



PO Box 160247 Clearfield, UT 84016  
Phone: 801-775-8737 \* Fax: 801-825-9978  
ashley@cwconstruction.com

Chad Meyerhoffer  
Weber County Engineering Dept.

May 9, 2013

RE: Engineer Review for Professional Building 4-22-2013

Dear Chad:

The following items address your concerns for your engineering review dated 4-22-13:

See the redlines on document Overall Utility Plan

Comments are addressed as follows:

- 1Q: Does water come from this location
- 1A: The street is sloped to the north in this area. Water that flows off the street continues to the west in a historical fashion.
- 2Q: Is this high-back curb?
- 2A: The curb consists of some standard curb and some spill curb. See the detail sheets for exact dimensions.
- 3Q: What is the high water mark of the detention area?
- 3A: The high water mark is at an elevation of 95.00. See Grading Plan.
- 4Q: Would like to see some spot elevations in this area and TBC.
- 4A: See Grading Plan for spot elevations and contours.
- 5Q: The piping is different than shown on sheet 3 of the storm water study. Are the slopes on the pipes the same?? In reviewing the nodes on sheets 9&10. Update study to reflect actual pipe layout.
- 5A: The Storm Water Study has been updated to reflect the current layout.
- 6Q: Was this pipe included in the pass through amount in the storm drainage study.
- 6A: The storm drainage study has been updated to reflect some of the flows generated upstream east across Hwy 89 to pass through each of the two pipes coming across Hwy 89.
- 7Q: Are there recorded easements in these utilities?
- 7A: Easements are in the process to get them recorded.
- 8Q: I don't think that the sewer clean outs can be this far apart. Need to follow R-317-3-2 Sewers (2.6 Manholes) and 2009 International Plumbing Code.
- 8A: Cleanouts have now been added to the plans in order to meet code
- 9Q: What was the existing sewer from? Does it serve another area? Is there another connection at this point?
- 9A: This sewer stub was put in in anticipation of this development. It will

not serve other development.

10Q: If this is going to be a 15" pipe and a land drain discharging should the 12" pipe be upgraded?

10A: This pipe needs to be 15" to allow for capacity at the design slope of 0.18%. The slope of the 12" pipe is 0.61%. It also has capacity at its slope, and therefore, does not need to be upgraded.

11Q: When this overflows, what keeps it from sheeting to the south?

11A: Elevations to the south are much higher. Overflow, if any, will continue to the west in a historical fashion.

12Q: There is a 18" pipe into a 24" pipe and then it is being reduced to a 12" Pipe??? Then another 12" pipe connecting.

12A: The 18" pipe is only that size due to UDOT minimum standards. Only one inlet with minimal inflow ties into the junction between the 18" and 24". Both of those pipes are oversized from a capacity standpoint. It is calculated in the storm water study that a total of 2.2 cfs is anticipated from the east of Hwy 89. This flow has been modeled as a pass-through flow that continues westerly through the proposed storm drainage system. The 12" pipes have sufficient capacity. See Utility plan and Grading Plan.

13Q: Is this 12" pipe large enough? Need letter from Pleasant View City.

13A: The 12" pipe is large enough and has capacity. See Updated Storm Water Study. Weber County has a copy of the letter.

14Q: Are downspouts of the building connecting to the land drain?

14A: Downspouts connect to the storm drain upstream of the orifice, while the land drain connects to the storm drain downstream of the orifice. See the updated utility plans.

Regarding a letter from Central Weber stating that the Sewer Impact fees have been paid or the amount that we need to collect - Lance Wood of Central Weber Sewer will send Chris a letter within a few days, but our preference as well as the sewer district is that the county collect the fee with the building permit.

We provided a letter from UDOT regarding approval for the right of way work. I am attaching a copy of the UDOT permit with this letter

We have already provided a letter to Weber County regarding the Storm Drainage System. If you need another copy, please let us know, we would be happy to provide it again.

Regarding the water maintenance agreement – the owner will maintain the on-site storm drain. Pleasant View will provide connection only, per the letter given to Weber County.

Regarding the sewer design needing to follow State Rule R-317-3 and 2009 International Plumbing Code – the necessary cleanouts have now been added. Sewer now meets Plumbing Code.

We are attaching a copy of the engineers estimate for your review.

We will submit As-built drawings at project completion.

A SWPPP has been prepared for this Site. See Sheet CW1.01 and a storm water activity permit will be obtained before construction begins.

Please let us know of any other concerns you may have regarding this project:

Sincerely,

Chris w Thurgood  
on behalf of Paul Mackley