
From: Randall B. Printz <Randy.Printz@landerholm.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 11:52 AM
To: Robert Maul
Cc: kurt@olsonengr.com; Curleigh (Jim) Carothers; Anita Ashton; Steve Wall
Subject: Re: Green Mt. Properties/Metro Land Proposal/Phase 3

Robert, thanks for the notes; we had a good meeting Bill yesterday. With respect to the geotechnical issue, we reviewed the MDNS and found your conditions to be acceptable. We assumed that complying with the SEPA condition would resolve any geo concerns that the City might have.

With respect to Bill's comments, some have already been addressed and some we are still considering. We have had Kittleson and Olson analyze the site access. The access will meet site distance even at the existing posted speeds. The site distance will be far in excess of the minimum required if the speed limit for Ingles Road is reduced to 25 mph which seems likely.

The access meets all of the geometric, Level of Service and safety standards adopted by the City. The access has been placed in this location due to the significant topographical constraints farther south. We understand the neighborhood, as with all neighborhoods, has concerns about traffic safety. Those concerns are always reasonable and it is the Applicant's obligation to demonstrate compliance with the appropriate safety standards. In this case, the Applicant believes it has done that. The Applicant will cut or trim as much site obscuring vegetation to maximize site distance. The Applicant is also providing a new left hand turn lane into the project. Warrants are not met at this intersection for any other safety measure.

As for water, Bill requested that we "loop" the water line that will ultimately serve the subdivision to the north. They are concerned about maintaining their water pressure. We have agreed to do that.

With respect to the storm water issue, There is a small amount of runoff that goes to the north today. Bill wants to be sure that we do not re-direct that storm water to the west. We will not re-direct north flowing water to the west or south. We will provide the exact details of the flow regimes as part of final engineering.

The lots on the north side of Phase 3 are much smaller than those in Mountain Glen. However, there is approximately 150-200 feet of separation between the lots. The backyards of the southern Mountain Glen lots appear to be heavily vegetated with mature and multi-canopied trees and shrubs.

Again, we had a good meeting with Bill and will continue to try and address the Mt Glen subdivision's concerns. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks
Sent from my iPhone

Randall B. Printz | Attorney at Law



LANDERHOLM

Legal advisors. Trusted advocates.

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

On Jan 30, 2018, at 9:36 AM, Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us> wrote:

Good morning, Kurt.

Here are some comments for the Green Mountain Phase 3 hearing. Also, we still need to talk about the remaining lots that have geo-issues. What is your strategy/proposal for dealing with those aside from punting to the building permit timeline? Thx

Robert

From: Bill Huyette [<mailto:huyette@premierinv.biz>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 9:02 AM
To: Robert Maul
Subject: FW: Green Mt. Properties/Metro Land Proposal/Phase 3

Sir Robert: Thank you for being patient. I have had the opportunity to meet with the Developer and lead Engineer. The items we discussed are listed below with detail in red following the meeting with the Proponents. If you need this in letter format, just let me know!

Access Road and roads in general serving the area.
Water line and service change from a PUD well to the City of
Camas for Mt. Glen subdivision.

Lot Sizes abutting adjoining existing large lot properties.
Existing topography/wetlands/flow basin.
Fencing adjoining existing properties.

ACCESS ROAD AND ROADS IN GENERAL SERVING THE AREA: The project proposes taking its principal access on the eastside of a downsloping – 45 degree curve at the end of N.E. 199th Avenue and the start of N.E. Ingle Road. The access road in existence currently provides service for the home of Mr. Lon Combs and has limited activity. Although not indicated on the plat map, I believe the Developers propose turn lanes at the intersection – both a pull out right turn lane for that traffic moving east to west and a left turn lane for that traffic moving west to east from south bound traffic on N.E. 199th Avenue. What is needed is improved site distance at the corner; some type of cooperative agreement with Clark County for improvements in that section affected by the increased traffic volume; possibly some form of additional traffic controls (round about, etc.); a solution to the intersection of N.E. 199th Avenue and SR 500 (if I read the traffic report correctly that intersection will be at failure) and a solution to the project only having one access/egress for the proposed 155 lots or approximately 500 folks – hopefully discussions with the Developers are already in progress. The access road serving what is labeled phase 3G should also have a right turn pull out lane and a left turn lane for traffic wanting to exit to the proposed four lots. **As we discussed and affirmed by the Proponents – because of the topography, the only reasonable access for the majority of the lots in the project is at the location shown. The Proponents are and will meet and/or exceed all transportation requirements. Each item in the text above was discussed at length including the intersection at N.E. 199th Avenue and SR 500.**

WATER LINE AND SERVICE CHANGE FROM A PUD WELL TO THE CITY OF CAMAS FOR MT. GLEN SUBDIVISION: The project proposes extending and already extended 8 inch water line in N.E. 199th Avenue to the intersection of N.E. 199th Avenue and N.E. 48th Circle (the access point for the 12 lots in Mt. Glen subdivision). Connection to the existing 8 inch line already serving the subdivision (via PUD well) is proposed at that point. Lots 4, 11 and 12 of Mr. Glen subdivision are substantially higher in elevation than the proposed connection point of the public water from the City of Camas and those higher lots will see a substantial loss of both water pressure and volume. The solution is to require a

loop system that ties into the existing water line coming from the existing PUD well. Several connection points are available. **The Proponents are planning to loop the system!**

LOT SIZES ABUTTING ADJOINING EXISTING LARGE LOT PROPERTIES: Lots proposed in phase 3A (lots 14 – 27) and 3D (lots 102 -122) adjoin lot 12 of Mt. Glen subdivision (a 30 plus acre parcel) are relatively small and do not provide the type on semi-large lot match characteristics that one would expect in a developing area such as this. Consideration should be given for some type of size enlargement such as a minimum of one half acre in the lot areas noted. **Most of the lots in Mt. Glen (specifically lots 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11) are separated from the proposed plat by the BPA right of way and the proposed entrance/exit road and are not affected by small adjoining lot sizes – only lot 12 is impacted by the lack of lot size transition. A note here, in conversation, it was pointed out to the Proponents that lots 5 through 10 of Mt. Glen will be affected by the traffic using the access road both from a noise stand point and also from car lights as the traffic negotiates the curve. The Proponents should and are considering a masonry wall adjoining the common property line between Mr. Glen (lots 5-10) and the proposed plat with the clear understanding that anything proposed is subject to BPA approval.**

EXISTING TOPOGRAPHY/WETLANDS/FLOW BASIN: The topography in which most of phase 3A, 3C, 3D, 3E and the indicated wetland are located is a flow basin that directs water from south to north - starting at what is labeled lot 94 in phase 3C (existing PUD well). The project proposes to direct storm water from this area directly west to a storm water facility adjoining N.E. Ingle Road (indicated as tract B4). Removing this water will permanently change the downstream wetlands and habitat area. Care should be exercised in this area. **The Proponents are aware and will engineer the drainage system to balance flow.**

FENCING ADJOINING EXISTING PROPERTIES: Lot 12 of Mt. Glen subdivision adjoins the proposal – specifically phases 3A, the wetland area, 3D and 3F. I ask that the entire property line adjoining the lot 12 of Mt. Glen be fenced with six foot high chain link fencing (the same as used to fence the storm water ponds on the initial phase adjoining N.E. Ingle Road). The Developers have indicated that the trail system will be improved for intended use by the proposed subdivision residents and the fencing will demark the property as well minimize intrusion onto private property. **This topic was discussed at length and is being considered by the Proponents. As far as I can recall, no affirmative decision was made.**

CULDESAC SERVING PHASE 3D: The culdesac serving this phase dead ends adjoining lot 12 of Mt. Glen. Design changes should be made to pull back the culdesac approximately 100 feet, incorporate a different lot pattern design at the end of the culdesac and provide an easement to lot 12 if the object is to provide for future circulation. **The Proponents are agreeable to this change.**

Again, thank you for the discussion. Please feel free to contact me!! Bill Huyette (360) 693-7331 Owner - lot 12 of Mt. Glen Subdivision

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.

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.
