

June 19, 2024

Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE  
Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayres Associates, Inc.  
20975 Swenson Drive, Suite 200  
Waukesha, WI 53186

RE: Boucher Nissan of Waukesha  
CSM, Site Plan and Storm Water Management Review  
raSmith Project No.: 3220213.01

Dear Mr. Payant:

Below are the responses of raSmith to Ayres Associates' review letter of June 11, 2024, to the City of Waukesha – Department of Public Works, regarding the above-referenced matter:

**General Comments:**

1. All plans, checklists and reports are to be signed and sealed by a professional engineer Licensed in the State of Wisconsin.

**raSmith Response 1. – General Comments: All plans, checklists and reports will be signed and sealed by a professional engineer Licensed in the State of Wisconsin.**

2. Easements are not shown as all utilities on site are assumed to be privately owned and operated. A storm sewer easement should be provided for storm sewer extending offsite to the south.

**raSmith Response 2. – General Comments: Title is being pulled for both properties. raSmith will coordinate findings.**

3. The following items were not included:

- a. Responsible party for installation of stormwater management practices.

**raSmith Response 3.a. – General Comments: To be determined once contractor is chosen for installation. The long-term storm water maintenance of the BMPs will be the owner, as indicated in the storm water maintenance agreement.**

- b. Legal Description of proposed development.

**raSmith Response 3b. – General Comments: The legal description of the proposed development is included on the Plat of Survey sheet C001.**

- c. Storm Water Management Maintenance Agreement, to be included with the Storm Water Management Plan.

**raSmith Response 3.c. – General Comments: Storm Water Management Maintenance Agreement will be provided in this submittal**

4. A financial guarantee is a project requirement.



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayes Associates, Inc.  
Page 2 / June 19, 2024

**raSmith Response 4. – General Comments: Developer will provide a financial guarantee.**

5. What is the purpose of WEPCO Easement Doc. 991597 & Doc. 1353091? This 8' easement is shown on site, but a large portion of the easement has no existing or proposed utilities. This also coincides with an OHW line within the easement that doesn't terminate at a utility pole. The easement also extends under the proposed building.

**raSmith Response 5. – General Comments: WEPCO easement to be vacated followed by communication with utility company. Any new/relocated easements will be coordinated with the utility company.**

6. North arrow and scale bar should be unobstructed on all sheets, and north arrow must consistently point north.

**raSmith Response 6. – General Comments: North arrow and scale bar have been updated to be unobstructed on all sheets. North arrow is now consistently pointing north.**

7. Streets should be labeled on all applicable sheets.

**raSmith Response 7. – General Comments: Street names are now labeled on all applicable sheets.**

8. Plans do not scale 11x17.

**raSmith Response 8. – General Comments: The plans submitted are 24" x 36". On page 1 of the engineering checklist plans can not be larger than 24" by 36". We meet this requirement.**

9. Verify that all shown lot numbers are correct. There appear to be multiple lots labeled as "lot 1".

**raSmith Response 9. – General Comments: The Plat of Survey does label two "lot 1" but they are different CSM numbers, making the "lot 1's" different.**

10. Can the Plat of Survey have the same title block as the rest of the plan sheets? The Plat of Survey should also have a page number correlated to the rest of the included plans. Otherwise, the plat was not reviewed by Ayres.

**raSmith Response 10. – General Comments: The Plat of Survey can't have the same title block but it can have a page number that correlates with the rest of the sheets. Plat of survey is now sheet C001.**

11. Checklist comments:

**Engineering Plan Checklist**

a. General Information

i. WRAPP is noted as N/A. Site is over 1 acre and will require a WRAPP.

**raSmith Response 11.a.i. – Engineering Plan: WRAPP will be submitted once final plans are submitted.**

ii. Provide off-site utility easements is noted as N/A. Storm sewer easement should be identified to the south.



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayes Associates, Inc.  
Page 3 / June 19, 2024

**raSmith Response 11.a.ii. – Engineering Plan: Title is being pulled for both properties. raSmith will coordinate findings.**

iii. The Storm Water Management Plan should be sealed by a Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Wisconsin.

**raSmith Response 11.a.iii. – Engineering Plan: The Storm Water Management Plan will be sealed by a Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Wisconsin.**

b. All Plan Sheets

i. Plan and profile sheets are not provided for utilities.

**raSmith Response 11.b.i. – All Plan Sheets: All utilities are private and no plan and profiles will be provided.**

ii. Provide labeling for Moorland Road where applicable.

**raSmith Response 11.b.ii. – Engineering Plan: Moreland Blvd has been added to all sheets.**

c. Cover Sheet

i. North American Datum of 1983/2011; Vertical: North American Vertical Datum of 1988(12) is not used.

**raSmith Response 11.c. – Cover Sheet: All plans will be updated to North American Vertical Datum of 1988(12).**

d. Plan View and Intersection Details and Cross Sections

i. Benchmark is only shown on cover sheet.

**raSmith Response 11.d.i. – View/Details/Cross Sections: All applicable sheets now have benchmarks shown.**

ii. Drives and parking are private and as such not detailed as requested in Plan View, Intersection Details, and Cross Section sections.

**raSmith Response 11.d.ii. – View/Details/Cross Sections: Correct, driveway and parking are private and don't require cross section details.**

iii. Addresses and owners of parcels are not shown on plans.

**raSmith Response 11.d.iii. – View/Details/Cross Sections: Addresses and owners of parcels are shown on the overall sheets in the plan set.**

iv. Legends showing all special symbols, line types, and hatches used are required. Symbols in the legend should match symbols used on the plans. If a symbol is used on the plans, it should be shown in the legend.



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayres Associates, Inc.  
Page 4 / June 19, 2024

**raSmith Response 11.d.iv. – View/Details/Cross Sections: Legends showing all special symbols, line types, and hatches used are shown on all applicable sheets. Symbols in the legend do match symbols used on the plans.**

v. All pavement and medians should be dimensioned. This should include necessary lengths and widths for constructability.

**raSmith Response 11.d.v. – View/Details/Cross Sections: All pavement and medians are dimensioned for constructability. In addition, construction staking will be provided.**

***Site, Grading and Drainage Plan Conditional Use Permit Checklist***

e. General Requirements

i. Impact fee payment confirmation required.

**raSmith Response 11.e.i. – Grading/Drainage: Acknowledged, impact fee payment will be submitted.**

f. Building Plans

i. Not reviewed by Ayres.

**raSmith Response 11.f.i. – Plans-Grading/Drainage: Acknowledged.**

g. Site Plans

i. General review is noted below; however, signs not reviewed by Ayres.

**raSmith Response 11.g.i. – Site Plans-Grading/Drainage: Acknowledged.**

h. Site Access and Parking/Traffic

i. Not reviewed by Ayres.

**raSmith Response 11.h.i. – Site/Parking-Grading/Drainage: Acknowledged.**

i. Grading and Drainage Plans

i. Show emergency overflow route.

**raSmith Response 11.i.i. – Grading/Drainage: Emergency overflow route is shown on sheet C300.**

ii. Existing topography does not appear to extend 50-feet outside the site to the west and south.

**raSmith Response 11.i.ii. – Grading/Drainage: Survey data was collected on our site and in the right of way. The parcels to the west and south are not the owner's property. Therefore, survey was not collected west and south. There is 50' of survey outside the limits of disturbance to the west. The parcel to the south is gated and access wasn't provided.**

iii. Species of existing trees is not provided.



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayres Associates, Inc.  
Page 5 / June 19, 2024

**raSmith Response 11.iii. – Grading/Drainage: Species of existing trees are provided on the landscape plan.**

iv. All the points with elevations on the demolition plan seem unnecessary as all points with elevations are shown on the Plat of Survey Sheet.

**raSmith Response 11.i.iv. – Grading/Drainage: Points with elevations on the demolition plan have been turned off.**

v. There is no included drainage plan. A drainage plan is to be included with future submittal and comply with City of Waukesha checklist for drainage plans.

**raSmith Response 11.i.v. – Grading/Drainage: The grading plan and storm sewer plans are the plans that represent the drainage plan. The plans submitted were preliminary. In future submittals checklist will be filled out appropriately.**

vi. The grading plans do not show existing contours.

**raSmith Response 11.i.vi. – Grading/Drainage: Existing contours are now shown in the grading plan.**

vii. The overall grading plan does not show labels for 1' contours.

**raSmith Response 11.i.vii. – Grading/Drainage: 1' contours are now shown in the grading plan.**

j. Erosion Control

i. Soils information and geotechnical report is not provided.

**raSmith Response 11.j.i. – Erosion-Grading/Drainage: No geotechnical report was conducted for this redevelopment site. There is no proposed storm water infiltration for this site, and a liner & underdrain is provided since we are except from infiltration. Proposed pavement depths are consistent with past dealership project.**

ii. Flow paths are not shown.

**raSmith Response 11.j.ii. – Erosion-Grading/Drainage: Flow paths are shown on sheet C300.**

iii. Drainage appears to flow from disturbed site uncontrolled along the west edge of the project. Substantial flow appears to drain to the silt fence to the east and south.

**raSmith Response 11.j.iii. – Erosion-Grading/Drainage: The SW project limits of disturbance are on a ridge and flows to an existing inlet on the disturbed site. The existing inlet will have inlet protection. The NW project limits of disturbance flows to the same existing inlet on the disturbed site. Inlet protection will be used to capture flows from the western perimeter, not silt fence. The south edge of the pavement also flows to the existing inlet on the disturbed site. Silt fence has been extended along the south property line.**

iv. Construction schedule is not noted.



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayes Associates, Inc.  
Page 6 / June 19, 2024

**raSmith Response 11.j.iv. – Erosion-Grading/Drainage: The Construction schedule is on sheet C100. Was previously on C600.**

#### **Stormwater Management Plan Checklist**

i. Why isn't Greater than 80% Connected Impervious Surface checked?

**raSmith Response i. – Stormwater Management: Greater than 80% Connected Impervious Surface is now checked.**

ii. Certification by a Wisconsin registered professional engineer and Financial Guarantee are required.

**raSmith Response ii. – Stormwater Management: Certification by a WI registered professional engineer and Financial Guarantee will be provided.**

iii. Survey datum is not correct as noted above.

**raSmith Response iii. – Stormwater Management: All plans will be updated to North American Vertical Datum of 1988(12).**

iv. The location of emergency overland flow route is not provided.

**raSmith Response iv. – Stormwater Management: Emergency overland flow route is shown on sheet C300.**

v. Computation of downstream capacity is not provided. (Calculated flows represent a reduction in flow from existing to proposed)

**raSmith Response v. – Stormwater Management: Per conversations with the City, since we are reducing flow from existing to proposed conditions and maintaining watershed divides, downstream capacities are not required.**

vi. Cost estimates for storm water management practices are not provided.

**raSmith Response vi. – Stormwater Management: Cost estimates for storm water management practices are not required as these are private facilities.**

vii. Geotechnical investigations have not been provided.

**raSmith Response viii. – Stormwater Management: No geotechnical report was conducted for this redevelopment site. There is no proposed storm water infiltration for this site, and a liner & underdrain is provided since we are except from infiltration. Proposed pavement depths are consistent with past dealership project.**

#### **Sewer Plan Review Checklist**

i. Sanitary lateral and water main plans are not provided and therefore were not reviewed.

**raSmith Response i. – Sewer Plan: Existing sanitary and water lateral will be used. Approximate location for both existing laterals are now included in the plan set.**

ii. Material of existing storm sewer being connected to is not provided.

**raSmith Response ii. – Sewer Plan: Contractor will verify pipe material.**

iii. Backfill materials are not noted on plan.

**raSmith Response iii. – Sewer Plan: Backfill detail is located on sheet C502.**



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayes Associates, Inc.  
Page 7 / June 19, 2024

iv. Easements are not shown.

**raSmith Response iv. – Sewer Plan: Title is being pulled for both properties. raSmith will coordinate findings.**

v. PE seal is not provided.

**raSmith Response v. – Sewer Plan: Final plans will have a P.E. seal.**

#### **Stormwater Management Plan:**

1. Calculations meet the detention release rate, but the analysis should also determine that the receiving storm systems to the east and south have adequate capacity.

**raSmith Response 1. – Stormwater: Per conversations with the City, since we are reducing flow from existing to proposed conditions and maintaining watershed divides, downstream capacities are not required.**

2. The report notes an increase in both impervious surface and green space on page 3. Please explain.

**raSmith Response 2. – Stormwater: Please re-read or provide the exact sentence that is contradictory. The site has higher amount of green space in the proposed condition.**

3. Provide ADS storm tech calculations which are not specifically shown in WinSLAMM inputs.

**raSmith Response 3. – Stormwater: The WinSLAMM Input Data is now provided in the Appendix D of the SW Report. The WinSLAMM file can be provided if requested.**

4. Provide geotechnical report for the site to support assumed infiltration rates.

**raSmith Response 4. – Stormwater: No geotechnical report was conducted for this redevelopment site. There is no proposed storm water infiltration for this site, and a liner & underdrain is provided since we are except from infiltration.**

5. Greater detail is required for the elevations, connections and construction of the ADS system.

**raSmith Response 5. – Stormwater: More than adequate detail is provided for the elevations, connections and construction of the ADS systems on Sheets C502-C505.**

6. The ADS details shown in the plans appear to be for different projects.

**raSmith Response 6. – Stormwater: The title on the ADS details have now been updated.**

7. Identify how the pretreatment of the parking lot required in the City Ordinance is accomplished.

**raSmith Response 7. – Stormwater: The pretreatment cleaning mechanism of the underground systems occurs in an “Isolator Row” that is completely encased in a geotextile fabric and acts as a sediment trap. A strip of woven geotextile is placed under the entire length of the row between the chambers and the base stone. This provides a floor to the row that will allow water to pass, but will trap sediment and debris. The isolator row is the first row in the chamber bed at each inlet point. Only when the isolator row fills does the water build enough of to reach the manifold invert to the standard rows.**

#### **General Engineering:**



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayes Associates, Inc.  
Page 8 / June 19, 2024

1. Depending on the final design, the below listed permits or approvals may be needed. Please submit digital copies of permits to City for filing prior to start of construction:
  - a. City of Waukesha Storm Water Erosion Control Permit.  
**raSmith Response 1.a. – General: City of Waukesha Storm Water Erosion Control Permit will be filled out and submitted.**
  - b. Wisconsin DNR NOI, and NOI for fill site.  
**raSmith Response 1.b. – General: Wisconsin DNR NOI, and NOI will be filled out and submit at the appropriate time.**
  - c. City of Waukesha – Engineering Division Construction Permit for all RW work.  
**raSmith Response 1.c. – General: Engineering Division Construction Permit for all RW work will be filled out and submit at the appropriate time.**
  - d. Approved Stormwater Maintenance Agreement.  
**raSmith Response 1.d. – General: Stormwater maintenance agreement will be submitted in this submittal.**
2. Additional required submittals, fees, and financial guarantees will be provided as the project progresses.
  - a. Financial guarantees  
**raSmith Response 2.a. – General: Financial guarantees will be submitted by the developer.**
  - b. Applicable sewer connection charges per Chapter 29.11(c) will be owed to the City for this project.  
**raSmith Response 2.b. – General: Site will be using existing sanitary lateral.**
  - c. Storm Water Permit. This permit will need to be obtained prior to starting work and obtaining a building permit.  
**raSmith Response 2.c. – General: Storm water permit will be applied for and submitted.**
3. The construction drawings and financial guarantees should be reviewed and approved prior to the construction being started and the building permit issued. If the location of any work needs to be changed as a result of the approved construction drawings, the drawings should be updated to reflect the needed changes.  
**raSmith Response 3. – General: Construction drawings and financial guarantees will be submitted before the start of construction and building permit issued. If any work is changed, revisions will be sent to the city.**
4. In accordance with Wisconsin Administrative Code A-E 2.02(4): Each sheet of plans, documents, specifications, and reports for architectural, landscape architectural, professional engineering, design or land surveying practice should be signed, sealed, and dated by the registrant or permit holder who prepared, or directed and controlled preparation of the written material.  
**raSmith Response 4. – General: Title / index sheet of plans, documents, specifications, and reports for architectural, landscape architectural, professional engineering, design or land surveying practice will**





Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayes Associates, Inc.  
Page 9 / June 19, 2024

**be signed, sealed, and dated by the registrant according to Wisconsin Administrative Code A-E 2.02(5).**

5. A separate erosion control plan shall be provided. (1.3.3.4)

**raSmith Response 5. – General: Separate erosion control sheet has been added and is sheet C100.**

6. Provide proposed sanitary system per 1.3.9.

**raSmith Response 6. – General: Existing sanitary lateral to be used.**

7. Provide proposed storm system per 1.3.10.

**raSmith Response 7. – General: Storm sewer system is provided on sheets C401 & C402. Storm sewer system details can be seen on sheets C503-C505.**

8. Sites are allowed one (1) sanitary lateral connection. (2.1.2.2.1)

**raSmith Response 8. – General: Existing sanitary lateral to be used.**

9. Details and plan sheets referenced in the plans reference incorrect plan sheet numbers.

**raSmith Response 9. – General: Details and plan sheets referenced in the plans reference the correct plan sheet numbers.**

10. Geotechnical report and normal groundwater elevation is not provided.

**raSmith Response 10. – General: No geotechnical report was conducted for this redevelopment site. There is no proposed storm water infiltration for this site, and a liner & underdrain is provided since we are except from infiltration. Proposed pavement depths are consistent with past dealership project.**

11. Construction access drives and tracking pads are not shown or detailed.

**raSmith Response 11. – General: Construction entrance is shown on sheet C100 and detail is on sheet C500.**

12. Erosion Control ordinance requirements are not addressed.

**raSmith Response 12. – General: The erosion control ordinance requirements are met with silt fence, inlet protection and stone construction entrance proposed on site. Inlet protection is also proposed off site.**

13. Vision corners and building setbacks are not shown and were not reviewed.

**raSmith Response 13. – General: Vision corners and building setbacks are both shown on sheet C200.**

14. Fire department review is recommended.

**raSmith Response 14. – General: raSmith has received comments from the fire department.**

15. The trash enclosure encroaches into the drive lane.

**raSmith Response 15. – General: The location for the trash enclosure and SW building corner are using existing locations and structures.**

16. Traffic control signage is not shown.

**raSmith Response 16. – General: Traffic control signage to be coordinated with city of Waukesha.**

17. Overall Grading Plan does not have contour elevations shown.



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayes Associates, Inc.  
Page 10 / June 19, 2024

**raSmith Response 17. – General: Existing and proposed contour elevations and labels are shown on the overall grading plan.**

18. Shown grades for slope intercepts at connections points. In general, greater detail is required for a complete review.

**raSmith Response 18. – General: Proposed elevations and contours can be seen on sheets C301 & C302.**

19. Existing grades are not shown on the overall or detailed grade plan.

**raSmith Response 19. – General: Existing and proposed contour elevations and labels are shown on the overall and detailed grading plan.**

20. Existing utilities are not shown.

**raSmith Response 20. – General: Existing utilities are shown on sheets C400 – C402**

21. Storm sewer outfall from ADS chamber is 24" diameter which then reduces to a 12" diameter to the receiving system. Provide capacity analysis for this.

**raSmith Response 21. – General: The intent of the 24" diameter equalizer pipe is to not hydrologically affect the system. The outlet control structure with the orifice and weir plate are the hydrological controls for the system. The capacity for a 24" equalizer pipe at 0.00% slope is 7.15cfs. The 10-year flow out of the North System is 3.83cfs and 5.00cfs for the South System.**

22. Provide rim and invert data for catch basin to which the site drains from Manhole 500.

**raSmith Response 22. – General: Rim and invert data for catch basin to which the site drains from Manhole 500 is provided on sheet C400-C401.**

23. Review authority to confirm no optional submittals are required for this project, including:

a. Traffic impact analysis

**raSmith Response 23.a. – General: raSmith to confirm with the City of Waukesha if submittal is required.**

b. Environmental impact statement

**raSmith Response 23.b. – General: raSmith to confirm with the City of Waukesha if submittal is required.**

c. Soil and Site Evaluation Report per DNR Technical Standard 1002

**raSmith Response 23.c. – General: raSmith to confirm with the City of Waukesha if submittal is required.**

d. Plot of effect of exterior illumination on site and adjacent properties

**raSmith Response 23.d. – General: Exterior illumination will be submitted in final submittal.**

e. Description of any unusual characteristics

**raSmith Response 23.e. – General: raSmith to confirm with the City of Waukesha if submittal is required.**

f. Street perspectives showing view corridors.



Mr. Michael D. Payant, PE - Manager – Engineering Services  
Ayres Associates, Inc.  
Page 11 / June 19, 2024

**raSmith Response 23.f. – General: raSmith to confirm with the City of Waukesha if submittal is required.**

g. Historic site

**raSmith Response 23.g. – General: raSmith to confirm with the City of Waukesha if submittal is required.**

h. Economic feasibility study

**raSmith Response 23.h. – General: raSmith to confirm with the City of Waukesha if submittal is required.**

i. Contaminated Waste Site

**raSmith Response 23.i. – General: There is no contaminated soils on site.**

If you should have any additional questions, please email me at [jeremy.jeffery@rasmith.com](mailto:jeremy.jeffery@rasmith.com), or call me at 262-317-3330.

Sincerely,  
raSmith

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Jeremy J. Jeffery'.

Jeremy J. Jeffery, P.E.  
Senior Project Engineer