

From: [Rosenberg, Heidi](#)
To: [Community Development Email](#)
Subject: FW: CUP16-02 Lacamas Heights Elementary School
Date: Wednesday, April 19, 2017 4:04:18 PM
Attachments: [Examiner Comments.pdf](#) - [Exhibit 33](#)
[17-0106 LHE Traffic Rpt - portables.pdf](#) [Exhibit 34A](#)

Please see email below. Heidi

From: Rosenberg, Heidi
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2017 8:14 AM
To: 'Robert Maul'; sfox@cityofcamas.us; Steve Wall; Curleigh (Jim) Carothers
Cc: Jeremy@robertsonengineering.us; Marnie.Allen@esd112.org; Carlson, Cathy; Abby Dacey (ADacey@MAHLUM.com); frank@charbonneauengineer.com
Subject: RE: CUP16-02 Lacamas Heights Elementary School

Good morning – I noticed that Randy et al was responding to a May 2016 report by Frank Charbonneau. That report was updated by a January 2017 report (see attached) which includes consideration of the portables in the traffic counts and addresses the 28th Street and 232nd Avenue intersection criterion. However, I can't find an official transmittal of that updated report to Sarah Fox. The report referenced in the hearing was the May report as well, so that is what the Hearings Examiner has as a point of reference. What is the protocol for the school district to submit this updated report, or is it too late?

Thank you,

Heidi

From: Randall B. Printz [<mailto:randy.printz@landerholm.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 11:22 AM
To: Robert Maul (RMaul@cityofcamas.us); Steve Wall
Cc: Rosenberg, Heidi; kurt@olsonengr.com
Subject:

Please place this email and its attachment from Kittelson into the record for the **Lacamas Heights Elementary School (CUP16-01)**. At the public hearing, Kurt Stonex, on behalf of the prospective purchasers (Holt Opportunity Fund II 2016 LP) of the Green Mountain Estates preliminarily approved subdivision, raised two issues before the Examiner. The first was that the Applicant was not complying with the applicable level of service requirements of the City of Camas and Clark County, with respect to the intersection of 232nd/28th. The evidence in the record at the time of the hearing supporting this allegation was the Applicant's traffic study which demonstrates that with trips added by the Applicant's project this intersection will fall below the adopted level of service established by the City and the County.

For some unknown reason, despite the Applicant's own traffic study demonstrating the regulatory requirement for mitigation at this intersection, the City's staff report did not recommend any mitigation at this intersection. The City's lack of a condition on this item could have been due to oversight, or based upon a letter from Clark County suggesting that mitigation might not be needed

due to the small number of trips going through the movement that caused the intersection to fail. As is demonstrated by the attached analysis from Kittelson, the County's letter appears to either be based upon a misunderstanding of the number of trips utilizing the intersection, including the lane which is causing the failure; or a misunderstanding of the proper methodology for calculating the level of service at this intersection.

The attached letter from Kittelson makes clear that the number of trips that are using the failing lane, regardless of whether those trips are going straight or turning left, causes the intersection to fall below any adopted level of service in either the City or the County. The Kittelson letter identifies two alternative mitigation measures that would bring the Applicant's project into compliance. One of them was recommended by the Applicant's own traffic engineering report.

Based upon the Applicant's traffic study and the attached letter from Kittelson, the Examiner should require that one or the other of the two mitigation measures recommended in the Kittelson letter be imposed as a condition of the Applicant's CUP.

The other issue that was raised at the hearing was whether the Applicant's traffic study included all of the required "in process" traffic. After having more time to analyze the Applicant's traffic study, we have found that the Applicant's traffic study did appropriately account for the applicable "in process" traffic.

Thank you for consideration of these issues.

Randall B. Printz | Attorney at Law



805 Broadway Street, Suite 1000

P.O. Box 1086

Vancouver, WA 98666-1086

T: 360-816-2524 | T: | F: 360-816-2525

www.landerholm.com

This e-mail message (including attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It contains confidential, proprietary or legally protected information which is the property of Landerholm, P.S. or its clients. Any unauthorized

disclosure or use of the contents of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, notify the sender

immediately and destroy all copies of the original message.

This e-mail, related attachments and/or any response may be subject to public disclosure under state and federal law.