

Lauren Hollenbeck

From: Wes Heigh
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:40 AM
To: Robert Maul
Subject: FW: FW: Parklands Archery Subdivision and Engineering Application - Deviation Request
Attachments: 04 Parklands Storm & Composite Engineering 24 Jan 2016 (1).pdf

Here it is.

W

From: James Kessi [mailto:james.kessi@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 2:40 PM
To: Steve Wall; Wes Heigh; Aaron Barr; Kevin DeFord
Subject: Re: FW: Parklands Archery Subdivision and Engineering Application - Deviation Request

Hi Steve,

The applicant is requesting a deviation approval from the City Engineer in accordance with 10.d below. The deviation request is to allow the proposed private Street ROW widths, Paved widths, sidewalk on one side of shown streets, street frontage as low as 20' on certain cul-de-sac lots, and cul-de-sac lengths greater than maximum length as shown on the the 04 Preliminary Composite Utility Plan Sheet 04 dated 24 Jan 2016 (attached). These deviations are requested due to the topography limitations, limitations due to wetlands, and unusual site constraints and layout unique for the site. In addition, all the layouts and proposed design elements were previous given during design review and the proposed plan was accepted by City Council as part of the MXPDP overlay process.

17.19.040.10-d

10. Street Layout. Street layout shall provide for the most advantageous development of the land development, adjoining area, and the entire neighborhood. Evaluation of street layout shall take into consideration potential circulation solutions for vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and, where feasible, street segments shall be interconnected.

a. While it is important to minimize the impact to the topography from creating an integrated road system, improved site development and circulation solutions shall not be sacrificed to minimize the amount of cut and fill requirements of the proposal.

b. Where critical areas are impacted, the standards and procedures for rights-of-way in the critical areas overlay zone shall be followed.

c. *When the proposed development's average lot size is seven thousand four hundred square feet or less, one additional off-street parking space shall be required for every five units, notwithstanding the requirements of CMC Chapter 18.11. These spaces are intended to be located within a common tract.*

d. *When, on the basis of topography, projected traffic usage or other relevant facts, it is unfeasible to comply with the foregoing right-of-way, tract and street width standards, the approval authority, upon recommendation from the city engineer, may permit a deviation from the standards of Table 17.19.040-1 and Table 17.19.040-2.*

A. See responses in **red** and **purple** to each of City comments regarding the Engineering plans.

B. Is the lot ROW frontage requirement as low as 20 feet is also requested

1. Your utility note #6 for the sewer and storm indicate that minimum cover requirements can be avoided with a recommendation from the geotechnical engineer – this may not be an accurate statement and would require city approval. **RESPONSE OK. We were trying to anticipate in the Final Engineering Plans the possibility of shallowing to the bare minimum some utilities, ONLY if hard bedrock was encountered, but we will change the final design to meet minimum cover requirements. A deviation is not requested**

2. The standard individual residential STEP systems may not be able to overcome the total dynamic head of the system in Payne Road and will likely require high head pumps (probably not a favorable long term maintenance option for the city) or direction of flows into a pump station with more powerful pumps. **RESPONSE : High head pumps will be necessary at each connection. There is not a local pump station with capacity to receive this flow. The system will be designed with appropriate pipe to convey the pressures needed to lift over the high point in Lake Road.**

3. Based on the requirements of Table 17.19.040-1 in CMC 17.19 the westerly short cul-de-sac (NW 10th Fairway) will require Private Street standard C which consists of a 42 foot wide tract with 28 feet of pavement width with a detached 5 foot wide sidewalk on one side. **RESPONSE- OK - Yes, in fact PVT 3 is proposed for NW 10th Fairway Drive, and meets these dimensions. The longer remaining private streets will require the Private Street standard D which consists of a 42 foot wide tract with two detached 5 foot sidewalks. Both private street sections restrict parking on one side. RESPONSE- OK - Yes, in fact PVT 4 is proposed for NW 16th Fairway Drive, NW Golf Drive and meets these dimensions. PVT 4 is proposed for NW 16th Fairway Drive, NW Golf Drive and meets these dimensions. Where NW Parklands Trail crosses on the upland between Wetland A and Wetland B, due to topographical constraints there is only being enough area to have an attached sidewalk on one side of the street, the connecting street is proposed as PVT 2 with 30' of ROW and a 5' attached sidewalk and 20 feet of paved width with no parking on BOTH sides. PVT 3 is proposed for NW 17th Green and , NW Parklands Trail south of the wetland to match having the sidewalk only on one side of the street, but the sidewalk has room to be detached. Note that all lots will be sprinklered and that No Parking signs will be located as required by the City.**

4. The minimum paved cul-de-sac radius per the code is 35 feet. You are proposing 30 foot paved cul-de-sac widths. **RESPONSE. The applicant agrees to provide a larger 35' paved radius design for the three cul-de-sacs. Per Dead End Turnaround Detail ST36, under guidelines for sprinklered Development (ALL lots will be sprinklered), the minimum Turning Radius (inside paved radius) is 30' , and the Minimum (Outer) Turnaround Radius is 35'.**

5. Please see CMC 17.19.040 (B) (10 d) if you are proposing to vary from the minimum street requirements of Table 17.19.040-1. **RESPONSE** We are proposing to vary slightly from the private road standards as proposed to fit the topographically limitations of the site and the constraints due to the existing wetlands and wetland buffers. The proposed variations to the streets and interpretation for the cul de sac dimensions are requested to be approved by the City Engineer as per 10.d above.

There are several areas on the plan where the water and sewer notes are swapped. **RESPONSE OK.** We will correct notes on final engineering plans as noted and needed.

7. The sewer notes on the plans refer to STEP and STEF systems, however the only possible STEF line that could work would be located in CM Drive and would then need to flow into the pump station near the clubhouse which could then overcome the TDH in Payne Road. **RESPONSE:** The existing Camas Meadows pump station (formerly known as Two Creeks #2) does not have capacity to accept flows from this proposed development. As a result, all of the lots/buildings will be served by individual STEP services with a common force main.

8. Other items that are non-engineering related would be the location of the parking lots serving the commercial uses (buildings should be up front and parking should be in the rear). **RESPONSE – This issue been fully addressed in the preceding MXPDP Overlay and Rezone approvals by the City.**

9. Also, are we providing adequate buffering between incompatible uses? Design review stuff – see CMC 18.19. **RESPONSE – This issue been fully addressed in the preceding MXPDP Overlay and Rezone approvals by the City.**

James Kessi P.E.
Kessi Engineering & Consulting
Civil Engineering - Stormwater - Planning
T **(360) 991-9300** E **James.Kessi@gmail.com**

On Thu, Feb 25, 2016 at 3:38 PM, Wes Heigh <WHeigh@cityofcamas.us> wrote:

Hi James,

Thank you for the composite preliminary submittal for review.

Below are my quick initial review comments/concerns:

- Your utility note #6 for the sewer and storm indicate that minimum cover requirements can be avoided with a recommendation from the geotechnical engineer – this may not be an accurate statement and would require city approval.
- The standard individual residential STEP systems may not be able to overcome the total dynamic head of the system in Payne Road and will likely require high head pumps (probably not a favorable long term maintenance option for the city) or direction of flows into a pump station with more powerful pumps.
- Based on the requirements of Table 17.19.040-1 in CMC 17.19 the westerly short cul-de-sac (NW 10th Fairway) will require Private Street standard C which consists of a 42 foot wide tract with 28 feet of pavement width with a detached 5 foot wide sidewalk on one side. The longer remaining private streets will require the Private Street standard D which

consists of a 42 foot wide tract with two detached 5 foot sidewalks. Both private street sections restrict parking on one side.

- The minimum paved cul-de-sac radius per the code is 35 feet. You are proposing 30 foot paved cul-de-sac widths.
- Please see CMC 17.19.040 (B) (10 d) if you are proposing to vary from the minimum street requirements of Table 17.19.040-1.
- There are several areas on the plan where the water and sewer notes are swapped.
- The sewer notes on the plans refer to STEP and STEF systems, however the only possible STEF line that could work would be located in CM Drive and would then need to flow into the pump station near the clubhouse which could then overcome the TDH in Payne Road.

Other items that are non-engineering related would be the location of the parking lots serving the commercial uses (buildings should be up front and parking should be in the rear). Also, are we providing adequate buffering between incompatible uses? Design review stuff – see CMC 18.19.

Regards,

Wes

Wes G. Heigh

Project Manager

City of Camas

616 NE 4th Ave.

Camas, WA 98607

[\(360\) 817-7237](tel:(360)817-7237)

wheigh@cityofcamas.us



From: James Kessi [mailto:james.kessi@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2016 11:14 AM

To: Wes Heigh

Subject: Re: Parklands Archery Application - Camas Meadows Drive / Prelim Engineering Plan Discussion

Hi Wes,

I don't know if you saw the Composite Engineering Plan, but here it is.

It shows an overall STEP system connecting to the 10" Force Main in Payne as we had discussed

All stormwater facilities have been removed from the buffers and wetlands completely.

All Water quality will be accomplished with Filterra Treatment Vaults, and then stormwater is directed to level spreaders to spread it out and let it flow to the wetland. As we had previously discussed in the meeting with Steve Wall, direct release to 100 year flood fringe from Lacamas Lake that extends onto a portion of the wetlands on the site is unique for this site and demonstrates a connection to Lacamas Lake.

Give me a call and I can go over it with you and make sure your questions are answered.

thanks

James

James Kessi P.E.

Kessi Engineering & Consulting

Civil Engineering - Stormwater - Planning

T [\(360\) 991-9300](tel:(360)991-9300) E James.Kessi@gmail.com

On Thu, Feb 25, 2016 at 10:04 AM, Steve Wall <SWall@cityofcamas.us> wrote:

Hi James,

Not any concerns per se, since as far as I know we haven't really started any reviews yet. Just wanted to try and stay ahead of things as much as possible. I think the biggest items would probably be stormwater and sewer. I'm not sure

what you ended up with on final stormwater design approach, but it may be worth discussing with Wes if there's anything that's "non-traditional" in your design.

Also, the one item that caught my attention briefly was in regards to sewer service. My limited understanding is that the project has to be served by at least one of the pump stations in the area. As such, the pump station(s) should be analyzed to ensure that there is adequate capacity to handle the flows from the new development. From past experiences, that analysis can take some time and is often an iterative approach to make sure everything has been accounted for.

Again, it was really just an offer to talk through things prior to the land use review and plan review starting up to make sure everyone on our end really understands your thought process and proposals. I won't be completing the reviews, but I'm happy to coordinate with folks on our end to help out as needed. We'll take your lead...

Thanks,

Steve

Steve Wall, P.E.

Public Works Director

Ph: [360-817-7899](tel:360-817-7899)

Cell: [360-624-2763](tel:360-624-2763)

Email: swall@cityofcamas.us



From: James Kessi [mailto:james.kessi@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 8:50 PM

To: Steve Wall

Cc: Kevin DeFord; Aaron Barr

Subject: Re: Parklands Archery Application - Camas Meadows Drive / Larkspur discussion follow up

Hi Steve,

As a followup to my voice mail I left today, Kevin and Aaron asked me to also email you

and check with you to see if there were any overall storm, sanitary, water, or transportation engineering concerns or questions you had on the Parklands or Camas Meadows Drive projects?

I would be happy to have a phone conversation to go over the big picture design concepts and go over the latest engineering plans or meet with you to give you an update or answer any questions or as needed to give you a level of comfort that the big picture items are being addressed for the applications.

Please let me know what you are thinking.

Attached is a pdf the latest updated engineering composite plan - a hard paper copy was also submitted with the latest materials to the City.

thanks

James

James Kessi P.E.

Kessi Engineering & Consulting

Civil Engineering - Stormwater - Planning

T [\(360\) 991-9300](tel:3609919300) E James.Kessi@gmail.com

On Thu, Aug 6, 2015 at 4:00 PM, Steve Wall <SWall@cityofcamas.us> wrote:

Hi James,

I appreciate the offer to be involved and I may be able to attend tomorrow depending on the time chosen. I'm sure you're aware I won't be completing any review myself and will be relying on engineering staff to review the storm design and ensure that it meets the City's requirements. If there's a complicated proposal that you'll be presenting tomorrow, more than likely we'll need to review internally anyway before providing any kind of response...similarly throughout the review process, if there are big picture items that crop up we'd likely review as a team.

That said, feel free to get a time set with Curleigh and Wes and I'll try and attend if I have availability.

Thanks,

Steve

Steve Wall, P.E.

Public Works Director

Ph: [360-817-7899](tel:360-817-7899)

Cell: [360-624-2763](tel:360-624-2763)

Email: swall@cityofcamas.us



From: James Kessi [mailto:james.kessi@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 2:32 PM

To: Curleigh (Jim) Carothers; Steve Wall

Cc: Wes Heigh; Gus (guss@harbengineering.com); George Embleton; Brian Groth

Subject: Re: Camas Meadows Drive / Larkspur discusison follow up

Jim, Wes and Steve,

We were hoping to have Steve there as well to make sure Steve was also ok with the overall storm concept.

Steve - is there a time tomorrow that will work for you?

thanks

James

James Kessi P.E.

Kessi Engineering & Consulting

Civil Engineering - Stormwater - Planning

T [\(360\) 991-9300](tel:360-991-9300) E James.Kessi@gmail.com

On Thu, Aug 6, 2015 at 12:40 PM, Curleigh (Jim) Carothers <jcarothers@cityofcamas.us> wrote:

James,

Wes and I could probably meet at around 4:00 today or we could meet tomorrow. Let me know. Thanks.

James E. Carothers, P.E.
Engineering Manager/City Engineer



616 NE 4th Avenue
Camas, WA 98607
[360-817-7230](tel:3608177230)
[360-834-1535](tel:3608341535) FAX
jcarothers@cityofcamas.us

From: James Kessi [mailto:james.kessi@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 05, 2015 5:35 PM
To: Steve Wall; Curleigh (Jim) Carothers; Wes Heigh
Cc: Gus (guss@harbengineering.com); George Embleton; Brian Groth
Subject: Re: Camas Meadows Drive / Larkspur discusison follow up

Hi Steve, Curleigh, and Wes,

Can you check with you three and name a time either tomorrow Thurs the 6th, or on Friday the 7th that works with you three with just us storm engineers can meet for 30-45 minutes to go over our Prelim Storm Plan design concepts for Parklands/Camas Meadows Drive and the Village at Camas Meadows? I dont think the planners or maintenance folks need to be there at this point, just the design reviewers to go over the basic storm design concepts.

If there is any way we can please do it this week that would be best as I am out of town next week and we desperately want to get your feedback on the concept before we go any further and so it can keep progressing or we can make some adjustments as needed.

We will be able to email a Prelim Storm Plan and Basin Plans tomorrow and will also bring some full size copies to our meeting.

thanks

James

James Kessi P.E.

Kessi Engineering & Consulting

Civil Engineering - Stormwater - Planning

T [\(360\) 991-9300](tel:3609919300) E James.Kessi@gmail.com

On Fri, Jan 23, 2015 at 1:07 PM, Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us> wrote:

I have heard back from most of you that this day and time will work. Please advise if there are conflicts that cannot be avoided.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.