257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, St. Louis, MO 63005
636.530.9100 – Main | 636.530.9130 – Fax
www.stockassoc.com

STOCK & ASSOCIATES
Consulting Engineers, Inc.
CIVIL ENGINEERING | LAND SURVEYING | LAND PLANNING

July 16, 2025

City of Bryant
210 SW 3rd St
Bryant, MO 72022

Attention: Mr. Colton Leonard, AICP

RE: Good Day Farm - Bryant
Response Letter
Stock Project No. (2025-7775)

Dear Mr. Leonard,

We are pleased to offer the following written responses to your comments contained within your comment letter received in an email on July 10, 2025.

Planning

1. *Since the site layout will be based on the final plat, For all of the sheets, the property lines will need to reflect the final plat lot lines. Not as the four individual properties.*
   Response: Understood. The revised plan set shall show this as requested.

2. *Include a Site layout drawing showing the proposed improvements, building setback lines, and easements with their dimensions.*
   Response: Please refer sheet C6.0 that shows this information as requested.

3. *On the construction detail sheet, there will need to be a detail on the dumpster enclosure stating the materials to be used. No fencing materials can be used on a dumpster enclosure according to the City's Commercial Design Standards.*
   Response: Forthcoming.

4. *The Landscape plan will also need to be included in the Site Plan set.*
   Response: This is included with the revised plan set. See sheet L1.01. The current Landscaping Plan does not reflect the current Site Plan. We will ensure that the Landscaping Plan is updated on the next submittal.

Engineering

Plans

1. *General comments*
   a. *The plans are missing a proposed site layout drawing, showing all proposed improvements, proposed right of way, etc.*
   Response: Please refer sheet C6.0 in the revised plan set that shows this information as requested.
   b. *Show a typical section for the half street improvements, must meet City requirements.*
   Response: A typical section was provide on sheet C9.2 in the revised plan set as requested.
   c. *Some of the drawings are difficult to read.*
   Response: Sheets were made more legible as requested in this revised plan set.

d. Multiple sheets are named the same
Response: All plan sheets are named correctly in the revised plan set.
e. Street lighting plan for Hurricane Lake Road needs to be provided.
Response: Per feedback with Entergy and correspondence with the City, all existing lights along Hurricane Lake Road will be replaced with LEDs and has been noted on sheet C6.0 in order to address this comment.
f. Signage plan for Hurricane Lake Road needs to be provided (No Parking Signs)
Response: Please refer sheet C6.0 that shows this information as requested.

2. *Sheet 2.0*
a. Storm drainage and/or utility notes are to show compliance with City of Bryant Standards.
Response: All notes were revised to show compliance to be to City of Bryant Standards.
b. Roadway construction notes are to show compliance with City of Bryant Standards.
Response: All notes were revised to show compliance to be to City of Bryant Standards.

3. *Sheet 3.0*
a. Show existing right of way on Hurricane Lake Road.
Response: Shown and labeled as requested.
b. Show gas pipelines connecting to Gas regulator and riser
Response: All existing underground gas facilities are currently shown from the markings in the field. We have reached out to the gas company to provide as-builts or maps of existing gas lines in this area.
c. Do not show improvements on an existing conditions sheet.
Response: Understood.
d. Show interior lot lines as dashed
Response: Understood. Shown as dashed as requested.
e. It's difficult to see everything on the drawing. Can this be cleaned up for clarity?
Response: Understood. This sheet was revised to be more clear.

4. *Sheet 4.0*
a. Show all three phases of erosion control (pre-construction, construction, post-construction)
Response: Refer to plan sheets C4.0, C4.1 and C4.2 in the revised plan set.
b. Show drainage arrows in direction of flow
Response: Drainage arrows added. Refer to sheet C4.1 and C4.2.
c. Show concrete washout area
Response: Concrete washout area added as requested. Refer to sheet C4.1.
d. Show port-a-potty location(s), if required.
Response: This is shown now shown on sheet C4.1 of the revised plan set as requested.
e. Provide a full SWPPP & Development from the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality
Response: Understood. This shall be forthcoming.
f. Provide a STAA
Response: Please let us know what this is.
g. Extend silt fence to edge of entrance and show J-hook
Response: These are shown on sheet C4.1 of the revised plan set as requested. Detail forthcoming.

5. *Sheet 5.0*
   a. *It's difficult to see everything on the drawing. Can this be cleaned up for clarity?*
   Response: This was revised to be more clear.
   b. *Does sidewalk meet ADA requirements for maximum slope?*
   Response: Yes, the sidewalk shall be designed to meet ADA standards, except for the sidewalk connection between Hurricane Lake Road and Highway No. 5. The developer wishes to seek a waiver for that connection.
   c. *Show ADA ramps at driveway*
   Response: These are shown and labeled in the revised plan set as requested.
   d. *Show proposed right of way line*
   Response: Shown and labeled as requested.
   e. *Eliminate property lines inside of proposed street right of way*
   Response: These were removed on this sheet in the revised plan set as requested.
   f. *Is the drainage ditch remaining in the design?*
   Response: Yes. The drainage ditch is to convey the runoff from the proposed development and to capture any and all runoff from to the north. The drainage ditch is designed to convey the 100 year storm event.
   g. *Label half street improvements*
   Response: Half street improvements are shown and labeled on the revised plan set as requested.
   h. *Is there a typical section for the half street improvements? If so, where is it shown?*
   Response: A typical section was provide on sheet C9.2 in the revised plan set as requested.
   i. *Does grading around the entrance to the building meet ADA requirements?*
   Response: Correct. Sidewalk around building and ADA spaces are all designed to meet ADA requirements.
   j. *Show trickle channel in detention pond*
   Response: Forthcoming.
   k. *Show typical section(s) for the detention pond*
   Response: Forthcoming.
   l. *Pond water appears to backflow into the storm pipe. Will that overflow the grate inlet behind the building?*
   Response: Our current design does not show any inlets overtopping.
   m. *Will grading of ditch conflict with utilities?*
   Response: We are not aware of any conflicts but will make note for the contractor to verify existing location and depth of all utilities.
   n. *Show contact information for the Gas pipelines*
   Response: This is shown on sheet C1.0.
   o. *Turn off or lighten the lot lines inside of the project site*
   Response: These are turned off as requested.
   p. *Is any detention being utilized inside of the parking areas?*
   Response: No.
   q. *Add notes to protect existing utilities, including but not limited to the force main.*
   Response: Note was added on this sheet as requested.

6. *Sheet 6.0*
    a. *Turn off contours*
    Response: Turned off as requested.
    b. *Show outline for pond berm & bottom*
    Response: Shown as requested.
    c. *Show proposed ditch*
    Response: Shown as requested.
    d. *Show gas piping around regulator and riser*
    Response: All existing underground gas facilities are currently shown from the markings in the field. We have reached out to the gas company to provide as-builts or maps of existing gas lines in this area.
    e. *Show legend for utilities*
    Response: This is shown on this sheet as requested.
    f. *Show proposed right of way*
    Response: This is shown and labeled as requested.
    g. *Label half street improvements*
    Response: Half street improvements are shown and labeled on the revised plan set as requested.

7. *Sheet 7.0*
    a. *Show dimensions to building, paved areas, sidewalk, ditch, pond, etc. (all improvements)*
    Response: Dimensions were provided on this sheet in the revised plan set as requested.
    b. *Label half street improvements*
    Response: Half street improvements are shown and labeled on the revised plan set as requested.
    c. *Show number of parking spaces in each area, along with a table showing the total number of spaces, handicap spaces, and van accessible spaces.*
    Response: Table was provided on this sheet as requested.
    d. *Add labels for clarity*
    Response: Labels were added as requested.

8. *Sheet 8.0*
    a. *Name the sheet "Storm Sewer Profiles"*
    Response: Sheet was renamed as requested.
    b. *Has the structure shown in the details been modeled with the openings shown?*
    Response: Correct.
    c. *Include the hydraulic calculations that are shown on the sheet in the drainage calculations.*
    Response: These have been included and are in Appendix C of the report.
    d. *Are inlet calculations in the drainage calculations?*
    Response: All calculations are shown in the hydraulic spreadsheet shown on sheet C8.0.

9. *Sheet 9.0*
    a. *No comments*

10. *Sheet 9.1*
    a. *No comments*

11. Sheet 10.0

a. Drainage basin shown does not appear to capture all of the runoff going to the discharge point.

Response: The drainage basin captures all runoff from the proposed development and has been designed so that the release rates are less than the pre-developed.

b. Turn off or dash lot lines

Response: Turned off as requested.

c. Show proposed right of way

Response: Shown and labeled as requested.

d. Label half street improvements

Response: Half street improvements are shown and labeled on the revised plan set as requested.

e. De-clutter sheet

Response: Understood.

12. Sheet 10.1

a. Same as 11

Response: See previous responses.

Drainage Calculations

1. General

a. Prepare and submit a stormwater management plan per Section 200.3 of the Byrant Stormwater Management Manual.

Response: Forthcoming.

b. Include soil loss calculations per the Stormwater Management Manual.

Response: Waiting for additional information as requested in the 7/14 meeting.

c. Show Inlet and Pipe flows for the 100-year storm for each inlet, pipe and ditch in the system.

Response: All storm sewer infrastructure is designed to convey the 100 year storm events. Storm sewer hydraulic calculations are shown in Appendix C and the drainage ditch calculations are shown in Appendix D of the report.

2. Section I
    a. No comment

3. Section II
    a. No Comment

4. Section III
    a. Stormwater Hydraulics
        i. No comments
    b. Open Channel Flow
        i. No comments
    c. Detention Design
        i. Rational method is required for drainage basins less than 200 acres. Pondpack utilizes the SCS hydrograph method. At the outfall location provide pre- and post-

development park flow information utilizing the rational method for each storm event, assuming no pond is constructed.

Response: Understood. We will revise and resubmit stormwater report.

ii. Provide a summary table in the calculations that show the peak flows at the outfall location for the pre-development condition, the post-development condition without the pond, and the post-development condition with the pond.

Response: Refer to page 5 of the report.

iii. It's difficult to correlate the calculations with the basins shown on the post-development drawing. Clarify how the calculations reflect the contribution form each of the basins into the pond.

Response: This comment is unclear of what is being requested. Can you please clarify?

5. Section IV
   a. Appendix D – Open Channel Flow
      i. How was a design flow of 11.62 cfs determined?

      Response: Refer to sheet C10.1 that show all runoff calculations for the subject site and any offsite areas that discharge onto this property..
   b. Appendix E – Runoff & Storage Calculations – Pre-Development Conditions
      i. What runoff coefficients (or runoff numbers) were used for each storm event?

      Response: Refer to table of contents or refer to pages 66-75 of the report.
   c. Appendix F – Runoff & Storage Calc
      i. What runoff coefficients (or runoff numbers) were used for each storm event?

      Response: Refer to table of contents or refer to pages 178-187 of the report.
   d. Appendix G – Site Grading Plan
      i. See comments in the construction plans regarding this drawing.

      Response: Understood.
   e. Appendix H – Storm Sewer Profiles
      i. See comments below for Appendix J concerning the outfall structure

      Response: Understood.

      ii. Demonstrate whether the grate inlet at Section 1.1 will overflow during a 100-year storm event, and how that may affect drainage in the north parking area.

      Response: Forthcoming.
   f. Appendix I – Drainage Maps
      i. It appears from the contours that the drainage areas do not capture all the runoff that will contribute to flow in the ditch (below the outfall).

      Response: The drainage area maps and calculations shall be revised in the revised report that will be forthcoming.
   g. Appendix J – Outfall Structure Detail
      i. The detail shows an 8" orifice for low flow, then a 2'x4' slot on 2 sides for the outfall structure. Show where this is accounted for in the calculations.

      Response: Refer to pages 375-461 of the report.

      ii. Demonstrate how clogging of the 8" orifice is minimized.

      Response: A trash rack is proposed to be installed on this orifice.

257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, St. Louis, MO 63005
636.530.9100 – Main | 636.530.9130 – Fax
www.stockassoc.com

As always, we appreciate your assistance and support for this project. Should you have any questions or comments, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

Ty Gramling

Ty Gramling, P.E.
Associate

CC: George M. Stock, P.E. – President
Lucas Willcut, Project Engineer
Regan Etheridge, Good Day Farm
Tim Fournier, City of Bryant
Troy Ellis, City of Bryant
Kelly Vanlandingham, City of Bryant
Lance Penfield, BPM Realtors

Enclosures