



AKS ENGINEERING & FORESTRY, LLC

9600 NE 126TH AVENUE, SUITE 2520

VANCOUVER, WA 98682

(360) 882-0419

April 29, 2026

Madeline Coulter
City of Camas Community Development
616 NE 4th Avenue
Camas, WA 98607

RE: Stell Ridge Staff Report Response - Camas Staff Responses 4/30/26

Dear Madeline:

Below is a list of clarifications with the findings and requested revisions to the conditions for the Staff Report for Stella Ridge (SUB25-1009) (Staff Report), dated April 22, 2026. All requested condition modifications also apply to the associated findings in the staff report. The clarifications or modifications to the findings and conditions are identified followed by reasoning for the request.

FINDINGS

Page 3 – Chapter 16 (Second Paragraph)

The SEPA checklist mentions that there is soil **contamination-gas at levels higher than allowed by the Washington State Department of Ecology (ECY)** in the southeast corner of the site. The checklist further states that once the soil gas area is fully delineated and all soil testing is completed; the applicant will work with appropriate jurisdictions to mitigate the soil gas **contamination**. See page 18 section 7.a.1 and 7.a.2 of the SEPA checklist. Staff recommend a condition of approval to this effect.

Clarification: We wanted to clarify that there is contamination off-site and that gases have traveled through the soil into the site, creating an area on-site with soil gas levels higher than allowed by ECY. There is no soil contamination on-site.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revisions.

CONDITIONS

Condition 10 – Page 34

If any item of archaeological interest is uncovered during a permitted land-disturbing action or activity, all ground disturbing activities **in the immediate vicinity of the finding** shall immediately cease, and the applicant shall notify the City and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP).

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. Forcing construction to stop for the entire site if something is uncovered would be excessive. If something is uncovered in multiple locations, this condition would also cover potentially stopping work on the whole site.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revisions.

Condition 12 – Page 34

Any entrance structures or signs proposed or required for this project will be reviewed and approved by the city.

a. All designs will be in accordance with applicable City codes.

b. The maintenance of the entrance structure will be the responsibility of the homeowners **association**.

Request: Revise the condition as shown above. A monument sign for the subdivision should be the responsibility of the homeowners' association to ensure that proper maintenance can and will occur.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revisions.

Condition 22 – Page 35

The applicant or **homeowners' association** will be responsible for maintenance of all private improvements, including but not limited to stormwater facilities Tracts and easements, Open Space Tracts, parking areas, landscaping and irrigation, private STEP tanks, and any retaining walls.

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. Once the plat is recorded, all private improvements will become property of the homeowners' association, and the applicant will no longer be responsible for maintenance.

Staff Response: Staff supports the addition of the homeowners' association language, with the following understanding/clarification:

- The applicant is responsible for maintenance of the stormwater facilities for a period of 2-years after final acceptance is issued, per CMC 14.02.090 at which time the HOA will be responsible for ownership and maintenance of the stormwater facilities.
- The applicant is responsible for all private improvements until such time as the homeowners' association is formed.
- The applicant is responsible for all public improvements for a period of 2-years after final acceptance is issued, per CMC 17.21.070.

Condition 27 – Page 35

~~If potential artifacts are discovered during construction, work must immediately cease, and both the State Department of Archaeological and Historic Preservation and the City shall be notified.~~

Request: Remove the condition. This condition is already covered in Condition 10.

Staff Response: Staff supports striking Condition 27.

Condition 36 – Page 36

36. Prior to engineering plan approval, the applicant is to work with engineering staff to revise the preliminary street plans and preliminary plat to include design features for traffic calming devices at the following locations:

- a. Raised crosswalk or other similar device, and mid-block curb ramps on both sides of NW Umatilla Street ~~at~~ **in the vicinity of** Tract I, Private Parking Area.
- b. Traffic circle at the intersection of NW Umatilla Street and NW 20th Avenue.
- c. Raised crosswalk or other similar device, and mid-block curb ramps on both sides of NW Umatilla Street between NW 20th Avenue and NW 22nd Avenue.
- d. A traffic calming device on NW 20th Avenue between NW Tidland Street and NW Brady Road, e.g., mid-block curb ramps on both sides of NW 20th Avenue and marked crosswalk, raised crosswalk, or other similar device.
- e. Raised crosswalk or other similar device, and mid-block curb ramps on both sides of NW Tidland Street in the vicinity of Tract G, Private Street.
- f. Raised crosswalk or other similar device, and mid-block curb ramps on both sides of NW 22nd Avenue ~~at~~ **in the vicinity of** Tract E, Private Parking.



Request: Revise the condition as shown above. The proposed revision allows for flexibility during final engineering design if the final location of the traffic calming device cannot be immediately adjacent to the tract due to other site design elements.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revisions.

Condition 42 – Page 37

*Prior to engineering plan approval, the stormwater plans shall be revised to include a stormwater manhole ~~at~~ **within** the right-of-way between public and private roads and private storm easements, as the stormwater systems located in private roads and private storm easements are to be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association (HOA).*

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. The modification will allow for the manhole located in the best location within the right-of-way at the public stormwater mainline. The way the condition is written, manhole rims could be located within the sidewalk.

Staff Response: Staff does not support the proposed revision for the following reason:

- There is to be a clear maintenance/ownership delineation between the public and private stormwater systems.
- A manhole or cleanout is to be located at the right-of-way between the private roads and private storm easements; and the public right-of-way.

Condition 47 – Page 37

Prior to engineering plan approval, the applicant shall ~~submit documentation work with City staff to verifying~~ that the existing 8-inch and 10-inch STEF mains can handle the additional inflow from the proposed development.

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. Per the attached email from City staff, the sanitary sewer in this area is not modeled and further internal discussion is needed. The revision allows for this discussion as well as time to determine what will be needed.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revisions.

Condition 51 – Page 38

*Prior to engineering plan approval, the preliminary plat and subsequently the preliminary street plans should be revised with the minimum centerline radius of seventy-feet (70-feet) for Curve #2, which is the corner of NW Umatilla Street and NW 22nd Avenue, or **a road deviation request shall be submitted to the city for review to request a reduction in the centerline radius.***

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. This allows the Applicant the opportunity work with City staff to explore the possibility of a road deviation to allow the 90-degree corner to be designed as shown on the preliminary plat.

Staff Response: Staff proposes the following: “Prior to engineering plan approval, the city engineer would support a deviation request from a traffic engineer identifying a minimum centerline curve radius for a 15 MPH warning speed posting. If the deviation request is approved by the city engineer, this location is to be signed and channelized accordingly.

Condition 57 – Page 38

*Prior to engineering plan approval, a streetlight is to be added to the plans for Tract **G**, the private street that*



serves Lots 64-69, and the private parking area on Tract H. A note is to be added to the applicable plans that the streetlights on Tract G and/or H is to be metered separately and are to be owned and maintained by Lots 64-69 and/or the Homeowners Association (HOA).

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. The revision clarifies what tract is being reference for the streetlight.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Condition 59-Relocate – Page 39

Prior to the applicant's submittal of electrical plans to Clark Public Utilities, the preliminary electrical plans for streetlights, transformers, J-boxes, etc., which are prepared by others, should be submitted to the city for review and approval.

Request: Relocate the condition to be under the "Special Conditions of Approval" heading, before the "Prior to Engineering Plan Approval" heading. The electrical designers will not design the electrical system for the development until engineering plans have been approved.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Condition 60 – Page 39

Prior to engineering plan approval, the driveway widths ~~would vary from 10-foot wide to 14-foot wide depending on the lot width,~~ shall meet the requirements of City of Camas standard details ST14 to ST16 or receive approval for of road deviation for wider driveways during final engineering review. ~~Where feasible, shared driveways should be provided between lots smaller than 25-feet in width, as the driveway throat shall not exceed 40% of the total lot frontage.~~

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. The proposed revisions continues to maintain the driveway width requirement in the standard detail without specifying width in the event that design changes occur that change the specific width requirements. The proposed revision also provides the opportunity to work with staff to see if wider driveway widths can be proved reasonable during final engineering design.

Staff Response: Staff does not support the proposed revision for the following reasons:

- Per CDSM Street Details ST14, ST15, & ST16 the "... driveway throat width is not to exceed 40% of the total lot frontage."
- Based on the preliminary plat, lot widths vary from 23.5-feet 36-feet-wide, which results in a driveway throat width not to exceed 10-feet-wide to 14-feet-wide.
- Based on the proposed lot widths, a driveway width in excess of 40% would not be approved, except for those driveways that are shown as 'shared' driveway between two lots.
- Driveways for single-family residences are not constructed during the civil improvement construction.
- Driveways for single-family residences are inspected during homebuilding by engineering staff per the CDSM requirements: not to exceed 40% of the lot frontage.
- The road section requires minimum planter widths of 6.5-feet and 4.5-feet. Driveway widths in excess of the maximum 40% of the lot frontage would potentially impact the following improvements:
 - Street trees, streetlights, water services & water meter boxes, fire hydrants, transformers, etc.

Condition 64 – Page 39

Prior to engineering plan approval, a Supplemental Memo to the TIA is to be submitted with the analysis of a left-turn pocket on NW 18th Avenue and proposed NW Umatilla Street; ~~and on NW Brady Road and proposed NW 22nd Avenue.~~



Request: Revise the condition as edited above. Per the amended pre-application report (Exhibit 2) the intersection of NW 22nd Avenue and NW Brady road should be right-in/right-out, not allowing for a left turn pocket. Removal of this portion of the condition is also verified in the attached email with City staff.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Condition 70 – Page 40

The mitigation credits ~~of .24~~ shall be purchased prior to final plat approval and proof shall be submitted to the City for confirmation.

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. The wetland fill impacts are required to go through a JARPA review with the USACE and ECY, which could change the final number of credits needed to be purchased. Therefore, it will be better to simply require the purchase of the credits, in case the final number of required credits changes.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Condition 80 – Page 41

*Prior to final plat approval, a note shall be added to the final plat stating that the owners of Lots 90-93 **and/or the Homeowners Association** are responsible for ownership and maintenance of the road in Tract A. The Homeowners Association (HOA) is responsible for ownership and maintenance of the 5-foot-wide public access sidewalk.*

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. Most developers prefer to have the HOA own and maintain private streets as the future cost for maintenance could be too large for four private lot owners and opposed to the entire community.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Condition 82 – Page 40

*Prior to final plat approval, a note shall be added to the final plat stating that the owner of Lot 124 **and/or the Homeowners Association are** ~~is~~ responsible for ownership and maintenance of Tract D.*

Request: Revise the condition as edited above. Most developers prefer to have the HOA own and maintain private streets as the future cost for maintenance could be too large for four private lot owners and opposed to the entire community.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Condition ~~87~~ Relocate – Page 42

The applicant shall delineate the soil gas ~~contamination~~ area and work with appropriate jurisdictions to mitigate the soil gas ~~contamination~~.

Request: Revise the condition as edited above and relocate the condition to a new section for prior to building permit approval. As previously noted, there is not contamination on site, the soil gas is the result of off-site contamination. Mitigation for the soil gas will be related to home build as there are no risks until enclosed spaces are constructed. Therefore, mitigation will be related to home construction and not site development. Mitigation for a home, if required, includes installation of a vapor barrier which should be reviewed at time of building permit issuance.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.



PLAT NOTES

Plat Note 11 – Page 43

Tract A, Private Street, is to be owned and maintained by the owners of Lots 90-93 and/or the Homeowners Association. The Homeowners Association (HOA) is responsible for ownership and maintenance of the 5-foot-wide public access sidewalk.

Request: Revise the plat note as edited above. Most developers prefer to have the HOA own and maintain private streets as the future cost for maintenance could be too large for four private lot owners and opposed to the entire community.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Plat Note 12 – Page 43

Tract D, Private Street, is to be owned and maintained by the owner of Lot 124 and/or the Homeowners Association.

Request: Revise the plat note as edited above. Most developers prefer to have the HOA own and maintain private streets as the future cost for maintenance could be too large for four private lot owners and opposed to the entire community.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Plat Note 15 – Page 43

Tract H, Private Parking, is to be owned and maintained by the owners of Lots 64-69 and/or the Homeowners Association.

Request: Revise the plat note as edited above. Most developers prefer to have the HOA own and maintain private streets as the future cost for maintenance could be too large for four private lot owners and opposed to the entire community.

Staff Response: Staff supports the proposed revision.

Sincerely,

AKS ENGINEERING & FORESTRY, LLC



Michael Andreotti, RLA, Land Use Planner

Attachments:

Email with City Staff



From: [John Meier](#)
To: [Curleigh \(Jim\) Carothers](#)
Cc: [Anita Ashton](#); [Michael Andreotti](#)
Subject: RE: Stella Ridge Staff Report Questions
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 10:35:10 AM

Thanks Curleigh!

John M. Meier PE - Principal

AKS ENGINEERING & FORESTRY, LLC

P: 360.882.0419 | www.aks-eng.com | john@aks-eng.com

From: Curleigh (Jim) Carothers <jcarothers@cityofcamas.us>

Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 10:27 AM

To: John Meier <jmeier@aks-eng.com>

Cc: Anita Ashton <AAshton@cityofcamas.us>

Subject: RE: Stella Ridge Staff Report Questions

Proceed with caution: This email hails from an external source. Unverified emails may lead to phishing attacks or malware infiltration. Always exercise due diligence.

John,

Condition 47 – The GSP map shows this area as a non-modeled collection system. Engineering will have to discuss with the utilities manager. We are trying to get in contact with him today.

Condition 64 – If the Brady median is to remain, there will be no need for a left turn pocket or analysis. The 22nd and Brady intersection can be stricken from the condition.

James E Carothers, PE

Engineering Manager/City Engineer

Desk 360-817-7230

www.cityofcamas.us | jcarothers@cityofcamas.us

From: John Meier <jmeier@aks-eng.com>

Sent: Monday, April 27, 2026 5:04 PM

To: Curleigh (Jim) Carothers <jcarothers@cityofcamas.us>

Subject: Stella Ridge Staff Report Questions

WARNING: This message originated outside the City of Camas Mail system. **DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments** unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the content. If you recognize the sender as a city employee and you see this message this email is a phishing email. If you are unsure, click the Phish Alert button to redirect the email for ITD review.

Curleigh,

We are preparing a letter response after reading the staff report. However, there are a couple of items that I would like to discuss with you prior to the hearing because they warrant more of a discussion:

- Condition 47: Capacity analysis of downstream 8 and 10 inch STEF mains. Typically, the City's capital facilities plan looks at the "system capacity of these facilities to address existing deficiencies and potential development" from the Executive Summary of the Draft 2022 City of Camas General Sewer Plan. The question I have is why we would need to do a capacity analysis since this is what the CFP is supposed to do. In addition, this site is at the far upstream end of a basin, so minimum pipe sizing should be more than enough capacity to serve this site.
- Condition 64: Left turn pocket analysis. The condition says we need to do a left turn pocket analysis at Brady and 22nd Avenue, but the pre-app notes said we were relegated to a right in/out only. Since there is a median at this intersection, is this condition incorrect or is there a different reason the City is asking for this now?

Thanks for your attention to these questions. I hope we are able to catch up tomorrow to discuss further.

Have a great evening!

John M. Meier, P.E., Principal



AKS ENGINEERING & FORESTRY, LLC

Physical: 9600 NE 126th Avenue, Suite 2520 | Vancouver, WA 98682

Mailing: 13504 NE 84th Street, Suite 103-295 | Vancouver, WA 98682

P: 360.882.0419 Ext. 322 | www.aks-eng.com | john@aks-eng.com

Oregon: Bend, Keizer, The Dalles, Tualatin

Washington: Kirkland, Richland, Vancouver, Wenatchee, White Salmon

NOTICE: This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. AKS Engineering and Forestry shall not be liable for any changes made to the electronic data transferred. Distribution of electronic data to others is prohibited without the express written consent of AKS Engineering and Forestry.

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.