transit agencies.
64. WSDOT provided technical review comments on the previous TIA. Please forward the revised TIA to WSDOT for comments.

SEPA Checklist – Transportation

65. *Transportation 14(c)* – Revise to include frontage improvements and right-of-way dedication consistent with the street modification issued by the Public Works Director. Additionally, pavement along Weyerhaeuser Way will be upgraded to accommodate truck traffic.
66. *Transportation 14(e)* – Traffic generated by the project must be consistent with the TIA. Revise truck traffic generated by the project to be consistent with the submitted TIA.
67. *Transportation 14(g)* – Revise this section to include adding a left-turn lane at the south driveway for truck traffic. Also, discuss traffic management plans to restrict trucks from traveling north on Weyerhaeuser Way.

Additional Information

For information, the city has received comments requesting further analysis of the following transportation items, which you are encouraged to address.

68. The existing traffic around the site (Weyerhaeuser Way South and SR 18 ramp terminal intersections) is already congested. These roads were not designed to handle the amount and types of traffic generated by the proposed development. Provide capacity analysis for the roadway segment and intersection LOS to address these concerns during the AM, PM, and Weekend Peaks.
69. The SR 18 ramp terminal intersections and Weyerhaeuser Way roundabout were not designed to handle the types of truck traffic by the project. Verify the design vehicle can maneuver through the roundabouts and SR 18 interchange on/off ramps using AutoTURN software. Provide plot of the design and verification.

Brian Asbury – Lakehaven Water & Sewer District, (253) 946-5407, basbury@lakehaven.org

70. The applicant has a current Developer Extension Agreement with Lakehaven (Lakehaven Project 6316012). However, the applicant has not yet submitted plans to Lakehaven for the proposed Warehouse A site.

71. Following are some preliminary technical comments, based on the most recent plans submittal to the city:
- a. No new water main/system connection to existing water main in Weyerhaeuser Way South is shown. This will be required to meet the minimum site development fire flow as required.
 - b. General layout of the proposed onsite water mains/system and fire hydrants appears consistent with the site's development requirements and Lakehaven standards.
 - c. From sewer manhole 1 to sewer manhole 2 is on a "diagonal." There is a retaining wall on either side of the east entrance and having the sewer more centrally located could place the walls outside of the sewer easement.
 - d. Is the sewer main between manhole 1 and manhole 2 line within the load area of the walls, or within the engineered portion (geo-fabric) of the wall? If so, the sewer main may need to be within casing.
 - e. No apparent sewer service is proposed to/for the trash area, although it's not entirely clear where the proposed trash area is located (east side of building east of parking lot?). Lakehaven recommends appropriate trash area BMPs and no sewer connection; however, if sewer connection is proposed, then the area/connection will need to meet applicable Lakehaven rules (e.g., cover/roof, oil/water separator, etc.).

Chris Cahan – South King Fire & Rescue, (253) 946-7243, Chris.Cahan@southkingfire.org

Fire Flow

72. The required fire flow for this project is 3000 gallons per minute for IIA construction, or 4000 gallons per minute for IIB construction. A *Certificate of Water Availability*, including a *hydraulic fire flow model*, shall be requested from the water district and provided at the time of building permit application.

Fire Hydrants

73. This project will require at least three fire hydrants if IIA, or four fire hydrants if IIB, in approved* locations.
74. Existing fire hydrants on adjacent properties shall not be considered, unless fire apparatus access roads extended between the properties and easements are established to prevent obstructions of such roads.
75. *Hydrant(s) spacing along access roads and location in relationship to buildings and sprinkler FDC shall be approved by Fire Marshal's Office.
76. Fire hydrants shall be in service prior to and during the time of construction.

Emergency Access

77. Fire apparatus access roads shall comply with **all requirements** of Fire Access Policy 10.006: <http://southkingfire.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/24>.
78. The site plan did not provide detail to verify the following requirements:
- Turning radius
 - Maximum grades
 - Angles of approach, departure, and minimum ground clearance

79. Designated and marked fire lanes may be required for emergency access. This may be done during the plans check or prior to building final. Requirements and marking options can be found in Title 8 of the FWRC: <http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/FederalWay/>.
80. Fire apparatus access roads shall be installed and made serviceable prior to and during the time of construction.

Vehicle Access Gates

81. All vehicle access gates, if any, shall comply with SKF&R Gate Policy.

Fire Department Lock Box

82. A *recessed* fire department “Knox” brand key box shall be installed on the building near the front entrance. Location(s) will be approved by the plan reviewer or Deputy Fire Marshal onsite.

Fire Sprinkler System

83. *An NFPA 13 fire sprinkler system is required.*
84. An automatic fire sprinkler system shall be installed in all occupancies where the total floor area included within the surrounding exterior walls on all floor levels, including basements, exceeds 5,000 square feet. Fire walls shall not be considered to separate a building to enable deletion of the required automatic fire-extinguishing system.
85. The system demand pressure (to the source) required in a hydraulically designed automatic fire sprinkler system shall be at least 10 percent less than the correlative water supply curve pressure.

Fire Alarm

86. *A fire alarm system is required.*
87. City code requires an automatic fire detection system in all buildings exceeding 3,000 square feet gross floor area. The fire alarm system is required to monitor the sprinkler system, including water flow. Provide full notification as required by NFPA 72. *Complete coverage smoke detection is not required for this project.* This fire detection system shall be monitored by an approved central and/or remote station.

Emergency Responder Radio Coverage

88. All buildings shall have approved radio coverage for emergency responders within the building based upon the existing coverage levels of the public safety communication system at the exterior of the building. A DAS system may be required.

High Piled Storage

89. The building shall be designed for High Piled Combustible Storage in accordance with chapter 32 of the 2015 IFC. This code offers options for fire protection based on the intended use of the building. Some options will limit the commodity and height of storage in the warehouse.

CLOSING

Please be aware that this review does not preclude the city from requesting additional information related to any of the topics discussed above. Please submit revised application materials as appropriate, accompanied by the completed "Resubmittal Information Form" (enclosed). Pursuant to FWRC 19.15.050, if an applicant fails to provide additional information to the city within 180 days of being notified that such information is requested, the application shall be deemed null and void and the city shall have no duty to process, review, or issue any decisions with respect to such an application.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at stacey.welsh@cityoffederalway.com, 253 835-2634.

Sincerely,



Stacey Welsh, AICP
Senior Planner

enc: Resubmittal Information Form

c: Brian Davis, Community Development Director
Robert "Doc" Hansen, Planning Manager
Jim Harris, Planner
Ann Dower, Senior Engineering Plans Reviewer
Rob Van Orsow, Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Sarady Long, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Brian Asbury, Lakehaven Water & Sewer District
Chris Cahan, South King Fire & Rescue
Sarah Ott, WSDOT, OttSara@wsdot.wa.gov
Felix Palisoc, WSDOT, Palisof@wsdot.wa.gov
Tom Messmer, tmessmer@industrialrealtygroup.com
Matt Reider, Matt.Reider@esmcivil.com