



COMMUNITY PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & INNOVATION

Development Services Division

435 RYMAN | MISSOULA. MT 59802-4297 | 406.552.6630 | FAX 406.552.6053

October 19, 2023

Brian Throckmorton
406 Engineering
1201 S. 6th Street West #102
Missoula, MT 59801

Re: Aspire Major Subdivision, Annexation, & Zoning Upon Annexation 1st Sufficiency Review

Dear Brian Throckmorton:

The first sufficiency review period began for the Aspire Subdivision on September 28, 2023. The 15-working day sufficiency review deadline is October 19, 2023. **At this time, Development Services cannot certify your application packet as sufficient for governing body review.**

Below is a summary of the deficiencies. Please address the items listed below, then submit only the updated sections of the application packet with a new cover page clearly titled as 2nd Sufficiency Review, and include the date submitted. Please submit the amended sections electronically and provide a replacement paper copy of all sections that are amended.

Project Summary

1. The fourth sentence in the second paragraph in the project summary says the current zoning designation is C-RR3 while the Missoula County Property Information System and the zoning map and regulations submitted in the application materials indicate the property is zoned Residential (R). Please correct.
2. On page 2, under Offsite Connection Streets, the fourth sentence says Waterside Drive is within a 50-foot wide right-of-way. The Water's Edge Subdivision plats show a Waterside Drive within a 54-foot wide right-of-way and utility easement. The reference to 50 feet is also located twice in the Low Density Urban Local Streets section and in the Variances Requested section. Please correct.

Annexation Petition

3. Please provide an original annexation petition with the original signatures of all landowners.

Phasing Plan

4. Phase 1 does not include adequate emergency service areas (Article 3-020.3.F). The fire truck turnaround area is not sufficient as shown and would require a fire official approved temporary turnaround. Either a temporary cul-de-sac or installation of the southern alley (preferred) would suffice.

Subdivision Application

5. In general, I suggest editing the text one more time for accuracy, spelling, and grammar. For example, near the bottom of page 8 the text says the Clark Fork River is located to the west of the property instead of the east. There are numerous spelling errors and minor edits needed.
6. On page 8 under agriculture production, the checked box indicates the proposed subdivision is not located on land currently or previously used for agricultural prosecution while the text above and below indicates the property has been used for agriculture. Please correct.

7. On page 10 under maintenance of agricultural water user facilities, the text states section C of the application includes existing water rights information. I did not locate this information within the application materials. Please provide.
8. On page 11 under historical features, please update this section based on the Historical Resources requirements indicated in this letter below.
9. On page 13 under water quality, section #1, October 12, 2023 correspondence from the Missoula County Conservation District indicates a 310 permit will be required for construction of the riverside trail and related fencing. Please update this section to reflect this requirement. Under section #2, the second sentence is cut off. Please update to include the complete answer.
10. On page 15 under limitations map, the text states there are no slopes in excess of 25% slope while the grading and drainage plan indicates there are slopes over 25% slope. Please provide a slope category map as described in Section 3-140.3 of the City Subdivision Regulations. If any residential development is proposed on slopes 15% or greater, please include a density reduction worksheet.
11. On page 15 and 16, please provide additional information on the types of wildlife that inhabit or are likely to inhabit not only the general area, but the property, particularly along the Clark Fork River Corridor.
12. At the top of page 24, a multiplier of between 0.2 – 0.5 school aged children per household is provided. Where did this range come from? Please state the source.
13. On page 25, please include parkland dedication calculations and ensure they are consistent with the requirements of the subdivision regulations and the totals depicted on the phasing plan or adjust as necessary.

Parks and Recreation

14. As requested by the Missoula County Parks, Trails, and Open Lands office in an October 17, 2023 email, please coordinate with and document the outcome of discussions with that office on the proposed western common area access and facilities as it relates to Canyon View Park. I am interested in participating / listening into the discussion so please copy me on correspondence and / or meeting opportunities.
15. Regarding the river trail, the minimum clear zone from the edge of the trail to the property line is three feet. Lot 77 may need to be adjusted to accommodate this clearance. Please investigate and adjust if necessary.
16. Regarding connection to the river trail in the Water's Edge Subdivision, please provide evidence that trail segment has a public access easement.
17. Please ensure there is vehicle access to the north and south ends of the proposed river trail to allow for maintenance.
18. City Parks and Recreation staff indicate the common area adjacent to Canyon View Park should be HOA owned and maintained common area. The City is not willing to take on ownership and maintenance at this time as it is within the service area of existing County parklands. Please update the covenants accordingly.
19. A proposed grading plan is needed for the western common area. It appears not all of this area will count toward parkland dedication as currently designed. Areas that are steeper than 25% slope cannot be counted toward parkland dedication.
20. Parks and Recreation staff suggest Lots 139 – 141 should be eliminated to create a park / common area that works well for the neighborhood, providing more usable activity area that is flat enough for active recreation, better connect the parkland to residents of the neighborhood, and increase passive surveillance of the park from the street and follow Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design guidelines.
21. In order to mitigate the variance for block length, staff suggests a shared use path be created through the common area and through the north side of Canyon View Park to connect to the Robinson Street ROW, perhaps included in an access easement.
22. Staff also suggests providing better pedestrian connections to the multi-dwelling lots as right now, there are only pedestrian connections proposed along the streets.

Historical Resources

23. As requested by City of Missoula Historic Preservation Officer Elizabeth Johnson in her letter of review dated October 12, 2021, please submit documentation of any buildings, structures, or site features known to be over 50 years of age that will be impacted by this proposal for determination of significance and compliance with City Subdivision Regulations Section 3-010.8. The documentation should be completed and recorded using an Architectural-Engineering Record form found [here](#). An historical research consultant can help compile this report, and it is important the individual working on the report meet the State Historic Preservation Office's professional qualifications. Should you have questions, please contact Ms. Johnson (JohnsonE@ci.missoula.mt.us) and copy me. Specifically, please include:

- a. A detailed site history that documents the physical development of the property and landscape.
- b. Photographs of all four exterior elevations of each building on the property that would be impacted by the proposed subdivision. If interior photographs are a possibility, please include those as well.
- c. Photo documentation of the existing conditions of any landscape features (irrigation ditches, etc.) that will be impacted by the proposed subdivision.
- d. Reproductions of any available historic images or documents related to the property.
- e. An assessment of the current condition of each structure / landscape feature known to be over 50 years old.
- f. An assessment of the property's eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.
- g. An assessment of any adverse effects the proposed subdivision may have on the historic properties / landscape features.

Transportation, Water, Sewer, Grading and Drainage – Note: the full comments from the City Public Works & Mobility Department are attached. The items below are required for sufficiency. We advise you address some or all of the other items with the updated submittal to move the project review and potential approvals along more quickly in compliance with City standards.

24. City Subdivision Regulations Section 3-020.12.A states, "New streets that will align with existing streets must have the same name as the existing street." The plat shows Bent Branch Road, while the main southern access to the subdivision is from Sommers Street. The road construction plan sheet changed the street name, but all other plans still call out Bent Branch Road. Please correct. Except as discussed below, please call each new street a generic name, such as Road A, Road B, etc. This will have to be reflected throughout the different sections of the submittal. A condition of approval will require proper street naming prior to final plat filing of Phase I.
25. The alleys must connect to Sommers Street and Crosscut Way at right angles as per Section 3-020.9.B and provide acceptable visibility (3-020.9.D).
26. Alleys providing fire apparatus access to the multi-dwelling lots must be a minimum of 20 feet paved width (3-020.3F and MCPWSS Table 7-5).
27. The 10-foot and 15-foot public utility easements in the multi-dwelling area references the wrong benefiting lots (5-010.4.H).
28. Provide names for the two alleys. Emergency services will have difficulty locating them if they are addressed off of other roads. The southern one would be logical to continue as Waterside Drive all the way to the intersection with Bent Branch Road / Sommers Street.
29. Provide a complete grading plan (5-020.11). Some street profiles show a large amount of fill dropping from the bench heading east (Waterside, Aspire, Junction, Crosscut). Street profiles must substantially follow natural contours while not exceeding maximum grades (3-140.6.C).
30. On sheet 17 and 18 of 20 of the road plans, clarify the trail surfacing material. The trail is shown as concrete but called out as gravel. It should be asphalt to match the existing trail in

Water's Edge – verify with City Parks & Recreation. Trail and connections must meet PROWAG accessibility requirements (grades, rest areas, stairs, handrails, etc.). Add profiles for pedestrian connections between Waterside Drive and the river trail. Check grades of pedestrian connections from Waterside Drive to the trail. Show the existing trail in Waters Edge and the proposed tie-in. Estimate grades to be verified with a profile view. (See Public Works & Mobility notes for additional information.)

31. Show utility service access for existing sewer main on the east side of the property (3-020.3.F and MCPWSS 5.3.4.A.1).
32. Please provide documentation of coordination with Missoula County Public Works regarding offsite transportation improvements.
33. Provide transit stop improvements at Sommers / Speedway (3-020.4.G).
34. All water system sheets – Show existing and proposed fire hydrants (5-020.12).
35. In reference to the subdivision application Section 6.e.v (water supply): The blow capacity comments from the pre-application notes need to be incorporated into the response. City staff will work through the issues related to the capacity issues, probably through conditions of approval, but the issues must be acknowledged in the application.
 - a. The City does not have sufficient water rights for the Canyon River well. Staff requests water rights be dedicated to the public if water rights exist for the property.
 - b. There is insufficient existing system capacity to provide fire flow to Canyon River. The City is working on a Special Facility District to fund improvements to the East Missoula water system. Phase 1 would be upsizing a water main in Sommers Street. The water model shows when this section of water main is upsized, it allows for the required fire flow in Canyon River.

Variance Requests

36. Variance request #2 states the request is to reduce a segment of the Waterside Drive right-of-way to 52 feet wide, which would match the existing Waterside Drive ROW. The preliminary plat and road cross section show this segment proposed with a 50-foot ROW. As noted above, the existing Waterside Drive has a 54-foot public ROW and utility easement – City staff suggest this segment be widened to 54 feet instead of 50 to match the existing ROW and provide justification for the variance. Also please edit for content, clarity, and complete sentences. For example, the existing Waterside Drive ROW is larger, not smaller, as stated in the request. Please show how the proposed sidewalk will align with the existing sidewalk.
37. Variance request # 5 does not seem to be based on conditions that are unique to the property. It appears Heartwood Place could be extended to the south. Staff suggest a revision or further discussion on this issue. A

Neighborhood Character Overlay

38. Staff have significant and substantive edits to the proposed format and text to align the proposed overlay zoning with the existing Missoula Title 20 zoning. These edits and suggestions are being provided under separate cover.

Recommendations

Please see the detailed comments and requirements of the City Public Works and Mobility Department and address the comments in updated submittal documents to allow more timely review and potential approval of the development application.

When you are ready to submit your updated materials, please direct them to me. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to give me a call at 406-885-7526.

Sincerely,



Dave DeGrandpre, AICP
Planning Supervisor
Community Planning, Development & Innovation

cc: Mary McCrea, CPDI
Eran Pehan, CPDI
Walter Banziger, CPDI
Troy Monroe, PWM
Steve Reichert, PWM
Nathan McLeod, Parks & Recreation
Lucy Rummler, Parks & Recreation

Engineering 1st Sufficiency Review – Aspire Subdivision

- **Section A – Maps, Plats, Plans, and Figures**

- **A8 Preliminary Plat**

- The below comment made in 2nd element was not addressed. The preliminary plat still shows Bent Branch Road.
 - Other (preliminary sufficiency items)
 - i. Article 3-020.12.A states, "New streets that will align with existing streets must have the same name as the existing street". The main access to this subdivision is from Sommers Street to the southwestern portion of the property. However, once this street hits this subdivision, it becomes Bent Branch Road. The main Road Construction plan sheet changed the street name, but all other plans still call out Bent Branch Road. Need to correct the inconsistency. We recommend calling each road a generic name (i.e. Road A, Road B, etc.) since there will be a condition of approval requiring the street naming exhibit to be reviewed and approved by Development Services prior to filing the amended plat per Article 3-020.12.
 - Alley must intersect with Sommers Street and Crosscut Way at right angles (Article 3-020.9B) and provide acceptable visibility (Article 3-020.9D).
 - Alleys providing fire apparatus access to the multi-family lots must be minimum 20' paved width (Article 3-020.3F and MCPWSS Table 7-5).
 - The 10' and 15' P.U.E.s in the multi-family reference the wrong benefiting lots (Article 5-010.4H).
 - Select a new proposed road name for "Junction Way". In the USPS addressing standards, the word Junction is reserved for the road type, like Drive, Avenue, Trail, etc. Junction Way is akin to Avenue St (Article 5-010.4D and MCPWSS 7.4.8F).
 - Provide names for the two alleys at the southern extent of the project. Emergency services will have difficulty locating them if they are addressed off of other roads. The southern one would be logical to continue as Waterside Drive all the way to the intersection with Bent Branch Road/Sommers Street (Article 5-010.4D and MCPWSS 7.4.8F).
 - Subdivision Application Section 2.c states that water rights will be abandoned/ transferred. The preliminary plat does not contain the required note for removal of water rights (Article 3-060.4C).

- **A12 Road Plans**

- All sheets – relocate sumps at curb ramps to the upstream flow path side (MCPWSS 6.3.4B).
 - All sheets – Sump placement seems to be random and not relatively balanced on both sides of the roads. Not related to low points. Check drainage basins in storm drainage report.
 - All Sheets – Consider traffic calming and pedestrian safety measures for internal intersections; these are local residential streets for which the City has set target speeds of 20 mph. At the least, I'd recommend curb extensions at gateway intersections (Sommers & Crosscut, Waterside & Aspire Lp) and something (curb extensions or a traffic circle) at the one four leg intersection of Heartwood & Aspire.
 - Provide a complete grading plan (Article 5-020.11). Some street profiles show a large amount of fill dropping from the bench heading east (Waterside, Aspire, Junction, Crosscut). Street profiles must substantially follow natural contours while not exceeding maximum grades (Article 3-140.6C).
 - Add plan and profile for alleys and show drainage plan (MCPWSS 7.2.2E.7).

- Sheet 3 of 20 – Add curb ramp at the end of the proposed sidewalk on the east side of Waterside Drive to the existing sidewalk in Waters Edge. (PROWAG R201.1)
- Sheet 3 Of 20 – The proposed chicane island at the north end of Waterside Dr is not a complete design for an effective chicane (missing parking lane island) - see image for example. Also, a facility like this should have associated lighting, even on a local street.



- Sheet 4 of 20 – Add curb extension, crosswalk marking, and signage to the mid-block crossing (MCPWSS 7.3.7).
- Sheet 5 of 20 – Add east-west pedestrian crossing between Lot 91/Lot 76 (MCPWSS 7.4.12J.2). Moving the pedestrian access to the trail from between Lot 77/78 to between Lot 76/77 to align with this crossing would also reduce the pedestrian access distance along this block face.
- Sheet 7 of 20 – Remove the pedestrian crossing/sidewalk at the alley entrance. Add curb extensions to the southern intersection leg and maintain the throat width (2 drive lanes) to the alley. Provide sidewalk on the east side to access the trail.
- Sheet 8/16 of 20 – Add ped crossing at the corner of Lot 142 and Lot 126, crossing to the Common Area (MCPWSS 7.4.12J.2). This will be a projected pedestrian desire line to the pedestrian network in the common area (NACTO Urban Street Design Guide). Add curb extension, crosswalk marking, and signage to these crossings (MCPWSS 7.3.7).
- Sheet 12/13 of 20 – Alley alignment must intersect the road at a right angle and must allow a single vehicle que at the stop line of the alley to meet AASHTO sight visibility requirements. The northern alley alignment is currently too skewed.
- Sheet 12/13 of 20 – Alleys providing fire apparatus access to the multi-family lots must be minimum 20' paved width (MCPWSS Table 7-5)
- Sheet 14 of 20 – Show Sommers St off-site improvements and tie-in with on-site improvements. Square up alley with Sommers St to reduce speed of vehicles turning off of Sommers. Add curb extension, crosswalk marking, and signage to the mid-block crossing (MCPWSS 7.3.7).
- Sheet 17/18 of 20 – Clarify trail surfacing material. The trail is shown as concrete but called out as gravel. It should be asphalt to match the existing trail in Waters Edge - verify with Parks. Trail and connectors must meet PROWAG accessibility requirements (grades, rest areas, stairs, handrails, etc...) Add profiles for all pedestrian connections between Waterside Drive and the river trail. Check grades of pedestrian connectors from Waterside Drive to trail. Show existing trail in Waters Edge and proposed tie-in. Estimate grades to be verified with a profile view:
 - 7.5% from beginning of trail from road down to river
 - 10% sections on trail from 5+25 to 7+25
 - ~14% between Sta 19+00 (road) – 3236' to Sta 4+44 (trail) – 3220'
 - ~10% between Sta 14+50 (road) – 3227' to Sta 8+80 (trail) – 3218'
 - ~12% between Sta 5+10 (road) – 3232' to Sta 14+55 (trail) – 3216'

- Sheet 20 of 20 – Make parking lanes 7' wide (including gutter) on sections A/B. (Table .2A for low density local residential street and MCPWSS Table 7-5). Wider drive lanes on section C are acceptable due to geometry but drive lane width cannot include gutter. (MCPWSS Table 7-5)
- Show utility service access for existing sewer main on east side of the property (Article 3-020.3F and MCPWSS 5.3.4A.1).
- A14 Watermain Plans
 - All sheets – Show existing and proposed fire hydrants (Article 5-020.12)
 - All sheets – Show trees/sumps/sewer services/other utilities to evaluate clearances (MCPWSS 4.2.2A).
 - All sheets – Minimize high points in the water main profile to avoid unnecessary air-relief. Add air-relief valves as necessary (MCPWSS 4.3.6).
 - All sheets – Call out main horizontal deflection (MCPWSS 3.2.2A.4). Ensure it doesn't exceed 60% of manufacturer's recommendation (MCPWSS Appendix 2-A, Section 02660, Part 3.2D.2.f)
 - Sheet 3 of 20 – Match the profile stationing to the plan stationing (reverse the profile).
 - Sheet 15/16 of 20 – How is alley going to be drained? We want to avoid conflict with water main routing and any necessary drainage facility. Water main should be centered unless there are clearance issues to other facilities.
 - Sheet 4 of 20 – Show existing sewer main (MCPWSS 4.2.2A).
 - Sheet 13 of 20 – Tee into Sommers St main at 90 degrees. Typical comment for other relevant sheets.
 - Sheet 20 of 20 – Horizontal fitting near 15+30 not realistic. Need to adjust so 22.5/45/90 degree bend can be used.
- Water Main Report
 - Include a more in-depth explanation of the phasing of the water system in relation to the subdivision phases.
 - Calculate water demands (MCPWSS 4.2.3B).
 - Discuss fire flow requirements (MCPWSS 4.2.3B.4).
- A15 Sewermain Plans
 - All sheets - INV IN and INV OUT appear backwards, double check all invert elevations.
 - All sheets – Show trees/sumps/water services/other utilities to evaluate clearances (MCPWSS 5.2.2A).
 - All relevant sheets – Show service lines from existing main (MCPWSS 5.2.2A.5).
 - Sheet 4 of 16 – Move manhole lids minimum 2' from gutters and out of wheel paths (MCPWSS 5.3.4.A.1.c)
 - Sheet 5 of 16 – Missing pipe size callout on profile (MCPWSS 5.2.2A.6.a).
 - Sheet 5 of 16 – Show existing sewer mains (MCPWSS 5.2.2A.5). Confirm that connection to wet well is feasible given the other sewer main connections.
 - Sheet 6/8/9/11/12/13/15 of 16 – Place terminal manholes that will not be extended further at minimum depth, adjust grade of sewer main accordingly to maximum of 10% grade in order to avoid using drop structures.
 - Sheet 7 of 16 – It is unclear what is proposed at the North intersection of Heartwood Place and Aspire Loop where existing and proposed sewer mains intersect (Sta. 4+89 on Sheet 8, Sta. 0+00 on Sheet 7). Show existing sewer mains and call out abandonment (MCPWSS 5.2.2A.5). Will the existing manhole be re-used or replaced?
 - Sheet 10 of 16 – Street names are mis-labeled. Correct and check other sheets.
 - Sheet 3/14/16 of 16 – Label depth in these minimum cover locations. Ensure minimum depth of 4' from top of pipe to finish grade is maintained. (MCPWSS 5.3.1.C.1) Use flat tops for manholes less than 5' from pipe invert to rim elevation. (MCPWSS 5.3.1.C.3)
 - Is there room to build on Lots 1-5 with the existing sewer main? How is access to the existing sewer main being maintained?

- Sheet 15 of 16 – 6-inch sewer services required for multifamily lots (MCPWSS 5.3.3B.1.b)
 - Confirm existing sewer can serve lots West of Bent Branch Road by a gravity sewer service. (i.e. no ejector pumps). Lots 100 to 110 especially.
- Sewer Report
 - Pipe sizing discussion is inadequate. Does not discuss carrying capacity of proposed pipe. Does not compute peaking factor and peak flow. Also need to discuss pipe sizing for section where existing sewer main is to be replaced. (MCPWSS 5.2.3B).
 - Need to discuss existing lift station and ability to handle new flows (MCPWSS 5.2.3C).
- A16 Phasing Plan
 - Roads
 - Phase 1 does not include adequate emergency service access (Article 3-020.3F). Fire truck turnaround is not sufficient as shown and would require a fire official approved temporary turnaround. Either a temporary cul-de-sac or installation of the southern alley (preferred).
 - Non-motorized
 - Phase 1-4 would not have access to the existing park. Temporary access for Phases 1-4 will likely be a condition of approval until Phase 5 is completed.
 - Water
 - Could not evaluate hydrants phasing for fire protection.
 - Sewer
 - Phase 1 sewer would require extension to lift station (and all stubs for adjacent phases)
 - Phase 6 services for Lots 142-148 would be long services from the existing sewer in common area (phase 5).
 - Which phase would require abandonment of the existing sewer through lots 182 and 87? Phase 4 will require abandonment of existing sewer beneath Lot 87 or platting with the existing sewer/easement in place.
- A17 Sommers Street Offsite Improvements
 - City staff acknowledge off-site improvements are under Missoula County jurisdiction.
 - **Provide transit stop improvements at Sommers/Speedway (Article 3-020.4G).**
 - Provide ramps for Sommers St pedestrian crossings at every intersection. At the very least, the crossings at the Speedway intersection should be striped.
 - Provide curb extensions on the continuous side of T-intersections (Dakota Ave, Colorado Ave) for those pedestrian crossings and additional traffic calming benefits.
 - Recommend centerline striping on Sommers (not required per MUTCD max volume threshold, but projected volume is approaching/at what we would consider reclassifying as a City collector) and sharrows to emphasize the route's potential bicycle greenway traffic.
 - City Complete Streets policy and PW Manual suggest lighting is appropriate on Sommers, especially considering the lack of a proposed dedicated bike facility.
 - Section B – drive lane cannot include gutter pan.
 - Is there opportunity for a JUT on the east side and bury of overhead utilities?
 - With a potential water main project beginning at the corner of Sommers/Dakota, road improvements may be held south of this intersection to avoid removing newly installed infrastructure. Timing of both projects, and a future Highway 200 project, would need to be considered as well.
- **Section C – Subdivision Application**
 - Section 2.e – Where is the referenced attachment? **"Attached in Section C of this application are existing water rights."**
 - Section 6.e.v (Water Supply) – The below capacity comments from the pre-application notes need to be incorporated into the response. We will work through the issues related to the

capacity issues, probably through conditions of approval, but the issues need to be acknowledged in the application.

- The City does not have sufficient water rights for the Canyon River well. We would request water rights be dedicated to the public if water rights exist for the property.
- Insufficient existing system capacity to provide fireflow to Canyon River. City is working on Special Facility District to fund improvements to East Missoula water system. Phase 1 would be upsizing a water main in Sommer's St. The water model shows when this section of water main is upsized it allows for the required fireflow in Canyon River.

- **Section L – Traffic Impact Study**

- City staff acknowledge off-site improvements are under Missoula County jurisdiction. These comments will be provided to Missoula County Public Works.
- It is recommended that the developers work with Missoula County and MDT to help implement the planned widening of Highway 200 through East Missoula and monitor the traffic conditions at the intersection of Highway 200 and Sommers Street during the development process to determine if a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection through 2030.
- [The East Missoula Highway 200 Corridor Plan](#) – shows the proposed section of Hwy 200 at Sommers in Figure 5-10 on Page 97. It lists Bus stop and striped crossing improvements are planned for the Hwy 200/Sommers intersection. Note: No traffic signal or roundabout is currently proposed in this plan. However, the TIS states the projected LOS for this intersection is D and E for the peak hours.
- Look to realign Sommers Street to a 90-degree angle with its intersection of Hwy 200.
- Minimum driving lanes on Sommers need to be 10' on asphalt, no driving lane width shall be shown on adjacent gutter pan.

- **Section N – Grading and Drainage Report**

- Proposed Condition needs to consider run-on from upgradient areas, including Sommers Street, Waterside Drive in Waters Edge, and neighborhoods to the West.
- Blanket use of Type A soil is not appropriate. NRCS soils report indicates Type B soils are present. Additionally, Geotech report indicates clay lenses were encountered.
- Post-development curve numbers should be based on actual proposed impervious area. Where impervious extents are not known (i.e. lot layouts) base CN on maximum impervious area allowed by zoning.
- Update pre and post development condition figures to show all requirements for MCPWSS 6.2.3.A5 and 6.2.3.A6, including land cover assumptions, curve numbers, and soil types. Elements can be shown across multiple figures as needed for clarity.
- Pre and post development condition analysis areas should have matching extents or provide justification for variations.
- Basins GG, HH, and NN are missing from Table 3-5.
- Proposed and existing contours are indistinguishable in proposed condition figure.
- Discuss multifamily stormwater control in greater detail. Runoff originating in parking lots and from multifamily roofs should be infiltrated by private sumps outside of the ROW.
- Single family lots should be graded to provide a drainage path to the ROW without directing runoff to across neighboring lots. Drainage across neighboring lots is allowable if drainage easements are provided.
- Provide more information about the swale in Basin NN. The report states that the swale will act as a detention facility but also states the swale will have centerline slopes up to 12%. Swale detention capacity should account for centerline slope.
- Swale in Basin NN should have 1-ft of freeboard and meet setback requirements of MCPWSS 6.3.11.
- Discuss swale drawdown time.

- **Recommended Conditions of Approval if not addressed in sufficiency.**

- Proof of abandonment of sewer main and easement from East Missoula Sewer District
- Transferring of water rights to City
- SID/RSID waiver statement for roadway improvements to Sommers Street including the intersection of Sommers Street and Highway 200.
- Utility access road for existing sewer main
- Temporary non-motorized connection from trail to existing park for use until Phase 5 is completed.
- Accessible route to nearest transit stops on Speedway.
- Latecomers agreement or other method for Dakota water main.