



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
 616 NE 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
 Camas, WA 98607  
[www.ci.camass.wa.us](http://www.ci.camass.wa.us)

June 9, 2023

Romano Development  
 Attn: Stacey Shields  
 4660 NE 77th Ave  
 Vancouver, WA 98662  
 Sent via email [stacey@romanofinancial.com](mailto:stacey@romanofinancial.com)

RE: Camas Meadows Hole 9 Mixed Use Development (CUP23-01) Staff Comment Letter

Dear Stacey Shields,

Thank you for your application submittal. After staff's initial review, there are items that need to be addressed prior to staff continuing their review or scheduling a public hearing.

Planning

- The rear yard setbacks for lots 4-19, 20, 21, 75-77 need to be 25 feet per the Mixed Use zoning requirements. Please update the preliminary plat.
- Off-site trees do not count towards the minimum tree density. Please update the tree density calculation.
- Per The Department of Fish and Wildlife email attached, the following need to be addressed and updated:
  - Additional information is needed to determine if the oaks smaller than 20" DBH are regulated individually or as an oak woodland.
  - The applicant needs to demonstrate how the layout follows mitigation sequencing starting with exhausting the avoidance option. Based on the layout, the two oaks on lots 21 and 41 can be retained if the lots are a tract.
  - Please update the critical area report, mitigation plan, tree survey and report, and development plans to ensure no net loss to the oak habitat.

Engineering

Preliminary Plat:

1. The noted 'alleys' are private roads and are to meet the private road standards for rock and asphalt sections.
  - A deviation request from the private road standards for sidewalks and planter strips along Tracts H, A, and B is required.
2. Proposed NW A Drive – northwest section to the Commercial Lot:
  - Provide an ADA accessible route from the west end of NW A Drive through the parking lot of Phase 3 to the front door of the Commercial Building.
3. All curb radii on arterials are to be a minimum 35-foot.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
 616 NE 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
 Camas, WA 98607  
 www.ci.camass.wa.us

4. Proposed Tract J requires a deviation request if proposed access is off NW A Drive and/or NW 78<sup>th</sup> Avenue, per the minimum access spacing standards for a Local Road, per Table 3.
5. Private roads on Tracts H, A, and B do not meet the minimum intersection setback spacing standards from an arterial. A deviation request is required and supported.
6. Proposed NW 78<sup>th</sup> Ave. & Tract H:
  - The curb radii on a local road is to be 25-foot minimum.
7. Proposed NW 77<sup>th</sup> Ave. & Tracts A&B:
  - The curb radii on a local road is to be 25-foot minimum.
8. Proposed NW 75<sup>th</sup> Ave. & Tract B:
  - The curb radii on a local road is to be 25-foot minimum.
9. ADA curb ramps throughout the site are to be directional unless the road grades exceed 5% and are not stop controlled.
10. Per the pre-app notes, proposed NW A Drive is to be extended to include the frontage across Lot 30 (Lot 54 in the pre-application).
11. There is a 20-foot access easement shown on Lots 20 & 21. What is the purpose of the easement?

Composite Utility Plans:

12. Commercial parcel: Drive aisles adjacent to the recycle/garbage receptacles are to be a minimum of 26-feet wide.
13. Commercial parcel: Garbage/recycle enclosure dimensions at 20-feet long, 16-feet deep, 7-foot-high concrete block surround, with 2 64-inch gates that are to open out.
14. The proposed location of the Community STEP tank, between two storm facilities, is not supported by Staff.
  - Location is to be easily accessible for maintenance and inspections and not adjacent to storm facilities.
  - The community STEP tank will be owned and maintained by the HOA.
  - The city does not maintain community STEP tanks.

Stormwater Plans:

1. There is to be a paved access to storm facilities and flow control manholes for maintenance and inspections of the residential facilities and the commercial facilities.
2. Rear yard stormwater runoff from Lots 30-48 are not to negatively impact adjacent parcels.
3. Stormwater discharge via the outfall/flow spreaders located on the commercial parcel and the eastern most Tract F are not to negatively impact the adjacent properties.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Madeline Sutherland", is written over a horizontal line.

Madeline Sutherland, AICP  
 Planner

**Madeline Sutherland**

---

**From:** Smith, Amaia A (DFW) <Amaia.Smith@dfw.wa.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 8, 2023 10:05 AM  
**To:** Madeline Sutherland  
**Subject:** RE: Camas Meadows Hole 9 -White Oaks On Site  
**Attachments:** Camas Meadows Hole 9 OWOs.JPG

**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.

Good morning,

Thank you for reaching out on this one. I wanted to follow up with our phone conversation and provide a summary on initial thoughts for this project.

It looks like the oaks identified in the preliminary drawing are different than what is showing on the map. Based on your description of the tree inventory, it sounds like there are oaks <20in DBH present on site. Even if the oaks are not considered habitat of local importance, our new guidance recommends mitigation for oaks <20inch DBH (I believe down to 6" DBH). Additionally, it is possible that the other oaks within this project area are actually contributing to an Oregon white oak woodland. Additional information is needed to determine if these oaks will be regulated individually or as an oak woodland since the mitigation requirements are different. I've attached a screenshot of the oaks we have mapped in this area and marked the oaks in red that appear to differ than what is identified in the preliminary layout.

Additionally, there needs to be demonstration on how this layout follows the mitigation sequence, starting with exhausting avoidance option. Based on that, it looks like there are oaks that can be retained for this development located in parcels 41, 21. I recommend alternative layouts to see if additional oaks can be retained on site and justification why the final design maximizes avoidance of impacts. Also, you mentioned that their justification for removing the oak in parcel 21 is that the dripline abuts to a retaining wall. While I recognize that the retaining wall may impact the oak's health, can the retaining wall be adjusted to lessen impacts? Also, can this oak be retained on the landscape with contingency that if it shows signs of decline, subsequent mitigation will be required? Even dead/dying oaks provide ecological function, so retaining it on the landscape will provide future benefit as a snag. I think there are steps the applicant can take to avoid/minimize impacts before removing the oak in parcel 21 entirely.

Last, we are finalizing our new Best Management Practices for OWO mitigation and the requirements to meet no net loss of ecological function are more than what has been recommended in the past. Based on this, the applicant will likely need additional mitigation than what is identified in this preliminary site plan, even if additional oaks are retained on the landscape. The final mitigation requirements will be based on if this stand is an oak woodland or regulated based on individual oaks.

Also, I'm familiar with the area and think that there are snags within these parcels. Is that also addressed in the critical areas report and/or mitigation report? If not, I am interested in knowing if the snags meet our PHS definition found in our [Washington State Priority Habitats and Species List](#).

Thanks again and let me know if there are additional questions,  
Amaia

**From:** Madeline Sutherland <MSutherland@cityofcamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 7, 2023 2:23 PM  
**To:** Smith, Amaia A (DFW) <Amaia.Smith@dfw.wa.gov>  
**Subject:** Camas Meadows Hole 9 -White Oaks On Site

External Email

Hi Amaia,

I am working with an applicant on a project and they have 7 Oregon White Oaks over 20" DBH on site. Per our code, they are considered habitat of local importance and need to be retained or mitigated for if they meet the mitigation sequencing requirements per CMC 16.51.170.

Based on their submittal attached, they will be removing 5 out of the 7 oaks. They submitted a critical area and mitigation report outlining mitigation plantings they will be providing for the removal of the 5 oaks. My question is if the removal of the 5 oaks is something WDFW is ok with if they are mitigated for? Or would you like to see more oaks retained? To me, it seems like the oak on lot 41 and 21 could potentially be retained as well. Let me know when you are free for a phone call to discuss this further.

Thank you,

**Madeline Sutherland, AICP**

Planner

Desk 360-817-7237

Cell 360-326-5524

[www.cityofcamas.us](http://www.cityofcamas.us) | [msutherland@cityofcamas.us](mailto:msutherland@cityofcamas.us)

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.

